CHAPTER TWO

EAP Academic Writing Theory and Pedagogy: an Exploration into an
EAP Dialogic Sociocultural Substitute

2.0 Introduction

The first chapter discusses two umbrella fields of EAP, ESP (in Swales’ (1985) account) and the writing theory (in Wards’ account of dialogic writing pedagogies, 1997). It has been found that these do not provide for cultural development and intercultural dialogue in their mainstream articulations and practices. The dialogic sociocultural perspective supports these aims and hence, provides the ideal framework for EAP. Three criteria have been proposed as catalysts for the above aims to be achieved in academic writing classrooms.

In the present chapter, the researcher explores further her proposal by showing some inherited debates and aims from the mother field ESP to the EAP which does not seem to support the above aims in EAP. All the mainstream writing pedagogies in EAP are shown to be focusing on the transmissive aspect of education and evading its developmental aims especially in relation to non-native speakers. The dialogic sociocultural perspective is explored further to provide the tools for achieving such educational aims in an EFL teacher development context. The researcher provides a detailed account by the end of the chapter of how this is to be achieved through relating the dialogic sociocultural concepts (internalization and mediation) with the three criteria.

The present chapter consists of four main sections. The first section presents inherited debates and aims in the EAP from the mother branch ESP. The researcher argues that such debates can be evaded using a dialogic sociocultural perspective for EAP; and the previous aims need to be replaced with developmental and dialogic ones. The first section is followed by a critical historical account of the main schools of writing theory and pedagogy within the EAP perspective; the Rhetoric School of writing, the composition or process school of writing, and the genre school of writing. The second section presents a proposal that the concepts, mediation and internalization, can be seen
from a dialogic sociocultural perspective for the purpose of cultural development and intercultural dialogue. The dialogic sociocultural perspective relates the concepts to dialogic sociocultural criteria (intersubjectivity, responsivity, and situatedness) for the achievement of the above aim in an EFL teacher development context. The last section is a brief summary of the chapter.

2.1 EAP-ESP Related History and Issues

The present section presents inherited debates and aims in the EAP from the mother branch ESP. The researcher argues that such debates can be evaded using a dialogic sociocultural perspective for EAP; and the previous aims need to be replaced with developmental and dialogic ones.

2.1.1 EAP-ESP Related History in Brief and the Inherited Specificity-Generality Debate (revisited)

The section consists of two interrelated main points. The first is a historical account and branching of EAP that relates it to ESP. The second is a more EAP focused account of the common core vis-à-vis subject-specific debate than that presented in the chapter in relation to ESP. The idea behind revisiting the debate is situating it within the EAP practices and arguments with the aim to find a dialogic sociocultural alternative for the debate.

EAP as a discipline developed following the pioneering work of Firth and Halliday. Following Halliday, applied linguists started seeing language as a resource for communication that varies across contexts. The goal for language teaching has become to prepare learners to communicate in specific situations. What was felt needed was an approach to language teaching which was based on descriptions of the language as it was used in the specific target situations. The rational for such an approach was set out in a seminal publication by Halliday, MacIntosh and Strevens (1964), *The Linguistic Science and Language Teaching*. In this book Halliday et al presented the concept of register analysis, the description of language varieties used in particular disciplines or occupations, based on statistical differences in lexis and syntax (Flowerdew and Peacock,
Following their work, applied linguists started describing the EST registers and works like Barber's descriptive study of syntax and vocabulary of Scientific English (1962); A.J. Herbert's selection of specific sentence patterns as well as frequent and trouble-causing vocabulary (1965); and Higgins' selection of 'frame' vocabulary and content passages (1967) have announced the inception of EST as the precursor for the EAP; see chapter 1, section 1.2.2 A bird-view of ESP, Swales’ legacy.

Jordan (1997) distinguishes EGP (English for General purposes) from ESP (English for Specific Purposes). EGP is also called TENOR (the Teaching of English for No Obvious Reason). The reason for using this term according to Jordan, following Abbott (year) who first coined it, is that many schoolchildren learn English and are too young to know the purpose for learning it. ESP is the term used when English is used for specific purposes. However, the distinction between the two major branches of ESP (i.e. EAP and EOP, English for Occupational Purposes), according to Flowerdew and Peacock (ibid), is not clear. A lot of work conducted in the academy is in fact preparation for the professional occupations students who are likely to go into when they graduate and might therefore be classified as EOP. English support for the more vocationally-oriented aspects of the Business course could perhaps be described as EOP as much as EAP (p. 11). They agree, however, that this distinction can be useful for research purposes. Thus, the distinction that is shown in the diagram below, the writer maintains, is not for teaching purposes but for research purposes. The writer agrees with Flowerdew and Peacock (ibid) on the claim that in teaching academic tasks, students are also prepared for their occupational and professional demands.

Following Johns (1990) cited in Jordan (1997, p.3), Jordan presents a chart which illustrates the main divisions of ESP. Here is the diagram:
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\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (ESP) at (0,0) {ESP};
  \node (EOP) at (0,-2) {EOP};
  \node (EAP) at (2,-2) {EAP};
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  \draw[->] (EST) -- node[below] {Other than EST} (EAP);
  \draw[->] (EAP) -- node[above] {English for Science and technology – the oldest branch of ESP} (ESP);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}
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(Figure 2.1)
From the diagram above, it appears that ESP has two branches: EOP (English for Occupational Purposes) and EAP (English for Academic Purposes). English for occupational purposes is divided into EPP (English for Professional Purposes) and EVP (English for Vocational Purposes). Under the EPP and EVP, materials are designed to give field practice that gives access to a particular occupation in a restricted situation such as doctor-patient interaction in casualty consultation. EAP has two divisions the EST (English for Science and Technology), the oldest branch in ESP, and EAP (English for Academic Purposes).

In EAP, a long-debated issue repeatedly occurs. It is an issue inherited from the mother branch ESP. It is the common core vis-à-vis the subject-specific debate. These are also called EGAP (English for General Academic Purposes) and EAP (English for Specific Academic purposes).

A large portion of the common core element is most commonly known as study skills. Subject-specific English is the language essential for a particular subject. This includes the language structure, vocabulary, the particular skills needed for the subject as well as the appropriate academic conventions (pp. 4-5). As it has been mentioned in Chapter One, there has been a debate in the field on whether to teach common core skills or subject-specific English. The debate was led by Widdowson and composition studies experts such as Leki, Spack, and Zamel for common core skills on the one hand, and St. John, Dudley-Evans, Johns, and Swales for subject-specific skills on the other hand. Benesch (2001) reports the L2 composition studies campaign as presented by Leki, Spack, and Zamel critique against the subject-specific English language teaching. Beginning with Raimes (1991), Benesch states that she 'views ESL composition as a humanities course in a liberal art curriculum with an “intrinsic subject matter”' such as grammar, literature, and culture. Raimes does not accept the idea of teaching writing in a module type for example for marketing, accounting, or nursing. These, she feels, contradict the very nature of liberal arts education whose tradition is to prepare students for general needs in English. Spack (1988), as reported in Benesch, argues that the best to be accomplished with regard to L2 composition students is 'to create programmes in which students can learn general inquiry strategies, rhetorical principles, and tasks that can transfer to other course work.' She suggests two skills of teaching writing to ESL.
undergraduates. These are working with data and writing from other texts (pp. 36-7). These, Spack maintains, can ensure students’ preparation for future academic courses whatever the subject matter be. Zamel (1993, 1995) proposes teaching English for general academic purposes based on the following conclusions:

- students will encounter a variety of unpredictable assignments in their future courses;
- their interpretations of those assignments will be unique and idiosyncratic; and
- their academic coursework will be “generally unimaginative and formulaic” . . . , with the subject matter presented in an “authoritarian” manner, preventing students from “engaging with material and work they are assigned.” (as cited in Benesch (ibid), P. 38)

Thus, the critique against the subject-specific of ESL writing has been based on the idea that the field of composition is grounded in the curriculum of arts. This implies that the composition scholars reject the idea of being introduced into an area (content courses) they have no knowledge of. The compositionists also believe that students need transferable skills across contexts which might be unpredictable and unique. From the above critique, one can say that compositionists’ campaign recommends a common core battery of skills on the basis that subject matter courses are representative of “authoritarian” discourse. The coincidence is that identifying some core skills to be studied as the only transferrable skills across contexts can be similarly authoritarian whatever the manner by which these would be taught. In addition, avoiding any attachment to the content and focusing on the skills deprive students from using language naturally. In any natural communicative context we find that the form and the content are inseparable; same can be said about the language skill and content. With the content, we use the designative function of language and the expressive function of language. The designative function helps us to find words for the thoughts which we have not yet formulated; and the expressive function enables us to express our ready-made thoughts. Thought cannot be contentless. In addition, thought cannot move without the appropriate skills which spring from the context in which we function or for which we aim.
Therefore, the researcher believes that what is needed is not only skills to be practiced and adapted in the situation but the ability to see skills as emerging within the situations in which we work.

From the other campaign for subject-matter, Dudley-Evans and T.F. Johns explain that the common core approach needs to be supplemented by an attempt to attend to students' more specific needs and language difficulties that students face in their disciplines; cited in A.M. Johns and Dudley-Evans (1991). Dudley-Evans and St. John argue that there are enough differences among disciplines in the genres that emerge and thus reiterate the importance of content-specific teaching. Johns (1997) argues that there are unique abilities to explore in academic worlds or academic communities. These can be their values, genres, and literacies. John Swales (1990) is concerned with the prototypical examples of relevant genres in each field. These reflect different demands of different discourse communities; all cited in Benesch (ibid).

The researcher finds that the idea behind the subject-specific teaching of writing campaign is based on the argument that genres are different across disciplinary areas. To teach genres, one has to first acquire the values, the discourse, and the practices of particular fields of study. The researcher's response is that genres should not and need not be taught as prototypes of the texts in particular disciplines if the idea is to help them write for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. Genres have evolved in the field due to certain persistent needs of its practitioners. They are not predetermined. For example, Canagarajah (2002) reports Bazerman's survey of the spectroscopic articles in the Physical review from its foundation in 1893 to 1980. Bazerman has found many changes in the use of citations; they first have been rather general relating broadly to the subject of the paper. By 1910, these have been curtailed, become recent, and directly relevant to the research. Bazerman has also observed changes in syntactic and lexical features of spectroscopic research articles. Until 1930, the research articles have been ended with a result section but after that discussion and conclusion sections have become more important and have often followed the presentation of the results (pp. 90-91). These changes that Canagarajah has reported from Bazerman's study show that the writing of the field is something dynamic not static. It shows the writers' effort to cope with the changes that occur in the field. Moreover, these changes are, according to Canagarajah,
not neutral. The writers, the researcher argues, dialogically respond to the sociocultural changes and demands flexibility in the way they write their papers. Each time writers begin to write, there is a possibility to sense a cultural (broad or narrow) need that necessitates borrowing from other fields/cultures. How far are this dynamism and future orientations accounted for within a subject-specific view? Moreover, an Arab learning an EF and is literate in Arabic must have come across similar genres in his/her study of disciplinary areas other than English language studies. S/He must also have observed relations between scholarly (secondary genres in Bakhtin’s sense) and other genres (primary genres in Bakhtin’s sense) in his/her oral tradition. If we (educators) want genuine interaction to occur between the indigenous genres that the students come across in the native culture and other genres that s/he comes across through the target language, we need to let genres interact in the students’ attempt to construct knowledge. *This means that a subject-specific focus on formal target language genres will not suffice.* If the students are tied to a particular disciplinary area and its genres, they will miss the chance of seeing the similarities and differences between genres across disciplines/fields and across cultures. For example, if language teachers learn to describe, they need to relate it to their situations both as professionals and as citizens who are responsible for the growth of their field in their country and internationally. *For this to happen, the writers need to be able to construct knowledge that is situated with aims of dialogue and development.* A dialogic sociocultural perspective provides a solution in terms of situated knowledge construction. In a situated construction of knowledge, both the designative and the expressive functions of language will be at work. Memory works semiotically and signs which carry thematic resemblance may get recalled as the situation demands. For the writer who wants to construct meaning that is new in terms of the demands of the situation of writing, different values for old meanings and new meanings for old values may occur. Thus, description as a generic function, for example, may be related to other functions such as analysis, synthesis, and/or explanation acquired in different contexts. Thus, functions might be related across contexts (that come to the mind of the writer due to certain connections perceived in the situated writing act) which are not necessarily subject-specific. Furthermore, subject-specific descriptions (description of classrooms, textbook layout, a table of information, a diagram, etc., are examples of description
encountered by student teachers) might semiotically be associated with words carrying similar descriptive features in a previously read poem in Arabic; thus, crossing the boundaries of fields.

Thus, the researcher concludes that the arguments for common core and subject-specific teaching of academic writing need to be seen within a new dialogic sociocultural approach. The two campaigns in the main stream EAP, the researcher argues, do not see the two functions of language (the designative and the expressive) as inseparable. Nor they, it seems, are aware of the possibilities a situated construction view may bring to the field. The dialogic sociocultural perspective that the researcher proposes sees the two functions of language as complementary in a situated meaning/knowledge making. Moreover, it argues for a situated meaning/knowledge making as tied to a concern for development and dialogue. This, the researcher argues, will provide a wider scope for EAP to shackle the chains of subject-specific via common core dilemma inherited from the mother field ESP. Relations rather than specificity or generality will be perceived; and these will dialogically as well as developmentally be nurtured.

2.1.2 Colonial-entrepreneurial ESP-EAP Origin

There was a growing need for EAP in higher education studies, for reading academic texts and conducting research, etc. According to Flowerdew and Peacock (2001), EAP has been carried out in mainly four geographical areas: in the major English-speaking countries (the US, UK, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand) for teaching overseas students whose first language is not English; in the former British colonies where English is used as the medium of instruction; in countries which have no historic link with English, but which need to access the research literature in that language (the countries of Western Europe, Japan, China, Latin America, Francophone Africa and others); and finally, the countries of the former Soviet-bloc, as they seek to distance themselves from the influence of Russia and its language and position themselves as participants in the increasingly global economy and academic community (p. 8).

The researcher wants to draw the reader's attention to the fact that EAP as a field began in the Arab World since its beginning in the 1970s. The researcher's country was
divided into two countries: The Yemen Arab Republic (occupying the north of Yemen and often called the North) and The Democratic Republic of Yemen (occupying the south of Yemen and often called the South) when Britain occupied the southern part of Yemen making it a British colony. After colonialization (i.e. when Britain withdrew its troops from the south of Yemen), English has been taught as a subject in the Yemeni schools in both North and the South of Yemen. It has become also a required subject in all Yemeni universities and a content subject for both education and arts colleges. Following the vogue of the ESP/EAP movement at that time in the Arab World, English has also become the medium for teaching Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacology, Engineering, computer sciences, etc. There has been no obvious reason for selecting English as the only medium for science and technology as well as the only requirement subject among other languages such as French, German, and Spanish. During the 1970s and onwards, Swales has been teaching in Egypt. With his presence and that of Dudley-Evans and other ESP/EAP specialists in the Middle East, the ESP/EAP movement has become dominant in the Arab World.

The presence of the EAP movement in the Arab World has not been completely innocent. Benesch (2001), reporting Huchinson and Waters (1987), detects economic intentions behind the appearance of the movement and draws attention to ‘a massive flow of funds and Western expertise into the oil-rich countries’ after the ‘Oil Crisis of the early 1970s’. After such flow of funds, there have been coordinated efforts of the UK and the US governmental agencies, private foundations, universities, and private industry to vigorously promote English language teaching in the Middle East countries with the desire to control oil market (pp. 26-7). Benesch also provides a quote from a paper given at the 1971 Adult English for National Development Conference titled “English is the language of oil technology and of the people who work in oil”. It confirms the above economic intentions using the perspective of an oil company employee, Charles Johnson, English Curriculum specialist at the Arabian American Oil Company (ARAMCO). Johnson’s contribution to the conference proceedings shows a side of ESP that is not usually mentioned in its literature: its role in making further the economic aims of a company. That is, the training ARAMCO workers underwent English instruction to foster particular attitudes, behaviour, and thinking the company wanted from its Arabic
workers. The following quote from Johnson’s conference paper (1971) shows this intention on the side of the company:

It is the position of ARAMCO training today that if the course of academic study is to help produce the kind of employee the company wants and needs, then training must go beyond the imparting of academic learning; it must involve itself in changing attitudes and behaviours, to make a better “achiever.” (P. 28)

Thus, even for its EOP branch ESP purpose has been to serve the economic and social needs of a company that has nothing to do in the area other than achieving its economic purposes. This is clear in the way it prepares its workers to serve its own purposes and not to have their own purposes.

Benesch (ibid) also finds the economic reasons behind the investment of EAP in the area clear from Phillipson’s (1992) analysis of the economic and political roots of English language teaching. According to Phillipson the British Council has its roots in the 1934 when the British Foreign Office has decided to form a committee, The British Council for Relations with Other Countries in order to promote English language and the British culture abroad. It has been determined that ‘[in] the very long term’ ‘the work of the British Council, especially in regard to the teaching of English in Asia, will be highly beneficial’ to Britain’s overseas trade (p.32).

Swales (1997) himself in a self-reflective thought of self involvement in EAP since the mid of the 1960s, acknowledged that he accepted that what Third World countries needed was a rapid acceleration in their resources of human capital, which could be achieved by hurried transmission of Western technical and scientific know-how delivered through the medium of English and supported by appropriate EAP programs. (P. 377)

He admits that he has conveniently overlooked the links between the teaching of technical languages and manufacturing and exportation of technical equipment from
West to the Third World countries. He also believes that the ESP’s “accommodationist” and “technocratic” stance about the value of English as a wider window on the world has been inherited in the ESL field. He, thus, regrets that English in consequence has become a Tyrannosaurus rex or ‘a powerful carnivore gobbling up the other denizens of the academic linguistic grazing ground’ (p.374). This, the researcher further argues, has resulted in the impoverishment of the creativity of the third world cultures; death of genres in these cultures leading to the death of the academic and non-academic practices in/for which they are created; and the fading away of the rhetoric and discourse through which the academic genres and innovations of these cultures have/may come in the first place to the academia. Swales comments that the above condition must cause us

to reflect soberly on Anglophone gate-keeping practices. Gate-keepers would no longer be able to get away with saying that ‘these foreigners just don’t know how to frame issues and arguments in ways that we feel comfortable with,’ because those foreigners would no longer be trying to do those things in the first place. (p. 380)

Swales’ comment arouses in the researcher the feeling that the so-claimed pragmatism as the rationale for the EAP field and talked about by Benesch (1993) is, as Benesch has correctly predicted, in fact ideological in its ESL/EFL realizations. Benesch questions the epistemological and social assumptions of the so-called pragmatism. She begins with the assumption of the EAP theorists that it is unrealistic to expect university to adapt itself to the culture, world views, and languages of non-native students. What is realistic in their view is that foreign students need to accommodate to the content and pedagogy of mainstream academic classes. She proceeds that even when students in EAP classes are invited to be more active participants in their education, the aim is to promote their awareness of current ways of teaching and testing. The aim is not to encourage their challenge of the status quo. Then, the epistemological assumption of the EAP classes is to train accommodationist minds rather than critical minds. In its social assumption the EAP also leads students to accept their social realities as they are. They are trained to passively accept cultural conditions as they are in L1 academia and cultures. What is rather needed, Benesch argues and the researcher also feels relevant for her country context, is to
negotiate academic curricula and make them responsive to sociocultural needs of the ESL students. Benesch quotes Boyer (1990) depicting the way this could be done:

The aim of the education is not only to prepare students for productive careers, but also to enable them to live lives of dignity and purpose; not only to generate new knowledge, but also to channel the knowledge to human ends; not merely to study government, but to help shape citizenary that can promote public good. Thus, higher education’s vision must be widened if the nation is to be rescued from problems that threaten to diminish permanently the quality of life. (p. 714)

Likewise, the researcher sees a similar need in her country context. The researcher, by the end of this section, wants to draw the reader’s attention to the fact that EAP has not begun as a foreign learner’s friendly. It has begun with another’s alien attention to invest and make use of English to achieve economic and social purposes. EAP theorists have, like Swales, naively accepted the announced pragmatic view of the field without really questioning the status quo of the field and relating it to the real reasons behind its establishment. The Arabic area or Middle East has been the first victim of its political and economical aims due to its richness in petroleum power. The researcher’s country (an Arab country, Yemen) is no longer under colonial patronage. Its purposes for teaching English in higher education need appraisal. The country undergoes a post revolution period and is in need for change and development (see section 1.1.2). It has so far exhibited accommodationist’s approach in adopting the academic aims and practices from Inner Circle EAP literature; in a way allowing English “gobble” “the grazing ground” for Arabic language and culture. It is the time when the two languages coexist and feed into each other and cause each other’s growth. The Arabic culture will prosper coexisting not only with the English culture but with all the other cultures that the English language gives access to. For this to happen, the researcher proposes a dialogic sociocultural perspective to EAP. In this perspective, the aim of teaching English in higher education is to enable citizens who are responsive to sociocultural needs both locally and internationally. The way they are taught allows them to an accommodationist view of the world of academy. Their enculturation into their academic fields cut them off
from the other related fields and from the broader aims of their field and their aims in studying them. Rather, they should be perceived as active members who participate in the practices of the field and nudged and given chances to conceive the need for improving the field practices from their grassroots in the academy.

2.1.3 Conclusion

In the above two sections (2.1.1. and 2.1.2), the researcher focuses on the inherited debates and colonial-entrepreneurial aims from ESP to EAP. The researcher argued for a way to evade the specificity via generality debate for teaching academic writing. She has argued for appraising the colonial-entrepreneurial aims for dialogic and developmental aims. The perspective that the researcher proposes inherits a communicative constructivist, contextual, interactionist, and double dialogic view of language, cognition, and communication (see section 1.3, chapter 1). Being based on the above assumptions, her perspective allows her to explore new aims (cultural development and intercultural dialogue) for EAP via her dialogic sociocultural perspective. This will be discussed in the following section. What follows is a critical historical account of the main schools of academic writing that addresses a gap in relation to the aims of the thesis in relation to teaching academic writing for cultural development and intercultural dialogue in the EFL context of her country.

2.2 The Schools of Academic Writing

In this section, the researcher provides a critical historical account of the main schools of academic writing. The idea is to address the gap perceived by the researcher to be left by the different academic writing school in an EFL context, especially in her country and the Middle East, for teaching academic writing for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. This section consists of three main sections: the first provides a critical account of the Rhetoric School of academic writing; the second provides an account of the process approach of academic writing; the third addresses the genre school of academic writing; and the fourth section is a conclusion in which the researcher summarizes her discussions and critiques of the three mentioned schools and addresses
the gap she finds in the literature of EFL academic writing for the purposes of cultural
development and intercultural dialogue.

2.2.1 Rhetorical Studies

Rhetoric, to begin with, has come from literary studies which have borrowed the
term from Aristotle. Aristotle has coined the term in his study of the Greek oration. He
defines it as 'the available means of persuasion', (Covino, 2001; Clark, 2012). In
literature, the term has come to mean the use of literary devices to make the literary text
more appealing. It has grown essential to judgment on the mastery of a writer through
examining the use of figures of speech, mastery in twisting grammar rules to satisfy
metric necessity, etc. In short, the art of rhetoric in literary studies has been understood as
achieving harmony between form and idea in a text. Rhetoric has developed into
numerous studies that have been concerned with the ways in which the expressive
function of language can be enhanced. Rhetoric, by having broader language concerns,
has outgrown the mere study of literary texts. New rhetoricians have become concerned
with the relation between form and function of language and how it can be put into
formulaic rules. This can be seen from books on rhetoric for the purposes of teaching as
early as 1930s such as Jefferson, Peckham, and Wilson's (1931). This has resulted in a
rigid structural view of text representation as unchanging and necessarily transmissive;
this is definitely incorrect as well as invalid in real world rhetoric. This transmissive
pedagogy of rhetoric rules has been dominant in 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s.
However, this pedagogy with its narrow aim of mastering rhetoric conventions of
paragraph writing has grown out of the favor of the teachers of writing. They have grown
aware of its demerits to serve pedagogy of writing for the twenty first century in which
diversity rather than stability is privileged. Their students who are aware of self worth
and the necessity of being productive in an unconventional way have been unsatisfied
with the constraints this pedagogy imposes on them. William A. Covino (ibid), from a
rhetorical pedagogy perspective, is critical of the text-orientedness inherited in the
rhetorical approach to writing teaching from classical rhetoric of Aristotle. This
perspective has also come under a severe attack from social constructivism which values
individuality and revolutionary nature of idea construction. Kenneth Burke, one
proponent of the social constructivism, redefines rhetoric for such a purpose of this school of thought as

the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols. (Cited in Covino (ibid), p. 45)

Here Burke emphasizes responsivity of the individual to language use. This brings the subjective/romantic view of the writer as rhetoric producer in response to some external stimuli. But this criticism and many others have not changed the pedagogical orientations of rhetorical pedagogy which has remained text-oriented and rule-governed. Rhetoricians in the USA have also become aware of this problem from a cultural perspective due to the multicultural nature of American classrooms. Covino (ibid), for example, is unsatisfied with the mainstream in rhetorical pedagogy which is Anglocentric and that other cultural interests are either underrepresented or totally ignored. He provides a way out of this critical situation in which rhetorical pedagogy is facing the crisis of rejection from the non-Anglo-Saxon origin races in America. He puts rhetoric within a framework of cultural literacy. He provides the following quotation by him and David A. Jolliffe (a collaborative writer) (1995) as both saying that

... William Covino has recently called rhetoric "the performance of literacy," stressing that any prevailing definition of literacy determines what sort of rhetorical performances are [sic] deemed appropriate and allowable. In other words, literacy implies rhetoric. (Square brackets in the original, Covino (2001, p. 49)

He justifies the above proposal on the basis of the crisis that the rhetorical pedagogy faces. He illustrates it as follows: 'Rhetorical pedagogy has...arrived at a point when the era of "Rules of Successful Paragraphs" seem...an interruption in a history that has often associated rhetorical skill with a shifting complex of aims, audiences, and versions of truth.' He adds:
As the century turns, we have returned from the current-tradition of rhetoric to an expansive sense of its scope and a more fully inclusive and international appreciation for the range of background, needs, and desires that inform the teaching of reading and writing. The question, now as always it seems, is whether a rich conception of rhetorical pedagogy can be sustained in academic and institutional contexts that continue to value formulaic models of writing and learning. (p. 49)

So, Covino indicates the expansive scope of rhetoric in an international situation. He agrees that instead of one rhetorical style, there should be an acknowledgement of varieties of rhetoric. If an EFL learner, the researcher argues, is given a chance to access and compare rhetorical choices rather than rhetorical conventions, awareness of rhetorical situation, and context will be enhanced. This is because in the first place rhetoric is introduced in the writing classroom to focus students' attention on what enables them to make an idea convincing, (Clark, ibid). In addition, the new rhetoric movement has become enlightened on the variations of rhetorical choices available for different cultures. Clark, quoting Killingsworth (2005) states:

Modern rhetoric does not so much replace one authority with another; rather it attacks the very idea of absolute authority. People who use rhetoric don't have to be atheists or moral relativists, but they must realize that the constraints on how we discuss issues are different as we move from community to community, audience to audience. (p. 9)

This means that the new rhetoric demands that the writers situate themselves within a specific community. Writers, under the demand of cultural specificity, have to strip off from a skin and exchange it with another when addressing audiences from different cultures. The point is not to stick to one culture or to be able to change your rhetoric with relevance to the particular culture. From a dialogic sociocultural perspective, the researcher advocates a position of academic rhetoric that is culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic. The point that the researcher wants to make is, if we want real cultural development to happen, then the rhetoric of the culture should
show flexibility and welcome different varieties of rhetorical styles. Besides, if a real intercultural dialogue is to occur, then the cultural variations should meet on the borders/interact meaningfully in the process of meaning making.

However, the writer here does not advertise an international style that is the same in every culture. Voices from the academia have already argued for united style for the academia especially for international publications. The point is that international journals really protect writing styles that are prominent in native communities of English (or the Inner Circle countries), (Canagarjah, 2002). The result is that academic writers from the outer and expanding circle countries are unable to access such journals because of difference in the cultural rhetoric. The question is who decides the rhetorical style of such international journals. The answer is people from the inner circle countries.

If the point is to bring about development and dialogue, then, rhetorical choices need not be predetermined or exhibit cultural rigidity. A dialogic sociocultural perspective perceives rhetoric as a way to use all that you know to convince the other. Thinking that a culturally valid trick of rhetoric is the only way to do so is like looking from a window and thinking this is the only land that we can see. The idea itself when new (what?) may bring with it a new rhetoric. When cultures meet, a new rhetoric may spring and new solutions may appear to the problem. The situation itself, when seen dialogically, evolves its situated rhetoric. Therefore, a dialogic sociocultural perspective shows a potential to renew the appeal of rhetorical approach by widening its scope; evade its shortcomings in terms of rigidity of rules transmission and production through its focus on development and dialogue.

The second school of writing pedagogy that has an impact on academic writing is the school of composition studies. It is discussed below.

2.2.2 Composition Studies/ The Process Approach

This school has sprung from the opposition of the rigidity of the rhetoric school of writing. The following subsection provides an account of the school and follows it with a discussion with relevance to the idea of cultural development and intercultural dialogue.
2.2.2.1 Overview

Composition studies have evaded rhetoric as a main interest. It has focused on the process of making meaning as experienced by the individual writer. The account below presents a critical account of the school as discussed by Nystrand, Greene, and Wiemelt (1993). The page numbers below and in the following section present direct citations and quotations from their article. A discussion will follow of the main models produced in the field from a dialogic sociocultural perspective.

Writing pedagogy in this school of thought is the result of, Nystrand et al state, 'a widely conceived literacy crisis during the 1970s'. It has become established in the 1980s. Writing teachers have raised many questions about the 'nature of process' and 'the interaction among reader, writer, and text.' The basic issues which concern this school of writing are the 'nature and structure of composing processes, the context and course of writing development, the indirect effect of readers on writing, and, most important, the problem of meaning in discourse (p.267-71).

Classroom activities in this approach emphasizes the stages writers often go through in text production such as brainstorming, planning, drafting, revising, editing and proofreading (Paltridge, 2001). From an ESL academic writing perspective, Canagrajah (2001) describes it as a writer-focused approach that stems from cognitive process theory in L1. It attends to the thought processes and cognitive strategies employed by writers shifting attention from the finish product. It considers writing as ‘a goal-oriented, cognitive activity of negotiating knowledge through language’ and ‘preserves the agency of the writer’. It, therefore, ‘displays interaction ideology, which envisions meaning to be produced out of an interaction of the subject with structures around him/her’ (p. 120).

2.2.2.2 Main Schools of Thought in Process Perspective

Martin Nystrand and his collaborators (1993) provide an account of the main schools of thought in their intellectual history of composition studies. Here it follows a summary of the two main schools of the writing pedagogy in the process approach.

Constructivism. The social constructivist school came to vogue as a result of a rejection of the formalist thinking of texts as products or in terms of their features. Moffett (1968)
argues that writers never just ‘write’ but always write about something to someone. He theorizes that discourse is reflective and rhetorical dealing with the writer’s relation to a reader. Therefore, rhetoric according to this school is personal or individualistic that is socially constructed. It is no longer conventional. It authors its own voice that exhibits, to use Britton’s (1970) words, ‘a loaded commentary on the world’. Thus, the cognitive process of writing is more important than the final product. Teaching writing, therefore, according to Britton, must foster exploration and discovery during the composing process. It should also encourage students to build into their presentation a ‘network of social relationships.’ Braddock et al (1963) urge teachers to observe students’ actual writing and consider situations and tasks that stimulate good writing as well as the effect of different audiences on students’ writing. Flower and Hyes’ (1981) model of teaching compositing processes is representative of this school of writing (pp. 278-280).

The researcher summarizes her understanding of the main principles of this school of composition studies as presented by Nystarnd et al as follows:

- Text is an event that happens (Fish, 1970) in the process of discursive interaction between the writer and the reader.
- Meaning is an abstract knowledge of the world that resides in the individual.
- Meaning making (composing) is relational as it is constrained by audience, the topic, and the task.
- Writing development entails learning to write (a) about increasingly more abstract topics and (b) to increasingly wider audience.

Social Constructionism. The focus on cognitive processes in the 1970s became dominated by social interpretations of language use in the 1980s. Socially-oriented scholars challenged the premise that meaning can be uniformly cognitive (univocal) in a pluralistic world. Bizzell (1982) argued that literacy problems should be understood as difficulties in joining unfamiliar discourse communities. Researchers have begun to examine the role language plays in enabling individuals to position themselves with respect to specific social situations and discourse communities. Shaughnessy (1977) is one of the composition scholars to claim that ‘writing is a social act’. She (1976) argues
that effective writing instruction requires students' awareness of basic writing conventions. Therefore, they need practice in the forms and conventions of academic discourse (p. 289). Bartholomae (1985) clarifies that students need to

Extend themselves by successive approximations, into the common places, set phrases, rituals and gestures, habits of mind, tricks of persuasion, obligatory conclusions and necessary connections that determine 'what might be said' and constitute knowledge within the various branches of our discourse community. (As cited in Nystrand et al., p. 290)

Nystrand et al explain that student writers in a discipline must learn to make rhetorical moves if they are to contribute to the ongoing conversation of the field. Those who write within a given community must not only acquire content knowledge but also must be able to manage this knowledge within certain linguistic and rhetorical conventions. They argue that compositionists' treatment of discourse communities was directly inspired by Fish's discussion of the role of interpretive communities in reader response. In his discussion, Fish explains that readers learn to read through a process of socialization into appropriate, common interpretive strategies (p. 290). Nystrand et al object:

By reifying discourse communities, social constructionists suggest that students can gain entry into disciplines if they merely learn the right forms and conventions (a position that moves very close to formalism). [...] By claiming that readers are representatives of interpretive communities and that their interpretations therefore structured the critical norms of these communities [...] (p. 291)

Thus, Nystrand et al are not with the idea of social constructionists that student writers need to know only the discourse conventions of their academic communities. The idea is rather that there should be a dialogue between the discourse communities and the students' inherited conventions in the situation of writing. It needs to be emergent rather than imposed or prescribed.
2.2.2.3 Discussion and conclusion

The composition studies represent a step forward from the focus on text conventions and formal rules to cognitive process. Flower and Hyes’ (1981) model is representative of the constructivist version of the composition school. In their model, the writer is represented as an isolated individual constructing meaning in the form of mental structure in response to a social occasion like a task. The writing process is seen in terms of mental stages that hierarchically begin with identifying a rhetorical problem. The planning or stage-setting commence through drawing on previous knowledge of the topic and the task (i.e. what a person has to say about something and how she/he can say it). This gets translated into idea which after being transformed into a written form, should be reviewed and monitored (pp. 369-375). Thus, this model and with the ideas of constructivism, as the property of individual alone, innate to it have been rejected by writing teachers. The basis for this rejection is that it represents writer as an isolated individual who is involved in problem solving. There is no obvious attachment in the above model between the individual and the external world or society around him/her. This is against the spirit of a dialogic sociocultural perspective which sees the unity of the social and the individual.

Concerning the social constructionist model of composition, the researcher begins with Raimes’ and Ruth Spack’s critiques of the social constructionist position from the pluralistic and sociocultural perspectives respectively. Both the critiques are relevant to the researcher’s argument because they present evaluation of the model from a non-native speakers’ perspective. They provide the springboard from which the researcher’s critique of the model from the dialogic sociocultural position will set off. Raimes (1991) questions the effectiveness of the process approach for ESL/EFL learners in the USA. From a TESOL (Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages) she proposes that the academic community needs to be benign and open to be beneficial for ESL students. She justifies her proposal: ‘Teaching writing is inherently political’ and the way we ‘perceive the purpose of writing vis-à-vis the academic community will reflect our political stance.’ She raises the question whether the discourse community is democratic enough for the proliferations of competing articulations; whether it is willing to try anything; and whether its members can explicitly express distinction or debate over
fundamentals (pp. 414, 416, and 421). Two issues she discusses with relevance to ESL/EFL writing: the topic for writing and rhetoric. With relevance to the first issue, she explicates that the purpose of academic writing instruction is to prepare students to writing assignments in academic discourse. Students, she argues, will also need to write for many different contexts of their professional lives. In agreement with Hairston (1991), she adds that students should learn to ‘use language to express ideas effectively’ for their purposes and intentions. In connection with the issue of rhetoric, which is obviously connected to the first issue, Raimes discusses how teachers read and judge students’ writing. Raimes, as a writing teacher, adopts a pluralistic perspective for ESL/EFL writing which is basically dialogic. She believes in a discursive writing ability that is relevant to the target language, the mother tongue, and the culture of the learner. This can be justified by her acknowledgement of the use of ESL/EFL students’ rhetoric and communicative purpose. This, she believes based on Kaplan (1989), will provide ‘[teachers] and students with knowledge about how the links between culture and writing are reflected in written products (pp. 414-7).

Ruth Spack (1997), from a sociocultural ESL perspective, criticizes ESL academic writing courses of being ‘vulnerable’ because ‘academic tasks can be understood only within specific contexts’; and ‘that all academic work is socially situated.’ She proposes that ‘[success] can be measured not by whether [ESL] students adopt a particular discourse practices but rather by how productively they can negotiate their way through diverse discourse.’ She explains: ‘What US academics call “rhetoric” is really only “Western rhetoric.”’ When Yuko, a Japanese studying in the US on whose academic writing competence Spack made a longitudinal study, has been instructed to explain her ideas with explicitness and precession, she regretted why she cannot subtly communicate her ideas. Spack comments: ‘We are asking them to embrace a certain stance towards knowledge that is not shared universally.’ Spack finally expresses her inconvenience with the monolithic view to discourse community adopted in the academic writing classroom. She reflects that ‘western tradition that demands a “wholeness borrowing of language and ideas” makes identity shift towards acceptance of wider varieties of expression slow and difficult’ (pp. 50-3).
The researcher, following Canagarjah (2001) observation about ESL/EFL academic writing courses, expresses a concern that EFL academic writing courses in her country where English is not a native language adopts a similar stance of academic writing inherited from L1 models of academic writing courses. They, the researcher says from an insider's perspective, inherited the same deficit of ignoring their cultural academic heritage and teaching only forms and conventions of the target discourse community. The duty of adapting the foreign discourse to the non-native culture is left to learners. Whether the learners adapt or get involved into a cross-cultural rhetorical and discoursal dialogue is doubtful. Learners, the academicians of tomorrow, get alienated from the discourse of similar fields in their culture; do not develop the ability to interact with academicians in their native tongue with whom they may exchange a useful academic discourse. For example, English teachers can broadly exchange knowledge about language teaching in a broad sense with Arabic teachers. This possible interaction, the researcher regrets, is not accounted for in the pre-service writing courses taught to student teachers in her university. The student writers who are about to graduate as English teachers are left disabled in the sense that a forward and backward movement between the two cultures as well as the two languages is not motivated in the course of their undergraduate academic writing study. Moreover, from a dialogic sociocultural academic writing perspective that aims at enabling students write for cultural development and intercultural dialogue, adapting a view of discourse and rhetoric that includes only the target language and the mother tongue discourses narrows down the possibility of widening students’ perspective of discourse. English has become an international language through which academics from around the world publish their works. If the discourse of these academics’ native languages is given a space to reveal itself through their writing in English, both the native and the non-native speakers of English will get a chance to see different varieties of rhetorical styles. Academics, natives and non-natives, may find culturally-varied rhetoric effective and start using it in their own academic discourses. In addition, not being circumscribed within a particular academic discourse conventions and practices may open the gate for innumerable varieties of discourses. This may broaden the field’s (here the ELE field) narrow investigatory angle into a wide array of scholarly investigations. The field may evolve
into a spectrum of different ideas and purposes that investigate and contribute to life differently. To conclude, a dialogic sociocultural perspective that aims at making writing for culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic purposes will see writing as a dialogic activity the processes of which are dialogically situated, intersubjective, and responsive. It does not see writing process as predetermined as is the case in Flower and Hyes model. It also does not see the processes as narrowly reflecting a particular community’s conventions. It values the fruitful interaction between societies, nations, and communities of practices. It also sees not only the process of production; it encourages that the product and the process interact as they are orientated to development and dialogue.

To conclude, the section presented a critical historical account of the process approach via Nystrand et al (1993). The critical historical account was followed by a critique by the researcher of the constructivist version of the approach. This was followed by two critiques of the social constructionist version of the approach by Raimes and Spack in the US context. The researcher extended the critique to her country teacher development context. She again restates her concerns for development and dialogue which are not accounted for in the main stream process approach and stresses the possibilities that might be achieved from a dialogic sociocultural perspective of academic writing.

In following section, the genre school of academic writing which has come into vogue after the process approach will be presented. The researcher will also discuss the school from her perspective.

2.2.3 Genre Studies

The following section discusses the contribution of this school to the academic writing theory and pedagogy. It also presents the various perspectives in this school of academic writing. The researcher ends in alignment with Belcher for considering ESP a vantage point on genre studies. She ends the section by a critique in favour of her dialogic sociocultural perspective.
2.2.3.1 Introductory note

During the process movement, the concept of genre has rarely been addressed in articles in composition journals. The reason behind this is that the movement has focused on self-expression and the discovery of personal voice. Genre has been viewed as an ‘old-fashioned, traditional, and outmoded concept, associated with literary texts, rigidity, and formalist conventions’ Clark (2012, p. 181). However, with the genre movement in USA and Australia, this view of genre has been changed. The following is an account of the genre tradition from Hyon (1996). The writer chooses this account because of its comprehensive view of the main schools of genres (ESP, NR, and the Australian; these have also the order in which they have been presented one after another also following Hyon’s account) as well as their pedagogical practices. It also makes explicit not only the writing practices that have emerged from these schools of genre but also the rationale behind such practices. In addition, it represents the history from an ESL stance and chronologically record different currents that have emerged in the field. Hyon’s account is followed by a discussion and conclusion section by the researcher.

2.2.3.2 ESP genre approach

Swales’ work is seminal in shaping genre approach in ESP. He describes genre as ‘communicative events’ that are characterized by both their ‘communicative purposes and by various patterns of ‘structure, style, content, and intended audience.’ In spite of the ESP scholars’ concern with both social function and form, their analysis of texts has been focused on formal characteristics of genre such as global organizational patterns in experimental articles as well as sentence-level grammatical features such as hedges and passive voice.

ESP practitioners focused on English for academic purposes (EAP) and English for Professional Communication (EPC). They have proposed that the genre-based use can help non-native speakers of English acquire the functions and linguistic conventions of texts essential for reading and writing in their fields and professions. They have emphasized the teaching of genre structures and grammatical features to help students control the organizational and stylistic features of these texts.
ESP scholars such as Dudley-Evans, Swales, and Bhatia have produced teaching materials for genre-based instructions. Dudley-Evans has used his analysis for cyclical move patterns in scientific master’s dissertations as a teaching resource. Swales has suggested activities for teaching the structure of research article introduction in his (1990) book. Swales and Feak (1994) have produced a textbook titled Academic Writing Students in which they have produced models of rhetorical forms such as problem-solution, data commentary, and language analysis task. Bhatia (1993) has converted his analysis of business and scientific genres into self-accessed English for business and technology (EBT) material. Other materials developed by (EBT) specialists include sales promotion letter, business memo, job application, etc. Flowerdew describes activities which he uses in his ESP course to raise awareness of genre. He proposes that students need to be trained in the techniques of the text analysis that they can use to identify discourse conventions of new genres outside the classroom. Such techniques include ‘flow chart’ analysis of genre structure, ‘gap filling’ of structural slots, and ‘concordancing’ of verb forms in genres such as the sales letter (Hyon ,ibid, pp. 695-703).

2.2.3.3 New Rhetoric (NR) studies

These studies derive its rhetorical base from a variety of disciplines concerned with L1 teaching including rhetoric, composition, and professional writing. In their analysis, new rhetoricians focus on the situational context in which genre occurs. They put special emphasis on genres functional purposes in social situations. New Rhetoric school draws on Miller’s (1984) definition of genre as ‘social action’ which is functional and purpose-oriented. Its proponents use ethnographic rather than linguistic method for analyzing texts. They have provided thick descriptions of professional and academic contexts in which genres take place and the social function texts perform in these contexts.

The aim of genre teaching in this school is to help students produce, according to Bazerman (1988) texts of certain formal requirements while understanding all the ‘life’ embedded in them. Students should appreciate the aims and assumptions of the
community to be able to 'evaluate whether the rhetorical habits' they 'bring to the task are appropriate and effective'.

New Rhetoric literature has generally lacked explicit instructional framework for teaching students about the language features and functions of academic and professional genres. However, some teaching materials have been produced by its proponents such as Freedman and Medway who focused on text, context, and function. Coe (1994) describes some procedures for genre teaching such as specifying features of the rhetorical situation including purpose of text, audience, and the circumstances of writing. These, he explains raise students' awareness of the social contexts that shape writing, all cited in Hyon (ibid, pp. 695-696, 698, 703-704).

2.2.3.4 Australian genre theories

Australian approach to genre is centred within Halliday's theory of language known as systemic functional linguistics. Halliday's theory is concerned with the relationship between language and its functions in social settings. In his theory of register, Halliday (1978) provides explanation of how key features of social context (field, tenor, and mode) shape forms of language. Halliday's students most notably Jim Martin and Christie have developed conceptions of genre within a systemic functional framework. Martin, Christie, and Rother (1987) define genre as *staged, goal-oriented social processes*, structural forms that cultures use in certain contexts to achieve various purposes. The focus of genre analysis in this school is on primary and secondary school genres and nonprofessional texts. In these texts, they have analyzed linguistic features, both global and sentence-level register features, using Halliday's scheme of linguistic analysis (field, tenor, and mode). Genre-based applications have been centred mainly in primary and secondary schools as well as adult migrant English education and workplace training programmes. Out of the concern that students are not being prepared to write a range of texts, an instructional approach is developed to help them master a variety of school genres such as report, procedures, expositions, and explanations. These, Martin (1989) calls, *factual writing*. The adult migrant education sector has also developed a genre-based curriculum aligned with competency-based workplace training initiatives.
The main goal of the genre-based curriculum has been to enhance 'labour market productivity of migrants from non-English background.'

The main aim of teaching text genres has been to help students become successful readers and writers of academic and workplace texts. Though this school defines genres as staged, goal-oriented social process, the emphasis in genre teaching is placed on formal, staged qualities of genres. By recognizing these features, Australian genre proponents have argued, students should read and use them in the texts they write. Students have been taught, according to Hammond (1978), through discussion of text structure how best to begin or end a text as well as how to organize information. One more aim for teaching the discourse conventions of school and workplace genres has been ideological. Genre-based instruction has been described by Christie (1989) as a tool for empowering students with linguistic resources. Certain genres such as exposition and report offer their users access to power and social influence. Nonmainstream students have less exposure to such texts than mainstream students. Therefore, to quote Kress (1993), 'genre work has both a pedagogical and political project'. Australian systemic functional literature has promoted several instructional frameworks for implementing genre-based pedagogy. The most widely recognized Australian model for genre-instruction is the teaching-learning cycle. It outlines the process of genre-instruction in three phases: modelling, joint negotiation of text, and independent construction of text. The first two phases are teacher led. The rationale given for this is that language acquisition is highly 'interventionist'. Adult genre-based teaching proponents have used a revised version of the cycle with an additional segment called building knowledge of the field. The aim of this tradition has been to develop students' knowledge of the social context and content topic of the genre at hand; all cited in Hyon (ibid, pp. 696-697, 699, 700-701, 704-6).

The difference in attention given to genre-based instructional methodology in the above three genre tradition Hyon (ibid) attributes to several factors. One is the publication forums and audience of each tradition. For example, ESP and NR studies are concerned with scholarly writing, publications, and academic readers. Therefore, their genre instruction tends to focus on text analysis rather than pragmatic models and teaching materials. Australian genre scholarship, on the other hand, has a strong
partnership with scholars and adult language and literacy instructors; hence comes its interest in pedagogical and instructional models. Moreover, the belief in the implicit vis-à-vis explicit teaching results in different teaching methodology resulting from these schools. ESP and Australian genre schools believe in explicit instruction. They see genre learning a matter of enculturation into the convention of a community which they believe is basically interventionist. NR school sees that genre knowledge can be acquired tacitly through exposure to genre in course reading. Freedman (1994), a representative of this perspective, argues that this can naturally motivate students to respond in certain genre; all cited in Hyon (ibid, pp. 708-9).

2.2.3.5 Discussion and conclusion

The Australian genre-based pedagogy, though ideological in its support for minority students and functional in its professional orientation to foreign adult learners, has regarded writing as an end in itself (Haneda & Wells, 2000). It aims at enabling students appropriate the purposes and formal properties of school genres as well as those in work place. The students in this school learn to serve ready-made purposes illustrated and made available in college. The students’ agendas are neither attended to in this school nor their aims and sociocultural resources are considered.

The NR studies with its focus on genre as forms of action that are open to change and subject to negotiation (Hyland, 2004), are not that much open for their ESL/EFL students’ mother-tongue rhetoric and cultural discourse; see Ruth Spack’s (1997) critique in the previous section. From related orientations to that of Spack’s, Auerback (1986) provides a critique of the ESL/EFL courses that uncritically derive their pedagogical orientations from L1 writing courses. Her analysis of the CBAE (competency-based adult English) framework in her context shows that it derives its theoretical premises and orientation from L1 CBAE. She finds that CBAE or ESL/EFL framework can be characterized of being performance-centred, a priori-identified outcomes, and mastery orientation towards behavioural outcomes. She reckons that it focuses on successful functioning in society and life skills; and uses a modularized instruction to achieve these aims and functions in ESL/EFL students. Under such rigid identification of skills and language behaviour, she criticizes, is hidden assumption about a static reality and a view
of knowledge as already existing there to be transmitted to students. This presupposes a view of ESL/EFL curriculum, she adds, as fact; in other words it presupposes a structure of socially prescribed knowledge to be mastered by students. She argues, quoting Candlin (1984), ‘the content of any experience is necessarily bound up with the experience itself... Content cannot be reasonably seen to exist independently of its interpretation’. She suggests curriculum as practice as a substitute for this view. In curriculum as practice, the focus shifts from how students can absorb and replicate knowledge to how they can synthesize and generate knowledge (pp. 414-417). The researcher relates Auerbach’s analysis of the ESL/EFL curriculum to Spack’s critique and suggestions for ESL/EFL students. She argues that these critique and analysis along with the arguments provided by Spack and Auerback are also relevant to NR studies as they have originated in the American context. In other words, how can academic genre writing in this tradition be culturally situated and responsive for ESL/EFL learners?

It seems that the ESP tradition, seen as a vantage point on genre studies, according to Belcher (2004), addresses some of these questions in an advanced way.

There are, according to Belcher, two acknowledged positions of ESP in relation to genre studies. One position argues that genre analysis is a tool of ESP, an engine for discovery and analysis according to Paltridge (2002) who is representative of this position. The other position is represented by Hyon (1996) and Hyland (2002), and is also the position of the researcher which ensues in the section on dialogic perspective of SCT.

In this position, ESP is seen as a subcategory of genre studies, with North American New Rhetoric, ‘a product of postmodern theory and L1 composition research, and the Australian Sydney School, derived from Systemic-Functional Linguistics, as the other two branches’. Taking ESP as major vantage point on genre, Hyland maintains, it is easy to view ESP as having subsumed the other non-ESP genre studies or co-opted them, and becoming the richer for having done so. Therefore, both New Rhetoric and the Sydney School have provided ESP with previously missing perspective on genre (p. 167). Belcher differentiates three overlapping directions in ESP: the sociodiscoursal, the sociocultural, and the sociopolitical. Below is a summary from Belcher of these three traditions in ESP and the page numbers also refer to her article.
2.2.3.5.1 The sociodiscoursal approach

In many respects, the means and ends of ESP and genre studies in this perspective are so similar that it is so difficult to disentangle the two: both investigate the discourse of specific speech communities. Though this tradition is accused of running the risk of treating students as "academic dopes" endlessly re-encoding the abstract rules and conventions of monologic discourse, there are serious attempts at avoiding prescriptions in classroom discourse. In the English for academic purposes, the textbooks and teaching of genres of Swales and Feak (2000), Lubes (2002), and Lendermann (2002) have shown tendency towards avoiding "the cookie-cutter" approach for teaching genre. The ESP practitioners have been 'upfront about areas of uncertainty, ignorance, or conflicting findings' in the research on academic discourse. They invite readers to conduct mini-analysis of the language and discourse of the field. Other ESP specialists such as Dudley-Evans (2002) and Johns attempt to steer learners clear of formulaic approaches to academic discourse. Dudley-Evans, for example, focuses on issues related to stance or positioning which is as much of a 'genre approach,' he argues, as any based on traditional moves analysis\textsuperscript{12}. In the English for academic branch of this tradition, students have to conduct textual analysis from a context perspective. Technology has facilitated recordings, collecting, and analyzing of real interactional data as well as generating of teaching materials from those occupational situations. Students have been able to approach text in context areas such as EMB (English for Medical Purposes) (pp. 168-170).

2.2.3.5.2 The sociocultural approach

This perspective of ESP genre studies has raised questions about the teachability of the strategic, functional relationships between form and rhetorical situation (p. 170) focused upon by the sociodiscoursal approach. It has rather emphasized the 'the fundamental roles of situated learning and scaffolding. It argued for immersion in the

\textsuperscript{12} This is a model by Swales (1990) of analysis of RA (Research Article) introduction. It represents three rhetorical moves: (1) establishing a territory, (2) establishing a niche, and (3) occupying the niche. These moves include smaller steps. For full account of the moves and secondary steps refer to Swales (1990) book.
target situations. As far as ESL/EFL learners are concerned, this perspective has preferred a more explicit in situ guided immersion.

EO/EA classes in this perspective have taken three different stances/positions for teaching ESL/EFL students. Miller, Adam & Artemeva, and Belcher & Hirvela, for example, have taken an EGP stance for teaching EAP and EAP. The texts used have been taken from periodicals rather than journals and literary texts have also been used. Dudley-Evans, Johns, and many others who have been dual-specialist professionals have taken a more immersion-like simulation approach. Sometimes, when the language experts in this perspective have no dual-specialization in both subject and language, team-teaching classes have been conducted. The third position is closer to target contexts. Hand-on experiences have been offered to the students by taking them in field-trips to real work places. Participant-observer instances have been encouraged for the target-area interaction and discourse to be simulated and practised (pp. 170-172).

2.2.3.5.3 The sociopolitical approach

At first sight, ESP and critical pedagogy would seem to be naturally at odds with the former focusing on efficiently and cost-effectively producing linguistically competent workers and students, and the latter interrogating the established social system's needs and proposing other needs that are not socially productive. However, Belcher argues, the aims of these seemingly disparate approaches to ELT can be productively modelled. Critical pedagogy has served a major port of entry into ESP for a number of critical educational, social, and linguistic theories such as Fereir, Benesch, Foucault, Luke, and Gore. Inspired by such thinkers, critical pedagogies argue not that academic and occupational survival be disregarded, but that language learners need more than communicative competence and functional literacy. They need voices that will speak for them well enough to make difference in their own lives. Critical pedagogy has entered the EAP classroom by several different means: by critically redefining traditional needs analysis as "right analysis," moving beyond collaborative learning to collectivist learning, and re-visioning text as not just situated in context but the hybrid product of multiple contexts. Text is seen as a sight for negotiating of personal and social identities, of home and academic or professional values. Some of the advantages that right can lead
to are bringing different readings in the classroom, enabling students’ control over their own textual identities, and exemplifying a negotiated position of more than one culture and academic community in classroom written texts (pp. 174-716).

To conclude, one can argue that ESP genre-tradition (especially in its sociocultural tradition) has reached beyond composition studies as both texts and contexts have been analyzed, studied, and taught. Writing has not been taught for writing sake, but to introduce the discourse, skills, and knowledge of academic or professional community. Therefore, one can say that language has been learned and taught for life. Having such a broad purpose, ESP genre-studies have become broader in scope than composition studies. Ultimately, composition studies have become one of the many sources ESP draws on. Moreover, it was more ESL/EFL learner friendly with its focus on hands-on experiences and in-field trips. However, though ESP includes also the sociopolitical tradition, its critical stance is limited in scope. ESP practitioners’ perspective has been limited to enabling their EFL learners, mainly refugees and new settlers, to effectively function in the target community. They have tended to push their students to accommodate to the needs and epistemological cultural reality to which they have shifted. Though this is functional and pragmatic in orientation, it tends to ignore that EFL students’ cultural heritage could be of some use to the new culture to which they are shifting. Maria Moraes (1996), for example in support of this point, pities the monolithic, orthodox vision of the Anglophone culture for viewing ESL/EFL learners as the powerless. She suggests rather that they are the powerless; they are blind to the benefits of the dialogue that, according to Bakhtin, could enrich both sides.

2.2.4 Conclusion

The researcher proposes that all the above stances for teaching academic writing in ESL/EFL contexts do not prepare students for cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

These aims have also neither been addressed in the higher education curriculum of her country in general nor in her university, Hodeidah University in particular. Also no previous research has been done on this idea, as far as she knows, in the whole Middle
East. This claim she makes on the basis of her research in her country’s National Centre for Information in which electronic copies of all master and doctoral thesis are saved; and on the basis of personal communication with two figures (Zeinab al Nagagar and Asma’a Gheithi) of a well-known Egyptian university in Cairo, Ein Shams University. They have commented after a discussion with the researcher that her research idea will be a precursor for similar work in the area.

The researcher claims that having these aims for teaching academic writing in her context has the potential of transgressing the lacuna between the three schools of EAP writing. Her dialogic sociocultural perspective addresses rhetoric not as formulaic, conventional rules to be transmitted to students. Rather the rhetoric is seen as experiential and situated. Thus, the conventions and the specificity of the interactional contexts are taken care of. The idea of composition as a process and process is also taken care of as the students are prepared for meaningful participating in the academic community. The idea of genre is also addressed from the point of view that genres are both the product of conventions and communicative interactions that are contextualized; see section 1.3 in chapter One. The researcher claims that her idea evades the criticism directed by her to the previously mentioned schools of academic writing.

The researcher finds that each of the three schools of academic writing addresses part of the writing task that faces the writer when he/she writes for academic purposes that is culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic. A comprehensive perspective of writing which can address all the three parts of the writing experience that are addressed by the three schools of EAP writing is needed. The researcher adapts three criteria from a dialogic sociocultural perspective that, she believes, addresses writing for academic purposes that is culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic. These are situatedness, intersubjectivity, and responsivity. In the following section, the researcher presents a historical account of the dialogic sociocultural perspective she adopts. Following this account, she attempts to relate the main sociocultural concepts with the criteria for achieving the aims that she proposes for a dialogic sociocultural perspective for teaching academic writing for cultural development and intercultural dialogue.
2.3 A Dialogic Sociocultural Proposal for EAP Writing

2.3.0 Introduction

The sociocultural theory is based mainly on Vygotsky’s and his colleagues – Luria’s – and students – Galprin and Leont’ev’s -- theoretical and psycholinguistic formulations. It owes its philosophical origins to the writings of Marx, and recently in its dialogic turn to Wittgenstein and Bakhtin. Bakhtin has attacked the Cartesian monolithic view of mind as passive receiver of knowledge. He has been interested in the dialogue that experientially occurs in the mind as it acquires knowledge and skills. In educational psychology, James Werstch is regarded its new founder; and the one who has assigned it its name. In ELE and development and Applied Linguistics, Gordon Wells and James Lantolf, Addison Stone, Steven Thorne, Claire Kramsch, Alex Kozulin, Suzanne Miller, Michael Cole, Sylvia Scribner, Vera John-Steiner, Mehan, Van Lier, and Kress are among its main theorists and pioneers. The major difference this theory brings to ELE is viewing language from a broader perspective beyond the conduit metaphor. It is by definition ‘a theory of mind... that recognizes the central role that social relationships and culturally constructed Artefacts play in organizing uniquely human forms of thinking’, Lantolf (2004) as cited in Lantolf and Thone (2006, p.1). This takes place through a goal-oriented internalized process of socialization mediated by culturally produced Artefacts and material tools and culturally conceptualized semiotics. The higher order mental processes become active when humans interact with written texts, hence the relationship between writing and thought comes into vogue in the literature of the theory. It has been hypothesized by Luria (1976) in his study of Uzbek’s reasoning process that

13The conduit metaphor portrays the communication process as the conveyance of a message as independent of or prior to the various ‘coding processes involved at different stages’. Reddy (1979) has introduced the term ‘conduit metaphor’ for the way of construing linguistic communication as follows:

(1) Language functions like a conduit, transferring thoughts bodily from one person to another; (2) in writing and speaking, people insert their thoughts and feelings in the words; (3) words accomplish the transfer by containing the thoughts or feelings and conveying them to others; and (4) in listening or reading, people extract the thoughts and feelings once again from the words. (p. 43)

Per Linell (1988) comments: ‘words, sentences, and texts are seen as containers loaded with content... Terms like “sender” and “receiver”... are common place.’ ‘They inspire a way of seeing speakers and listeners as simply “sending” and “receiving” packages within ready-made contents’; all cited in Per Linell (ibid, p. 43).
**literacy improves the efficacy of cognitive process.** He gave a series of syllogisms to assess their willingness and ability to reason deductively. The evidence presented by him shows that schooled individuals have showed both ability and willingness to operate with linguistic objects and a linguistically created reality. The non-schooled persons have shown non-linguistic, practical experience in their reasoning; cited in Lantolf and Thorné (ibid, p. 37). In spite of the controversy around Luria’s study which attacks his denigration of everyday thinking, presupposed in the tools used in the study and the prediction of the result¹⁴, Luria’s study is a proof that there is a strong connection between written language and deductive thinking. Using language, human beings can organize their thinking process and make predictions and interpretations of the world.

The question here is: what kind of literacy promotes the active use of higher mental operations? David Olson (2009) distinguishes two types of literacy: the ‘basic literacy’ and higher academic literacy. He maintains that basic literacy involves learning the relationship between written marks and the phonological properties of one’s own speech. It can be pedagogically defined as the ability to read and write simple texts, and is appropriate for primary education. On the other hand, he defines the advanced level of literacy as ‘the ability to reflect on . . . , to paraphrase, summarize, extrapolate from, and re-contextualize texts’. This includes ‘knowledge of how to classify texts – as to types, registers, genres, and ‘to adopt the appropriate complex grammatical forms, the accompanying metalanguage, and ‘metalinguistic concepts essential for referring to discussing, editing, and interpreting various types of documents’ (pp. 573-4). From this definition, it is obvious that the higher forms of literacy cannot be distinguished from reasoning and thinking (the higher order skills in Vygotsky’s terminology); and that both are related to language (as also proposed by Vygotsky). Reinhard Koselleck (1985) has made the case that whenever people want to express more complex ideas, these ideas are inextricably mingled with the linguistic concepts they have at hand; reported in Brockmeier and Olson (2009, p. 6). It is also obvious from the description above that

¹⁴ Michael Cole (1985) states that the sentences used by Luria as cognitive puzzles have been used in Western European studies to specify ‘general principles of mental function and cognitive development’ under the impression that there are general laws for reasoning. This, he maintains, Vygotsky objects to strongly as he has aimed at studying ‘cognition as process in change’ (p. 150).
both language and thought are inseparable from cultural and disciplinary practice. Cole and Cole (2006) note that the basic assumption of the Vygotskian perspectives has been that ‘the human mind is formed through the active appropriation of the cultural store and the modes of social interaction they entail’; cited in Brockmeier and Olson (ibid, p. 12).

Thus, thinking, language, and culture are interrelated in the dialogic sociocultural perspective. Then, what will be the use of making the higher mental skill active in the literate act? The purpose of higher literacy is making meaning that, in the researcher’s opinion, can lead to cultural development and intercultural dialogue. According to Halliday (1978), ‘[t]he individual [. . .] is [. . .] a ‘meaner’, one who means. By his [or her] acts of meaning, and those of other individual meaners, the social reality is created, maintained in good order, and continuously shaped and modified’ (p. 139). The individual, thus, creates meaning not for self but for the other. In the context that the writer suggests, a foreign language academic writer of English, the individual produces meaning not only for his culture but also for different cultures that English language gives access to being an international language. How may the dialogic sociocultural perspective help in creating the context for academic meaning making that is culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic? The researcher will attempt to answer this question through introducing the dialogic aspect of the main concepts (mediation and internalization) of her dialogic sociocultural perspective. She follows this with a discussion section in which she relates the two concepts to the criteria from for a dialogic sociocultural view for enabling cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

2.3.1 Mediation

The most fundamental claim of the SCT (Sociocultural theory) is that human mind is mediated. Higher forms of human mental activity are mediated by culturally constructed auxiliary means. Human development, Vygotsky maintains, is a product of a broader system of social cooperation and that higher forms of thinking incorporate external symbolic forms that arise as a consequence of participation in cultural activities. Through mediation humans deploy culturally constructed Artefacts, concepts, and activities to regulate (i.e. gain voluntary control over and transforms) the material world or their own and each others’ social and mental activity. From a neuropsychological
perspective, mediation, Vygotsky (1997) states, is the setting up of connections in the brain from outside'. The central claim made through this concept is that higher forms of mental activity are enabled and organized by historical and qualitative aspects of symbolic artefacts, material artefacts, and social relationships, Lantolf and Thorne (2006, pp. 59-60).

Wertsch (1994) has pointed out the centrality of mediation in understanding Vygotsky’s contribution to Psychology and education in the following way:

[M]ediation is the key in his approach to understanding how human mental functioning is tied to cultural, institutional, and historical settings since these settings shape and provide the cultural tools that are mastered by individuals to form this functioning. In this approach, the meditational means are what might be termed the “carrier” of sociocultural patterns of knowledge. (Cited in John-Steiner and Mehan (1996), p. 193)

Thus, the sociocultural milieu in which the person lives and reacts affects the way our mental processes are mediated. Each society has its own set of meditational tools. How about the individual who learns a foreign language? The foreign language will also mediate his/her mental process. Lantolf and Thorne (ibid) states:

Acquiring a second language is about acquiring new conceptual knowledge and/or modifying already existing knowledge as a way of one’s interaction with the world and with one’s psychological functioning. (p. 3)

Thus, the foreign language remediates the individual’s mental functioning. This means that it may change the way a person thinks about the world in which he/she lives and enable him/her to find the ways to make it better. The foreign language gives access to different cultural tools that remediates (and thus re-contextualize) one’s interaction with others and the world. The second section will elaborate this idea in relation to artefact and sign mediation.
2.3.1.1 Artefact Mediation

Among the cultural meditational means, artefacts are simultaneously mental and conceptual aspects of human goal-directed activity. By this view of Artefacts, the dialogic sociocultural perspective, Cole (1996) states, elides the long-debated issue in the social sciences over where culture itself should be located: 'external to the individual' or 'internally, as a pool of knowledge and beliefs'. Artefacts mediation 'entails the historically cumulative cultural generation of auxiliary means that are inserted between us and objects (mental or physical) in the world. These interact in complex, dynamic ways with each other and with biologically endowed phenomena. Moreover, this view of cultural Artefacts as dynamic differs from the belief in the non-dialogic sociocultural mainstream which perceives cultural Artefacts as equivalent to physical tools which add to or supplement the ability of humans to perform action. This, Lantolf and Thorne (ibid) objects, is an 'instrumentalist approach to Artefacts and mediation'. They maintain, in agreement with Wertsch (1998), that human-ideal activity is constituted by a human-(agent)-acting-through-mediational means. This, according to Cole (1996), generates the power of the ideal-mediational dialogue. Evald Illenkov (1977) provides a practical illustration of the above idea in the example he gives of an architect building a house first as a schematic, ‘not simply in his [sic] head but by means of his head, on the plane of idea on Whatman paper, on the plane of drawing board. He thus alters his internal state, externalizing it, and operating with an object distinct from himself'; square brackets in the original; all cited in Lantolf and Thorne (ibid, pp. 62-64).

With texts as Artefacts that give the individual the ability to go beyond his/her natural ability, the researcher argues that a foreign text can help a person see his/her culture differently. These Artefacts give the foreign learners access to ideas and knowledge which he/she might not be able to find in his/her culture. Thus, the learner’s mind becomes a dialogic space in which the native culture’s ideas and knowledge meet with those of the foreign culture. These need to be positively encouraged to be in dialogue for the production of new ideas so that the two cultures will be enriched and developed and will be drawn to dialogue.
Sign mediation: According to Vygotsky signs have two functions: (a) they can refer to the context in which they occur, i.e. they have an ‘indicative’ or indexical function; (b) they can operate independently of the context in which signs occur, and refer to other signs with which they enter into relationships that are constant across context of use. These two functions correspond to two ways in which signs relate to the world. They can either refer to objects in the world (what Vygotsky calls reference) or they enter into relationships with other linguistic signs (what Vygotsky calls meaning). Kramsch (2000) argues that language learners do not create foreign linguistic signs that they use; and that their nonlinguistic signs (the way they dress or body their language) are for the most part conditioned by their environment, not created by them.

The researcher argues that while it is true that linguistic codes and much of non-linguistic behaviour are handed down by the group, individual learners always have the capacity to choose from among the increasing arsenal of signs that they acquire throughout their study, those that best fit their communicative needs. In addition, by relating signs to other signs in an utterance, across utterances or across texts, learners do create new signs that may express new meanings. The creation of meaning occurs by combining and recombining already existing signs. Having two languages and thus two sign systems at hand may create a new space for remediating previous meanings in a new sociocultural context. Harré and Gillett’s (1994) remark on the role of tools in general for individual transformation supports this claim on the part of the researcher. They state that ‘the tools made available in natural language, penetrate deep into the organizational structure of the brain, in the sense that in the course of acquisition of all sorts of discourse and manual skills, the brain structure is transformed to provide the machinery that an active human agent puts to work in exercising those skills in a multiplicity of tasks of everyday life; all cited in Lantolf and Thorne (2006, p. 60). Language systems work as tools that mediate our cognitive and emotional life. One of these mediators’ distinctive features is that they ‘do for our minds something like what tools do for our bodies: They extend our powers’, (Egan & Gajdamaschko, 2003, p. 97).
2.3.2.1 Internalization

According to Frawley (1997), the Russian term implies the emergence of 'active, nurturing transformation of externals into personally meaningful experience'. In the words of A.R. Luria (1979), 'it is through this interiorization of the historically determined and culturally organized ways of operating on information that the social nature of people comes to be their psychological nature as well'; all cited in Lantolf (2003, p. 350).

Internalization is regarded as the second most fundamental concept after mediation. It has been proposed by Vygotsky as a way out from the Cartesian dualism pervading psychology at his time, Wertsch and Stone (1985). With the innatists focusing on the internal mental activity and the behaviourists preferring the external behaviour as the sole object of study in psychology, internalization has just been the long-awaited for solution for such dualism in the field. Vygotsky has begun with the assumption that internal and external activities are not identical but related. He has justified his assumption as follows: if they were identical, then there would be no need to study the internal activity; and if they were unrelated, then the internal activity would be an irresolvable mystery. On the premise of the above preposition, he has hypothesized a genetic or developmental relationship between the internal and the external activity. The major issue of psychological investigation, thus, should be of how external processes are transformed to create internal processes. Although this account of internalization seems compatible with Piaget's 'interiorization' via reflective abstraction, Vygotsky's formulation incorporates two unique premises. First, for him internalization is primarily concerned with social process. Second, his account is based largely on an analysis of the semiotic mechanism, especially language, which mediates social and individual. Vygotsky's idea of internalization must be viewed as part of the more general picture of how human consciousness emerges out of social life. His account of semiotic mechanism provides the bridge that connects the internal with the external and the social with the individual. Thus, the concept of internalization recognizes unique human minds that owe their existence to and are inextricably intertwined with the social, cultural, historical, and material processes (including brain activities). It is conceived of as a representational activity, a process that occurs simultaneously in social practice and in the human mind. In
this context, Bakhurst (1995) has written that 'the nature and content of an individual's mental life cannot be understood independently of the culture of which that individual is part'; cited in John-Steiner and Mehan (1996, p. 196). He further suggests that there are two intuitions that lie behind the claims of 'strong cultural theories of mind':

The first is that meaning is the medium of the mental, and meaning is (in some sense) socially constructed.; the second is that the human mind, and the forms of talk in which human beings explain and predict the operations of minds, should be understood on the model of tools, and like all Artefacts, we cannot make sense of them independently of the social processes which make them what they are. (Bakhurst (1995) cited in John-Steiner and Mehan (ibid), p. 196.

Therefore, in order to understand the role of the above two premises in Vygotsky’s account of internalization, they must be explicated within the framework of his genetic analysis that ‘returns to the source and reconstructs all the points in the development of a given structure’, (Wertsch & Stone ibid, p. 164). In this connection, Vygotsky (1981) formulated the following ‘general genetic law of development.’

Any function in the child’s cultural development appears twice, or on two planes. First, it appears on the social plane, and then on the psychological plane. First it appears between people as an interpsychological category, and then within the child as intrapsychological category. This is equally true with regard to voluntary attention, logical memory, the formation of concepts, and the development of volition. (Cited in Wertsch and Stone (ibid), p. 164)

Vygotsky’s formulation of the genetic law provides the ground work for Vygotsky’s notion of the ZPD (Zone of Proximal Development) which he has proposed could be used not only for evaluating child’s actual cognitive ability but also to address the potential growth by examining intrapsychological functioning. Out of his ZPD construction, his evaluation of instruction has been similarly motivated by his claim that
intrapsychological functioning grows out of interpsychological functioning. In this case his argument goes as follows:

Instruction is good only when it proceeds a head of development, when it awakens and rouses to life those functions that are in the process of maturing in the zone of proximal development. It is in this way that instruction plays an extremely important role in the development. (Vygotsky (1956) as cited in Wertsch and Stone (ibid), p. 165; emphasis in the original)

Here again, the issue is how to evaluate interpsychological processes and relate them to their intrapsychological outcome. Vygotsky's semiotic mechanism blends his ideas of genetic analysis and the social origins of behaviour in an integrated approach. It is within a theoretical framework based on these points that internalization is considered by Vygotsky.

Lantolf (2003), echoing both Stetsenko (1999) and Ball (2000), cautions against taking internalization to literally mean 'within the individual or in the brain'. Instead, he emphasizes, it refers to the subject's ability to perform a certain action, concrete or ideal, without the immediately present problem situation in the mind and within an understanding that is derived, but independent of, someone else's thoughts or understanding. (p. 351)

He further states that there are audible and inaudible forms of internalization. He draws on Frawley (1997) who states that the interactive social speech gets abbreviated into 'audible speech to oneself, or private speech and ultimately silent speech for oneself, or inner speech.' 'Social dialogue', Frawley adds, 'condenses into a private dialogue for thinking.' As with talk, Vocate (1994) argues, the self-talk is dialogic, but instead of an "I" who talking to a "You," private speech entails an "I" that makes choices on what to talk about and a "Me" that interprets and critiques choices. These processes usually occur in a person's interpersonal interaction including intentional instructions which are
frequently structured by the teacher in ways that make sense to students. Students internalize these processes, but in this case, of interaction between teacher and student, the interaction is between the "I" and the "Me"; all cited in Lantolf (ibid, p. 351).

2.3.2.2 Three Critiques against the Concept of Internalization

According to Lantolf and Thorne (2006), there are three critiques against the concept of internalization posed by the innatists, the social constructionists, and Wertsch. These will be presented down here respectively with their sociocultural responses in favor of retaining the concept.

The innatist critique is taken care of by Vygotsky himself on how to solve the dualism created by the innatists and the behaviourists; see the discussion above. The social constructionists' critique is represented by Rogoff who proposes the term appropriation as a substitute for internalization which, according to her, is too individualistic and entails alienation from society. The socioculturalists reply that the social constructionists' critique fails to consider that internalization also entails socialization. The terms appropriation falls short from its substitute as it suggests merging and the disappearance of the individual's voice among the other social voices. Wertsch's grounds his critique on two claims: first, the concept of internalization converts the individual into a passive recipient of cultural meaning; next, it implies the conversion of cultural meaning from the external to the internal plane. He suggests two concepts, appropriation and mastery, to solve the fore mentioned problems. Lantolf and Thorne respond to this by arguing that the concept of internalization implies both the concepts proposed by Wertsch while at the same time avoids the pitfalls caused by his concept of mastery. Mastery, they criticize, is not a lucky choice by Wertsch since it fails to capture the difference in language mastery between first and second language speakers. With the former, appropriating the conceptual knowledge and the latter mastering the linguistic code, resulting in a dualism supposed to be avoided. The concept of internalization, on the other hand, can account for this difference without resulting in dualism. Moreover, Wertsch's notion - mastery - does not account for how tools such as calculator, spreadsheet, or Morse code can be internalized. These tools can assist people in doing various tasks but they do not mediate the process for which they are used. These
tools' mediation is tactfully captured in the concept of internalization which accounts for this purpose as a distributed activity between the mind and the external world emulated and reconstructed, all cited in Lantolf and Thorne (ibid, p. 156-165).

2.3.3 Discussion and Conclusion

One important point one can make from the above account of the two main concepts is that human intelligence and actions are inseparable from the culture in which they have occurred. They are mediated by the thought patterns/discourse as well as by signs, tools, and Artefacts. Discourse is here understood in the poststructuralist theory as the complex of signs and practices that organizes social existence and social reproduction (Peirce, 1989). In this sense, a discourse delimits the range of possible practices under its authority and organizes how these practices are realized in time and space: A discourse is thus a particular way of organizing meaning making practices (Peirce, ibid, pp. 404-5). Tools can be material or psychological; and Artefacts represent products of interactions and actions. Artefacts can be material, intellectual, folkloric, pictorial, or spiritual. Cultural heritage can be used as a common name for all the above mentioned Artefacts.

Because language for Vygotsky is a tool, and a tool can also be a cultural artefact, then, it is relevant to ask the following question: is language a cultural product or not? The answer to this question is 'yes' and 'no'. It is a cultural product as it takes material form (allophones, phonemes, morphemes, allomorphs, syllables, words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and texts) spoken or written selected by a particular culture. On the other hand, it is not a product of the culture; it is the culture. This is not difficult to explain. Language plays an important role in the construction of cultural knowledge. One does not know something for real until one has a word for it; language constitutes reality. It gives knowledge a material form in terms of concepts, simple or complex. Through communication, which takes place mainly verbally, people share and develop their knowledge. Their knowledge is cultural because it constitutes valuable information and practices for a particular group of people who share interest. Looked at from this perspective, language is cultural knowledge that is shared by people and is the reality through which it exists. Then, language is culture. Thus, language can also play an important role in deconstructing, reconstructing, creating a culture, or even redefining
relations between cultures. It is an ideological cultural tool that has the power of limiting or extending the culture. This we can prove easily by pointing to the prosperity of English cultures whether in Britain, or America, or Australia after the spread of English language. Many civilizations have also diminished with the death of their languages like Greek and Latin.

Culture in, the researcher understands following Lantolf and Thorne (2006), is an objective force that infuses social relationships and the historically developed uses of Artefacts in concrete activity. An understanding of culture as objective implies that human activity structures, and is structured by, enduring conceptual properties of the social and material world. In this sense, culture is ‘(1) supraindividual and independent of any single person, and (2) rooted in the historical production of value and significance as realized in shared social practice’ (Lantolf & Thorne, ibid, p. 1).

The researcher argues that the same is also relevant to language. It is also supraindividual and rooted in the practices and activities of a community. Agar (1994) proposes language and culture (i.e. the activity of people making sense of the world) back together, as they were intended to be in the early work of cultural anthropologists Boas, Malinowski, and Sapir. Agar refers to the organic union of language and culture with the functional neologism ‘languaculture’; cited in Lantolf and Thorne (ibid, p. 5). Lantolf and Thorne explain that the sense of meaning expressed by languaculture is not of the referential sort (signifier-signified) described by Saussure. In contrast, it is constituted of conceptual meanings created by communities of speakers as they carry out goal-directed activities mediated by language. Therefore, language can be used as a tool for making or resurrection or construction of culture. The researcher proposes a foreign language as a tool of construction of cultures and renewing their relations and role played by each for the others. For example, if language mediates thought and a foreign language remedies thought within a new conceptual system, it is possible then to claim that the bilingual mind moves between more than one conceptual system; the conceptual system of his/her mother tongue and that of the culture mediated by the foreign language. When foreign language speakers, for example, read texts (Artefacts) from another culture, they have the choice to either interpret it from their conceptual system (i.e. their mother tongue’s conceptual system) or from the target text culture if they have already been exposed to
that particular culture. Thus, written language will, in this sense, remediate the individual's cognition and reveal other possible ways of seeing the world. Moreover, when students are asked to write what they think about the ideas presented by the foreign texts, this might give them a chance to see their culture or the foreign culture differently. Mediation here needs not to be thought about as revealing only what is given. Since the idea is to bring about cultural development and intercultural dialogue, then learners need to be encouraged to question established conceptual thoughts either in their language or in that revealed through the target language. This will make their learning dialogic because it brings about students' empowerment, individual thinking, and learner citizenship as talked about by Robin Alexander (2008). Student writers, the researcher reckons, will be empowered by being given the chance to think beyond their cultural conceptual schemes. They will also be empowered by questioning the target culture through their own culture or by moving beyond both the cultures to create a new culture for themselves (Kramsch, 2001, p. 47). Mediators are thus given a new role in the researcher's dialogic sociocultural perspective. Mediators become tools for mediating and making possible the existence of a new reality. Academic writing will become a way of attempting to create for self a position that is one's own and negotiating for self a reality that he/she has struggled to achieve. In this way, teaching and learning writing from the dialogic sociocultural perspective will evade the monolithic view of culture as either the native or the target culture. The dialogic sociocultural view of writing will allow for multiplicity of seeing culture in the written product. It can be the native, the target, both, or even a new created reality or culture negotiated by the learner in his/her productive writing.

Moving from the larger culture to the culture of a particular discourse community, the researcher claims that through a dialogic sociocultural perspective of EAP writing, the same can be achieved. The discourse of a particular community is seen as mediating the reality for the practitioners of the field. Thus, there are two possible ways of reflecting this reality to the novices. It is possible to reflect it as static, unchanging, and authoritarian, or to enable them see it as constructed reality, the reality as it has been situately seen by other human beings in their attempt to understand the world. In the first view, reality is mediated through teaching-learning practices as given; and in the
second it is mediated as one possibility of seeing the world. In the second view, learners are encouraged to think for themselves and reconstruct the reality in their own ways. Therefore, they will be encouraged through the second view to see the written texts as ‘resources for cultural growth rather than cultural transmission’ (Rastogi, 1995). This is, according to Rastogi, a meaningful use of a second or foreign language (pp.III, IV).

When the purpose is to make the mediating foreign text a resource for cultural development and intercultural dialogue, it is necessary to help students see the discourse of the field not as given but as mediating a constructed reality of others in the field. In this respect, other discourses from other fields play the same role and can be used to remediate the particular reality of one’s field if there is relevance, thematic, procedural, or methodological if a possibility to extend the vision of/insight into the field occurs to the learners. Therefore, the writer proposes that boundaries among the fields to be flexible so that text mediation will be dialogic in the sense that it will lead to cultural development and intercultural dialogue within and among the academic disciplines/fields.

Moving to the role of internalization, the researcher proposes that it also can be seen as dialogic. Within a dialogic sociocultural perspective, internalization cannot be limited to enabling the transfer of readymade cultural knowledge from the interpsychological plane to the intrapsychological plane. This will reflect classroom interaction as transmissive, as enabling one to contribute to only the continuity of the existing system of rules and factual knowledge. The idea is that we need learners to be creators of their own meanings/knowledge and to cause through meaning/knowledge creation the advancement in the existing view of knowledge as the prospective professionals. One can argue that it is too early for learners to contribute to the existing system of knowledge. The researcher’s reply to this is that as it is our duty to transfer to them the existing knowledge system, it is also our duty to help them gain the skill to go beyond it. Otherwise, it will be like enabling transmission and being passive to the emancipatory and/or students’ potential and creativity development view of education as empowering students to create their own meanings (Freire, 1970/1996; Wells, 1995). If we accept education as transmission, we will encourage seeing teacher learner relationship as necessarily asymmetrical. This is the way internalization has been conceptualized in the old Vygotsyan perspective while in Bakhtin’s view; the dialogue
needs to be symmetrical. The solution to this can be thought of in this way. Rommetveit (1985) states that intersubjectivity (it means interaction between two people) is dialogic when a 'symmetrical pattern of communication control' occurs. This, he adds, cannot be achieved unless 'unlimited interchangeability of dialogue roles constitutes part of the externally provided sustained condition of interaction' (pp. 187, 191). Thus, the solution is in the insight that the teacher needs to put self in the place of the students in order to give them a chance to understand and to give self a chance to understand them. Moreover, the teacher needs to think of himself/herself as an interpreter of the field knowledge rather than as an authority. Students should be given the status of interpreters of field knowledge to be able to consider themselves in the same status as the teacher. However, one thing cannot be transcended in the relationship between the teacher and the students. It is the years of experience that have been spent by the teacher as an interpreter in the field. In this vein and to bridge this gap towards dialogic classroom discourse, Wells (1999) recommends that the IRF (initiation, response, and follow up/feedback) circle needs to be open. The follow up step in the interaction circle must be initiative or inquiry-based. Teachers must enable students build on their responses and relate them to their field knowledge, life experience, and interest. In doing this, he maintains, students need not be repetitive or reproductive of others' ideas. They can initiate their own ideas and a considerable share of classroom time should be exploited for helping them to do so. This, the writer claims following Rupert Wegerif (2005), brings dialogic reasoning to the writing classroom. He defines dialogic reasoning as 'the creation of a space of reflection between participants in which resonance between ideas and images can occur as well as co-construction when participants build creatively on each other's proposals' (p. 236). By enabling this dialogic intersubjectivity that brings about dialogic reasoning on the part of the students (or between the students and the text writers), our teaching will be responsive. It will lead to the excellence of education in John Gradner's (1984) sense which he explains as leading to

perpetual self-discovery, perpetual reshaping to realize best self, to be the person one could be. It includes not only the intellect but the emotions, character, and personality [. . .] not only surface but deeper layers of
thought and actions [...] adaptability, creativeness, and vitality [...] [and]
ethical and spiritual growth. (Cited in Gay (2000, p. 15; Square bracket are mine)

The researcher interprets Gardner’s words to mean that education should lead learners to reach the stage of best self-realization in terms of production of self knowledge or discourse with the other. The learners must be enabled to produce acts of meanings that they can share with others in their community; meanings that engage their minds and hearts in dialogue with the meanings of the others. Here acts, the writer defines following Bakhtin (1993) as follows:

An act of our activity, of our actual experiencing, is like a two-faced Janus.
It looks in two opposite directions: it looks at the objective unity of a domain of culture and at the never-repeatable uniqueness of actually lived and experienced life. (p. 2)

Thus, the acts of meaning that the students make are to be seen as both reflections of their understanding of the traditional meaning in the field as well as the meanings they create as responses to those meanings. Gardner continues that the meanings created are adaptable. The researcher understands from this that the students’ attention must be drawn to the fact that meanings created by them are like others’ meanings; they are interpretations and thus liable for change and adaptations by them later or by others. Furthermore, he adds that the meanings are ethical. The researcher interprets ethical in her case as bound to bring about development and dialogue. Students should be made aware of the obligations they that bound them towards culture’s developments and the field development. The development in the field through new created meanings might be taken by members of the field in other cultures and will also cause development in their particular culture. Through this internalization can be taken further to be dialogic and enable cultural development and intercultural dialogue. Therefore, these two concepts, mediation and internalization, have been given dialogic stance and thus the researcher’s dialogic sociocultural stance is argued for. Moreover, writing for AP, seen from this perspective, will transcend its limited functions inherited from the three schools of
writing pedagogy, the rhetoric-oriented, the process/composition-oriented, and the genre-based. Through using mediation and internalization viewed from a dialogic sociocultural perspective, teaching academic writing will be enabling students to actively make meanings for cultural development and intercultural dialogue in their writing.

One more thing the researcher wants to add. It is that the concepts of the dialogic sociocultural perspective, mediation and internalization, need to be seen in relation to three criteria to lead to cultural development and intercultural dialogue. These criteria are intersubjectivity, responsivity, and situatedness. The writer will briefly introduce the relation between these criteria, the above two concepts, and the two main aims (culturally developmental and interculturally) for a dialogic sociocultural academic writing.

2.3.3.1. Intersubjectivity

Each culture follows different practices in which writing plays different roles than other cultures. This does not reflect itself only in discourse rhetorical organization but also in the forms that the final products take. For example, poetry has been privileged in the academic practices of Arabic culture for centuries. In English culture, one can generalize to Western culture, the practices of poem composing has been confined to religious and literary purposes. Hence, poems as genres in English tradition have not been used for academic purposes. But, they have been used as such in Arabic academic writing. For example, Arabic scholars have composed summaries of whole disciplines in verse. They have made them so rhythmic and musical that they could be taught even to children (see section 1.1.1, chapter One).

I do remember an incident that happened to me when I was an M. Ed student in Yemen. My Literature professor has instructed us to write a summary of the first three chapters of Hamlet. Enchanted by the rhythm of Shakespeare’s elegant blank verse, and having the cultural practice of using poetry for summarizing for academic purposes in different disciplines, I wrote my summary in blank verse. My professor praised my metric summary by saying: 'flashes of genius! But, I cannot accept it.' For him, following an English tradition, a summary should be written as prose not as verse. The interaction, here, between the student and the teacher is not dialogically intersubjective. The teacher maintains a traditional monolithic view of a cultural practice (i.e. summary
writing) as seen from the target language academic culture. He has not asked why I have written summary in verse. Of course, it might be argued that the teacher does not know about the academic practice of poetic summary writing in Arabic language since he is Indian. But, the researcher argues that if we need real intercultural dialogue to occur in EAP writing classroom, then an intersubjective dialogue will occur between the teacher and the student about why she has written in such a way. Then, an understanding might occur and thus development of the student cultural understanding. What will happen is what Nieto (1992) may call *additive multiculturalism*. Through this notion, it is celebrated that learners who have reached full development in two languages enjoy cognitive advantages over monolinguals. They also enjoy advantages over monoculturals as they have a broader view of reality and can enjoy multicultural flexibility (p. 271). However, a chance for intercultural dialogue has been missed because the teacher learner discourse has not been intersubjectively dialogic. It is also monolithic and reflects a transmissive view of educational process. The teacher here has mediated the field knowledge as it is and has neither given himself nor to his student a chance to see field knowledge dialogically.

### 2.3.3.2 Responsivity

In Vygotsky's terminology, responsivity can be taken to mean enabling students to take-over, to have control over their own thinking processes, to decenter from dependence on others' judgement (Rommetveit, 1978), and to depend on and commit to develop their intellectual abilities. In Bakhtin's dialogic theory, it can mean an internally convincing dialogue. It differs from authoritative dialogue that is compelling and accepts no discussion. It also differs from the internal dialogue that knows no external other. Internally convincing discourse/ responsivity is on the border between both the internal and the authoritative discourse. It is both personal and communal. In Wells' (1999) view of a constructionist, dialogic inquiry, it is to enable learners form theories of their own that spring from the literate activities in their discipline [or field].

Responsivity, the writer proposes, can be achieved at two levels. It can be enabled by (1) making students differently interpret the subject matter and the skill that the academic task represents, (2) by encouraging different forms and content of students'
written production that spring from their different interpretations. This means that interpretation should be judged within the high literacy perspective as suggested by Olson (2009); (see the introduction above). This means that responsive academic writing will reflect high literacy if they reveal, to use Olson’s (ibid) words, ‘the ability to reflect on those texts, to paraphrase, summarize, extrapolate from, and recontextualize texts’ (p. 573). This means that the use of the texts (if the mission of teaching is to enable cultural development and intercultural dialogue) must be seen as mediating an integrated view of the interaction context, the practices of the field and those rooted in students’ cultures. This can be achieved if the practices of the two cultures, the text target-culture (including non-English cultures revealed through the English script) and the students’ native culture are seen as resources for interpretation and production. Using the incident narrated in the previous section on intersubjectivity as an example, one can say that writing activities in English departments are designed to be responsive to needs not necessarily relevant to ESL/EFL learners’ native culture. For example, summary, as concisely writing the main points of a topic, has occurred as a writing practice in the Arabic culture with the emergence of schooled literacy. It does not exist outside the institutional practices of schools and universities. There are, instead, the narrative accounts which are usually imprinted with personal perspectives. In academic practices, summarizing is not regarded a highly literate practice at all. Rather, topic-oriented paraphrasing that is contextualized in the field of the scholar, and illustrated by the scholar’s personal instances of local variation of the phenomenon has existed in academic Arabic literacy and has been regarded as a high literate practice. It has been done to enhance understanding of the subject matter and enable scholarly judgment. Coming back to the example above, the student and her literature professor, summarizing as practice has been taught in EFL department without what cultural practice it stands for. How is summary, as an account of what happened in three chapters of the drama, supposed to play in practicing literature from a high literacy perspective? How does it serve the value of literature and literary studies’ mission for elevating spiritual and intellectual values? On the other hand, topic-oriented paraphrasing that has occurred in Arabic academic writing has allowed the use of relevant verse from poetry, verses from the Holy Qur’an, and narratives from ancient wisdom. What if the English summary writing as a literary practice in an EFL classroom
is left to be in dialogue with the Arabic topic-oriented paraphrasing in students' writing? If a dialogue between the two genres and the practices of the two traditions, a hybrid genre may exist, and later a totally new genre may occur. After all this is how genres are created. In addition, if it is acceptable to use translated verses from Arabic literature, wouldn't the written product/summaries be richer both in content and form? Wouldn't academic writing be a more effective meditational tool of thought as it activates bidirectional use of students' cultural memory? Will it be able to bring to life dead cultural practices which are no longer needed because we are following a system of education that is alien to our cultural, scholarly heritage? Our scholarly practices are not useless. They are simply neglected. The English culture is not aware of them because it is obviously not our culture. It has its own practices for which certain language forms are needed. The student teachers need to be enabled to be dialogically responsive. Thus, their produced texts may successfully mediate dialogue between practices and forms of different cultures. Otherwise, cultural practices (linguistic and material) may demise. We need students to be responsive; and this will happen if our mediation and internalization of the writing practices are responsive in the sense that it makes them culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic.

2.3.3.3 Situatedness

From the ESP/EAP literature situated practice broadly means enabling the learning of register, practices, skills, and discourse of a particular academic field. The question here: does the EAP succeed in situating individuals in academic activities of their disciplinary/academic community? Hard and Negri (2001) respond that, rather, disciplinary form of power

fixed individuals in institutions but [has] not [succeeded] in consuming them completely in the rhythm of productive practices and productive socialization; it [has] not [reached] the point of permeating entirely the consciousness and bodies of the individuals, the point of treating and organizing them in the totality of their activities. (Cited in Collin & Apple (2011), p. 298; square brackets mine)
This entire permeation of the consciousness of EAP learners, the researcher reckons, cannot happen because of the narrow view of situatedness reflected in the EAP field. The idea of situatedness, the writer believes, should involve an element of transcendence of the situation. That is learners need to be enabled to see beyond a particular situation to predict future ramification of some idea. For example, if their aim is to develop a particular discourse community, the learner has to be able to look for other discourses from other discourse communities. Then the idea of situatedness the researcher is proposing can be summarized in Bakhtinian terms as follows: the person, to be fully aware of the situation in which he/she is involved and to be capable of improving this situation in future, he/she needs to put self in and out of the particular situation. In other words, s/he needs to put self in the situation in a way that reflects the border with other situations. This is similar to what Bakhtin (1993) would call aesthetic reflexion:

\[\ldots\text{the aesthetic reflexion of living life is, in its very principle, not the self-reflexion of life in motion, of life in its actual aliveness: it presupposes another }\textit{subiectum, a subiectum of empathizing, a subiectum situated outside the bounds of that life. (p. 15)}\]

An aesthetic reflection means to be in and outside the object of reflection. Subiectum in the above quotation means consciousness. Bakhtin makes the existence of another consciousness a condition for the occurrence of aesthetic reflection. In the context that the researcher is referring to, the native culture of the EFL students and the culture of the field, the other consciousnesses for them are another culture (may be the target culture or the culture that the text reveals) and another discipline (may be one that is related to the field of EFL or just another field which the idea of the text makes relevant).

Therefore, researcher thinks, foreign language mediation needs to enable such kind of situatedness that is transcendental of a particular situation if the aim of such language mediation is to bring about cultural development and intercultural dialogue. Moreover, the internalization of the particularity of field of knowledge to an investigation and improvement of a particular aspect of life needs flexibility on the part of the student teacher as the prospective scholar of tomorrow. The aim here is not to enable learners to
absorb knowledge of a particular filed but also to find connection between it and other fields in search of possibilities for development and dialogue. In addition, with relevance to intercultural dialogue, the purpose is not to study the target or the native culture but to connect or relate both the cultures or to have multiplicity of cultural vision via knowledge/meaning production.

Furthermore, for non-native academics, their speech community differs from the field and practice community to which they culturally belong. This difference results in alienating English teachers from having a fruitful dialogue with groups who are related to their expertise like Arabic language teachers. English teachers in Yemen live alienated from other teachers in their speech community. They regularly face enmity from teachers of Arabic language, who are supposed to be dialogue partners (with the assumption that both are language teachers). This enmity occurs because Arabic language teachers feel that the prosperity of English as the medium for academic study represents danger to Arabic language and to the cultural practices to which it is related. This enmity is an obstacle against the occurrence of future dialogue between academics that belong to two different but related academic communities. Teaching of a language practice in an EFL context needs to provide for the dialogue to occur between these communities in the same culture. Situatedness as transcending one's situation may be of use here. A dialogue between texts of Arabic non-Arabic authors on language to be written about in a pre-service academic writing (for example) may enable student teachers be prepared for future dialogue with Arabic teachers.

Moreover, the academic discourse which the student teachers acquire in their content courses in English department in the researcher's university provides them with a foreign storage of ideas and knowledge relevant only to the specific study of English. They study other subjects in Arabic language. They acquire two discourses that belong to two academic cultures and communities; their culture and community that they belong to by birth and the other two through membership. If one of the ambitions of the student teachers is to bridge the gap between both cultures and both communities, they are not prepared for that because of the narrow angle from which situatedness is seen; i.e. each community is enclosed within its own territory. They internalize the cultural mediation of academic Artefacts of two cultures separately from each other. If the mediation of the
cultural Artefacts they are given is dialogic, then possible transformative internalization in terms of dialogue between the two cultures may happen. They will be dialogically situated. In consequence, cultural development and intercultural dialogue may occur in their discourse. They will see themselves situated in the border between their culture and the cultures which the English language makes available to them.

To conclude, within the dialogic sociocultural perspective, the EAP writing pedagogy will be richer in the sense that it may be more capable of enhancing culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic purposes in student teachers academic writing. Teachers must enable student teachers dialogic interaction with the texts and tasks in a way that enable real dialogic interaction. This interaction should help them to be responsive, dialogically intersubjective, and situated in the written products. Thus, EAP writing pedagogy in this perspective finds available alternative for the focus on formalities of structures as it has been reflected in the rhetorical pedagogy. It sees the process and product as an interaction between thought and structure as related to situation and thus not limited to the process as the composition pedagogy. In this approach genre production is not restricted to production of conventional forms of texts but a creation of hybrid texts and new forms and in this sense goes beyond the genre writing pedagogy.

2.4 Conclusion

The chapter examined the details of the theory and practice of EAP writing and explored its potential for enabling culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic aims. It has been found that the main stream EAP theory and pedagogy do not provide for such developmental aims. The dialogic sociocultural perspective was proposed to provide for such aims. The researcher proposes an account of how the main concepts in this perspective can be seen from a dialogic angle to account for such aims in the writing classroom. A detailed account in which these concepts were related to the researcher's proposed criteria is debated in the next chapter to show how the proposed aims may be achieved through seeing mediation and internalization dialogically in relation to the proposed criteria.