CHAPTER THREE

Introducing a Tentative Dialogic Sociocultural Approach Based on some Selected Criteria

3.0 Introduction

The following chapter consists of three main sections. In the first section, the researcher presents some models and frameworks of academic writing. After presenting each model, it follows a discussion from a dialogic sociocultural perspective. The writer attempts, where possible, to trace the use of the criteria (intersubjectivity, responsivity, and situatedness) in the models and discusses whether they have been used for culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic aims. The second section provides a conceptualization of the criteria from a dialogic sociocultural perspective for the above purpose, the relation among the criteria and operationalizes them for classroom use. The third section is a brief conclusion for the chapter.

3.1 Main Divisions of EAP Instructional and Theoretical Models

According to Janet Jones (2004), the teaching of academic writing can be mainly divided into three main areas: EAP and Genre analysis, writing across the curriculum (WAC), and academic literacies framework.

Jones (ibid) first introduces the first model: EAP and Genre analysis. She states that under the framework of genre analysis, models of teaching such as traditional collaborative and ‘team teaching’ like those of Dudley-Evans can be listed. In this model teacher intervenes in the subject discourse to make it more ‘transparent’ for the non-native speakers. Pedagogical models in this tradition are also based on, she continues, three key interrelated elements: the concepts of discourse community, genre, and language and learning task based on communicative purpose (p. 257).
The writing across the curriculum movement in the USA, the second pedagogical framework of academic writing, has arisen out of unsatisfied voices from inside and outside the academy (for example, employers) who demanded higher standards of students' communication skills. The WAC movement exhibits the following principles:

- Its incorporation of two approaches to writing: 'writing to learn' and 'learning to write',
- Making the responsibility of improving the quality of writing a university-wide responsibility, and
- Making the practice and reinforcement of writing a must within and across the disciplines (p. 258).

Though this movement has initially been designed for a less linguistically diverse student population, it has recently addressed the needs of ESL students.

The academic literacies framework has different pedagogical orientations in UK, USA, and Australia. In UK, the academic literacies approach is based on the research of Lea and Street (1998) and provides insight into the perception of academic writing by students and staff in learning support units and faculties. Students, for example, conceived disciplinary divisions as artificial. The real difference among disciplines, however, arises in the deeper levels of variations in knowledge which goes beyond the transferability of particular skills. One significant contribution of the research in this movement is the delineation of three models of student writing: 'study skills', 'academic socialization,' and 'academic literacies' The study skills model is informed by behavioural theories of learning because writing is seen as a set of technical skills to be learned and transferred to other situations. The academic socialization model is informed by psychological theories of learning and formed within phenomenographic methodologies. It focuses on how students are acculturated into the university contexts and on how they approach and perceive their learning and their academic tasks. This model divides students' approaches to learning and academic tasks into 'surface', 'deep' or 'strategic'. The academic literacies model conceptualizes literacies as social practice and conceives writing and learning at the level of epistemology and identities rather than skill or socialization. It sees 'the institutions in which academic practices take place as constituted in, and as sites of, discourse and power'. The social and ideological
orientations underpinning this approach draw upon 'New Literacy Studies' along with critical discourse analysis, SFL (Systemic Functional Linguistics), critical language awareness, writer identity, and the social construction of knowledge (pp. 258-9).

In USA, the socioliterate approach of Johns (1997) has shared the academic literacies model a concern with pluralized definition of academic literacies. The approach of Johns is also related to socially framed theories of literacy. However, 'the text and language elements' of the approach 'draws extensively' on SFL (pp. 259-60). In Australia, Janet Jones (ibid) expounds, recent student writing pedagogy is related to academic literacies models. Baynham (2000), she adds, identifies three approaches: 'skill-based', 'text-based,' and 'practice-based'. A combination of the latter two, she says, is recommended by Baynham. In addition, the notion that writing practices and pedagogy needs to be linked to the context of their use is present in this pedagogy proving its lineage to the academic literacies model.

The above division will be the guiding principle for choice of the variations of the instructional models that will be discussed below. The EAP instructional models usually occur in a combination of the above three divisions: the EAP and Genre analysis, writing across the curriculum (WAC), and academic literacies framework. Moreover, most of the EAP instructional models have been used for teaching non-native students.

### 3.1.1 Some EAP Instructional Models

The following are some EAP instructional and theoretical models: Dudley-Evans' model, the Sydney School Model, Australian higher education models, and Berkenkotter and Huckin theoretical framework. Most of these models have been used for teaching non-native students. The researcher has detected the presence of her proposed criteria (intersubjectivity, responsivity, and situatedness) in these models though not with the same meaning and purpose and sometimes with different names. Each model's presentation subsection will be followed with a discussion subsection. The researcher discusses that the above criteria are not present in these models in their dialogic sociocultural connotations and implications. Thus, the researcher believes that they may not catalyse cultural development and intercultural dialogue.
3.1.1.1 Dudley-Evans' Model

The approach introduced by Dudley-Evans below has been used in the University of Birmingham where international students come in large numbers to study at the undergraduate or the graduate levels. His model consists of three main variations: the common-core class, team-taught writing class, and the writing club. This subsection consists of four subsections: the first three subsections chart out the three types in his model and the fourth one is a discussion of the model from the researcher's perspective.

3.1.1.1.1 The common-core class.

Dudley-Evans explains that this type of teaching communicative skills for academic writing involves three particular procedures. The first is concerned with the development of 'rhetorical awareness of the conventions that pertain to the overall structure of a journal article or thesis. The second involves teaching of 'linguistic forms and the expression of the writer's purpose within each section.' In the third, the rhetorical and linguistic awareness are converted into the ability to properly order a particular idea and data into logical "narratives" as expected by the discourse community.

In the first procedure, the students are instructed to carry out a short piece of discourse or genre analysis through a series of questions. These questions help them think about the patterns of organization of a text designed especially to introduce them to general aspects of academic style. They then have to, while thinking about the organization of the patterns, predict the reasons why these patterns are favoured by the academic community (p.296).

The second procedure makes use of the various *move analysis* of the different sections of the journal article or thesis. These can either follow Swales' (1981) four-move model or Dudley-Evans' (1986) six-move model. Exercises like unscramble or reorder, in which students are asked to put sentences presented in a jumbled order into the correct order, are used for the purpose of addressing awareness of the move analysis models. The sentences then are discussed and after this the four-move model is presented and
explained. This practice is followed by a detailed practice of the language that can express each of the four moves (pp. 297-300).

The third type of activity involves a ‘deep-end’ approach. The students develop either a full report or a full section of an article or thesis based on some data of information provided. No special guidance is offered to help them do so. Rather, students have to use the information gained in the above procedures to write up the data or information properly.

3.1.1.1.2 Team-taught writing class.

This type of teaching, according to Dudley-Evans, is done in subject matter’s classes where large numbers of international students are present. Language teachers and subject teachers collaboratively work to help students with tasks such as examination answers, assignments, and thesis. The team-teaching approach has much in common with the WAC (the-Writing-Across-the-Curriculum) movement. The major difference is that the team-taught writing class involves a mutual work of both the language teacher and the subject teacher. The subject teacher prepares a suitable and specific task relevant to the subject that students learn. This task forms the basis for classroom discussion about the most suitable strategies for doing the task. In addition, this discussion of the strategies considers the genre conventions in a way that ‘combines very effectively product and process approaches to the teaching of writing’ (p. 308).

3.1.1.1.3 The writing club.

This type of class has, according to Dudley-Evans, a stronger emphasis on the process. The course aims to enable students ‘develop an awareness of the forms of writing expected by the discourse community that they are aspiring to join.’ The sessions take place after the classes on genre conventions of thesis and article writing. The assumption in the sessions then is that students have some knowledge of the conventions of thesis and article writing and the way they are to be expressed. The session begins with student’s piece of writing, an essay, report, or a chapter of a thesis that is getting prepared
by him or her. One student's work is got copied and distributed to all the students. This will be discussed either individually or in pairs and suggestions for improvements are made. The suggestions for improvement range from corrections of spelling through to restructuring of the argument. The writing teacher acts as a referee since the students have to do most of the correction work. This type of teaching, Dudley-Evans acknowledges, is an adaptation of the use of reformulation in the writing classroom. This is because the changes or suggestions for improvements made by the students do not alter the content of the original work. Rather, these are corrections at the sentence and at the discourse level. The reformulated text then is distributed along with the original text with the aim to be compared. The discussion's focal point is coming up with the reasons behind the changes made. The writing club sessions end with students' revisions of their original drafts in the light of the discussions. The writing club classes, Dudley-Evans maintains, differ from the past use of reformulation in writing class in its change of the emphasis from writing teacher's reformulations to the fellow students' reformulations. By this, he adds, the writing club type of teaching has much in common with the peer review/response system in L1 and L2 composition classes in the U.S. Students feel less threatened with their fellow writers who, like them, do not have expertise in the subject area. They focus on an actual piece of writing and consider whether it meets the needs of the audience as well as the expectations of the academic community.

3.1.1.4 Discussion

Dudley-Evans' three-types-model of academic writing instruction is an attempt on his side to 'synthesize the findings of applied research and classroom-based experience.' His model draws upon many pedagogical and research strands such as the genre analysis, the WAC movement, reformulation, the peer review, and the process as well as the product approaches. The first two types, as he describes them, are 'flexible prescriptions'. He admits that they may be 'considered to focus more on the product or forms of writing' (p. 308).

The common-core type is an example of the use of inductive procedures to make students come up with the linguistic structures and discoursal expressions for writing a
section of an article or report. Swales’ four-move model of genre analysis is to be assimilated by students as a representative of a consensual organizational pattern followed by the academic community discourse. The use of questions and unscrambled sentences aims at making students deduce the organizational patterns and practice it. The last procedure brings the different parts into a whole by making students move from sentence practice to discourse practice. The question here ‘is this really the nature of human discourse?’ The natural human discourse is diverse and varied in accordance with the situations and contexts in which it is created. It is responsive to particular purposes for which it gets written in the first place. It is also governed by dialogic intersubjective relationships between the members of a community and how they respond to each other. Besides, will practising and mastering already existing discourse pattern lead to cultural development and intercultural dialogue? The researcher does not find this as an aim in this type of Dudley-Evans’ model nor due to its prescriptive nature may provide a base for it; see the critiques of the rhetorical studies focus on form and being product rather than process oriented in section 2.2.1 in Chapter Two.

The second type of teaching in Dudley-Evans’ instructional model (the team-taught class) is a training course rather than an educational one. The academic community that represents the conventional patterns to govern students’ writing is their disciplinary community. They are supposed to practise the kind of writing that they will face in their study of their academic discourse such as examination questions, assignments, and theses writing. The collaboration between the language teacher and the subject teacher is not genuine. The subject teacher explains how the idea is supposed to be presented, and the language teacher’s work is to show how this could be fulfilled using the written language. In this type, the researcher finds that the link between the thinking process and the role of language in the formulation of thought is not tackled. The relation between language teaching and the disciplinary area is instrumental. The language teacher’s mission is to help students express the disciplinary thought in language. This is an instrumental role of language as only a dress for thought. In addition, students are seen as passive receivers of the subject teacher and language teacher instructions. Moreover, the tasks presented are so limited in scope in the sense that they do prepare students for
life inside the university. These tasks do not seem to enable them to be responsive individuals to their sociocultural needs as discursive and varied.

The third type of Dudley-Evans' instructional model (the writing club) represents a shift from a teacher-centred class to a student-centred writing classroom. The teacher's role is to be just a referee or a consultant for advice or after-thought discussion. This type also exhibits, according to Dudley-Evans, a transfer of focus into a stronger process approach. The focus is more on the ways students do the work rather the end product. The samples given for correction are representatives of students' writing rather than some prepared pieces for the purpose of teaching. The students are given authority to analyze and correct the samples as they are themselves the representatives of the academic community. This type also gives them a chance to act as audience to their writing and thus construct the situation of interpreters of their produced writing.

The range of the tasks given is governed by types of the tasks to be performed in the academy. That is these are either a report, or an article or thesis. The final products of the students are also expected to be similar to the norms followed for writing these types of writing. That is, at the end, the report, the article, or the chapter of the thesis produced by the students is expected to reflect the conventions. The conventions themselves are represented in the first types of the model as static and inflexible. Thus, the end product of the students will reflect the same rigidity and non-dynamicity. The aim, rather, has to be to help students produce variety of discourses as varied as they are. They need to see themselves as real members of community who have voices which language accords to and helps to bring to life. The conventions they have been prepared to follow in the second and first types will play the role of the gate-keepers which may blind them to the various responses they may make for various situations.

All in all, the model represents the academic community as non-diverse and non-discursive. The researcher does not object to the idea of having norms but to sticking to them and seeing them as unchanging. If we want to engage students in developmental and dialogic practices, we should begin from where they are and help them to achieve their purposes as academicians. Teachers need to introduce tasks that situate students where life and the academy interact in the practice of responsive meaning/knowledge
production. This is because we should see the boundaries between the academia and everyday reality as always being in interaction (there is always ‘double dialogicality’); see the explanation and implication of this dialogic sociocultural assumption in section 1.3 in Chapter One. Furthermore, the international students' sociocultural backgrounds are not addressed in this model. How they originally perceive texts and approach them for reading and writing, whether they use different genres to express different ideas, and many interculturally related issues are not discussed in the model. To conclude, this model does not provide for any of the criteria that the researcher argued for in Chapter Two, and therefore, she believes, may not be a suitable model for enabling cultural development and intercultural dialogue. The following model to be discussed is the Sydney School of academic writing.

3.1.2 The Sydney School Model

The Sydney School genre pedagogies have been designed for three populations in Australia: primary and secondary school children as well as adult migrant second or foreign language learners. These pedagogies are based on the work of M.A.K. Halliday on SFL (Systemic Functional Linguistics) and his students and fellow theorists in the Sydney schools such as Martin and Christie. These and many other theorists and practitioners in the field have identified and analyzed the common genres in Australian culture and government schools for the purpose of teaching them. The overall aim behind this genre research and pedagogy is to enable the disadvantaged students both immigrants and the indigenous people (the aborigines) to have access to the privileged genres in the schools and mainstream Australian culture.

The Sydney School provides clearly outlined an easy to learn elementary genre descriptions to be taught in a variety of academic content areas. Textbooks and guides are provided which include elemental descriptions of how genres look like. The following table from Johns (2003) presents a sample of a typical description taken from a secondary school curriculum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Social Purpose</th>
<th>Social Location</th>
<th>Schematic Structure</th>
<th>Description of Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Discusses an issue in the light of some kind of “frame” or position. Provides more than one point of view on an issue.</td>
<td>Discussions are found in essays, editorials, and public forums, which canvass a range of views on issues. They also occur in panel discussions and research summaries.</td>
<td>[issue Arguments for and against Conclusion]</td>
<td>Issue: gives information about the issue and how it is to be framed. Arguments for and against: canvasses points of view on the issue (similarities and differences or advantages and disadvantages). Conclusions: recommends a final position on the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Instructs in how to do something through a sequence of steps.</td>
<td>Procedures can be found in science experiments and in instructional manuals such as gardening books, cookbooks, and technical instruction sheets.</td>
<td>[goal ^ Steps 1-n ^ (Results)]</td>
<td>Goal: gives information about the purpose of the activity (might be in the title or in the opening paragraphs). Steps 1-n: presents the activities needed to achieve the goal. They need to be put in right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>Entertains and instructs via reflection on experience. Deals with problematic events that individuals have to resolve for better or worse.</td>
<td>Narratives are found across all aspects of cultural life, in novels, short stories, movies, sit-coms, and radio dramas. They are important in subjects such as English.</td>
<td>[Orientation](Complication, Evaluation, Resolution]</td>
<td>Orientation: provides relevant information about the characters’ situation. Complication: introduces one or more problems for characters to solve. Evaluation: highlights the significance of the events of characters. Resolution: sorts out the problems for better or worse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first column, there is a list of elemental genres common to all various educational and workplace cultures. The second column illustrates the social purposes or the functions of the texts. The third column presents the contexts in which the genres may be found. The fourth column shows the general organizational patterns in which texts are to be written. The last column outlines the various moves of the text (Johns, 2003). The curriculum is not intended to be applied as it is as teachers are encouraged to survey the
students' needs and negotiate the curriculum. Thus, only the most needed genres are selected and taught.

Common to all the Sydney School curricula is the 'genre-based cycle of teaching and learning' that is based on the work of Vygotsky (1934/1978). The cycle *scaffolds* learners through an interactive process of analysis, discussion, collaborative and individual construction of texts (Johns, ibid, pp. 201,203). The following figure from Johns (ibid) shows the cycle of teaching and learning.

![Figure 3.1](image)

The first step involves students' assistance in understanding context for writing. For example, if students in the language class were to write a story, they might watch a video in which a mother, for example, narrates a story for her child orally. The teacher, during this step, assists students in understanding the genre through asking questions, trying some exercises for vocabulary building or role play and other exercises which initiate students into understanding the genre. In the second step in the cycle, students are enabled to make use of different written textual models of the studied genre. The models are labelled according to stages to ensure that they can understand how stages, purposes, and language interact. The teacher assists students' analysis of the models using the genre
descriptions as illustrated in the table above. The language structures, lexicon, and grammar are practised in relation to the genre and its purpose. The next step, which is also consistent with Vygotsky (1934/1978), is the joint construction of texts, with the teacher or with another fellow student. The students construct texts of the assigned genre from the context building step or drawing on other sources. The final step is the students’ independent construction of texts.

3.1.2.1 Discussion of the Sydney School and Literacy Models

The Sydney School and other literacy-oriented currents like those who adopted its aim of empowerment in North America have missed up one thing. They have aimed at preparing the students for the New World forgetting that students have come from other worlds. The idea in the pedagogies springing from these schools is to prepare the ESL/EFL learners for work and study by acquiring the “cultural capitals” of Australia and America. They have ignored that the students have brought with them a wealth of their cultural heritage. If the students have come to Australia as immigrants, this does not imply that they will not come back to their homelands. Thus, the preparation is unidirectional and monolithic in its anticipation of the students’ aims.

In the table above, the descriptions of the genres, the social locations, the purposes, and the macro and micro structures of the texts give the impression that they may be used as templates. Thus, language is not viewed as constitutive of thought; see the discussion of language as both constitutive of knowledge and culture in subsection 2.3.3 in Chapter Two.

The teaching and learning cycle shows that the role of scaffolding ends by the students’ ability to construct genres like those demanded by the authority (school or the working place). The genres have to be taught and get assimilated by the students to be able to cope with the demands of the schools and the workplace.

From pedagogy that aims at cultural development and intercultural dialogue, the students’ academic writing must not be suffocated by the demands of rigid genres construction. They need to critically examine the new situations to which they have moved and how best they can extend their abilities to improve these situations.
The learners who are the immigrants of today might come back to their homeland. By such pedagogical orientation to genre, the students will be detached from their tradition and their culture to which they may add. If we ethically deal with cultures as ecologically interacting and contributing to each other’s development, then, it will become the responsibility of the pedagogy/the educational systems to do so. This can be done by seeing the language itself as enabling responsivity, dialogic intersubjectivity, and situatedness of genre flexible use. This above ideas will be discussed in more details in the following subsection.

3.1.3 Australian Higher Education Models

Within the WAC (Writing-Across-the-curriculum) movement in Australia, the learning 'centres' in higher education at the undergraduate level took the responsibility of teaching academic writing. The reason behind an increasing care for writing to be taught across the curriculum is the increasing awareness of the students’ low levels of literacy. The researcher finds the models emerging in this Australian context relevant because some of the models have been used for non-native speakers particularly at risk students. This subsection consists of four subsections. The first three subsections provide a brief account of the models as presented in Jan Skillen (2006). The fourth section provides a discussion of the models from the researcher’s perspective.

3.1.3.1 The remedial model

In this model, teachers in learning centres give one-to-one consultations to students from non-English speaking backgrounds. These students were at risk but were also motivated enough to be improved. Significant outcomes have been achieved through this model but only a limited number of students have been involved. This is because of the intensive nature of the remedial treatment given and the limited number of staff in each centre. However, the teaching was isolated from the disciplinary areas. This is because the assumption was that the model is targeting students whose language skills are poor. Therefore, no connection is made between writing and the disciplinary areas.
3.1.3.2 The integrated model

The teaching of writing to students was part of the general teaching of the disciplinary areas or content subjects. The philosophy underlying this model is developmental. It ensues from the belief that university educational system requires a wider range of skills than those required in the secondary system. Thus, students need to acquire new sets of literacy and learning skills ‘pertinent to academia generally and to their fields of study specifically’ (Jan Skillen, ibid, p. 142). The integrated model is supported by education and linguistics. The idea behind the educational perspective in the approach comes from educators such as Ramsden in tertiary education. Ramsden suggests that skill acquisition is most effective when placed within a specific context where students can see the relevance of what is being taught. The students in this model are seen similar to second language learner because the varieties of discourses that are taught in the disciplines are different from the Standard English (Skillen (ibid)).

The SFL (Systemic Functional Linguistics) is the linguistic theory informing the model. This is because it supports the idea of a descriptive grammar of the structure and functions of language. The SFL is used for the purpose of providing students with awareness of linguistic devices characteristic of academic writing such as modality, nominalization, passive voice, etc. It is also used to enable students have conscious control of their use.

The learning theories provide the learning skills needed for academic success. It emphasizes that students are scaffolded/assisted around exposure to experience the new academic information, given feedback to their inquiries, and given time for reflection. The model, in contrast with the remedial model, is successful for teaching large number of students. The reasons for this, according to Jan Skillen (ibid), is that this model

- contextualizes the teaching within a disciplinary learning environment, making content of that teaching more immediately useful and ‘real’ and making it relevant to students’ needs and interests;
- provides instruction which is an indivisible part of studying a subject;
• efficiently and equitably provides instruction to all students studying a subject; provides cost-effective instruction because more students can be taught than in the traditional learning centre;
• provides teaching at the right time in relation to learning and assessment;
• gives students conscious knowledge of and control over the structural and rhetorical devices of the target genres; [and]
• achieves significant development in skills for all students within a cohort. (pp. 143-4)

3.1.3.3 The transformational model

It is a variation of the integral model. It emphasizes that it is carried out in the disciplinary area as a transformative one. That is beyond the achievement of individual students. Collaboration takes place between writing teachers or learning developers from language centres and staff of the universities: faculties, departments, and discipline lecturers. The collaboration targets curriculum goals for teaching not only the explicit subject of study but also the skills implicit in studying that subject. What is interesting in this model is that the transformation, aimed for, includes a revision, as demands occur, of assessment practice within curricula. This may be done to enhance a match between learning objectives and assessment strategies. Both of the formative and the summative assessments are used to multiply opportunities of learning both skills and content. Besides, the collaboration allows Learning Developers to teach writing in a strategic way to a large number of students. It also allows cross-disciplinary discussion to take place and the analysis of common objectives within or across disciplines to take place. The aims of collaboration within disciplines are to identify the desired generic as well as discipline-specific skills of graduates and to develop practices to ensure that they are acquired by students within time frame of their degree. All in all, collaboration enables students’ acquisition of skills and content knowledge towards students’ enculturation into the disciplines.
3.1.3.4 Discussion

The models listed above reflect a growing awareness of the social nature of language learning and its connection with thinking.

In the first model, the remedial model, language is taught in isolation from the subject area or content. The assumption behind this is that the types of students to be taught are of the very low level of achievement in language. So, the remedy is to give them intensive tutoring focusing on the language skills such as structure practice and vocabulary acquisition.

In the second model, the integrated model, a beginning to consider the connection between form and content begins to manifest. In this way, it is very similar to Dudley-Evans team teaching model. A sort of interaction, though not a genuine one, between language theories, in this context those springing from SFL, and learning theories takes place. The result is a bunch of linguistic and learning skills related to the subject areas as they reflect linguistic and learning skills useful for this discipline. The major difference between this model and the previous one is the addition of content knowledge to be taught along with the linguistics knowledge and the ability to teach large numbers of students.

The third model, the transformational model, represents a shift towards awareness that if genuine change in the students' learning behaviour takes place, this must be associated with the change in the way we teach and assess them. This explains the occurrence of both summative and formative types of evaluation in the model and the change of curricula in a way that suits the learning objectives.

All in all, the three models begin as a response of an awareness of the low literacy levels of students. The response ranges from teaching only the linguistic skills to teaching situated cognition.

One more point the researcher considers with relevance to the last two models. It is the social cultures of the students. In the last two models, the relation between the particular academic culture and the culture of the country in which the educational system takes place is not emphasized. The situatedness is thought of in terms of the particular academic community without thinking about it as manifestation of the larger community of which it is only a part. The learner, who is supposed to respond to the
needs of his/her country as a particular member of an academic community, needs to relate what s/he learns in this community to the larger culture to which s/he belongs. If the academic community prepares for this relevance to occur, then, sociocultural background of the students needs to come to focus. The vernacular practices of all the students need to be seen side by side with the dominant group practices.

The learners have to be aware of the point that the situatedness of knowledge/meaning construction is a complex phenomenon occurring at different levels: the level of a particular academic community, between academic communities, between the academic community and the larger speech community, and between academic communities across different cultural milieus. This lack of a dialogic sociocultural perspective of situatedness in the above models may result in the students' as the academics of future inability to respond to the needs of their countries from within their special academic communities. It may also result in students' ignorance of how to situate their academic achievements in their countries with relevance to those from other countries. That is, the way they intersubjectively interact with the achievements of the others in the field and how they dialogically respond to this intersubjectivity will be absent; this particular issue will be discussed in detail in the following sections on situatedness and situatedness as a dialogic sociocultural criteria.

On the basis of the above argument, the researcher argues that the above models of academic writing may not enable students' academic writing to be culturally developmental and intercultural dialogic.

In the following subsection, a theoretical framework which is regarded as dialogic and sociohistorical is presented. Some of the criteria proposed by the researcher are proposed in the model but with different orientations and implications. The researcher will present a concise summary of the framework as presented by its authors and will follow it with a discussion from her perspective.
3.1.4 Berkenkotter and Huckin Theoretical Framework

Berkenkotter and Huckin (1993) propose a structurational and sociocognitive framework for genre writing. They represent a ‘dialectical’ relationship between individuals as active members in the academic community which is in need of consensus as well as expansion of vision through efforts of its members. In their framework, they conceptualize writing as situated and genres as arenas for negotiation. The following points represent the principles that constitute their framework as represented by them:

- Dynamism: Genres are dynamic rhetorical forms that develop from responses to current situations and serve to stabilize experience and give it coherence and meaning. Genres change over time in response to their users’ sociocognitive needs.
- Situatedness: Our knowledge of genres is derived from and embedded in our participation in the communicative activities of daily and professional life. As such, genre knowledge is a form of “situated cognition,” which continues to develop in the activities of culture.
- Form and content: Genre knowledge embraces both form and content, including a sense of content that is appropriate to a particular purpose in a particular situation at a particular point of time.
- Duality of structure: As we draw on genre rules to engage in professional activities, we constitute social structures (in professional, in situational, and organizational contexts) and simultaneously reproduce these structures.
- Community ownership: Genre conventions signal a discourse community’s norms, epistemology, ideology, and social ontology. (p. 478)

The writers acknowledge their debt in developing their framework to a combination of theoretical perspectives among which ‘Bakhtin’s theory of speech genres.
Vygotsky’s theory of ontogenesis, Giddens’ structuration theory, and Russain activity theory as it has shaped the movement in American psychology called “situated or everyday cognition” (p. 478). Here it follows an elaboration of the above principles as presented by them.

Under the first principle, dynamism, the writers state that this principle is deduced from contemporary rhetorical examinations of genres as exemplified in the works of Campbell and Jamieson (1978) and Miller (1984). The idea of genres as responses to recurrent situations comes from Bitzer’s (1968) discussion of recurrent situations:

From day to day, year to year, comparable situations occur, prompting comparable responses; hence rhetorical forms are born, and a special vocabulary, grammar, and style are established. . . . The situations recur and, because we experience situations and the rhetorical responses to them, a form of discourse is not only established but comes to have a power of its own—the tradition itself tends to function as a constraint upon any new response in the form. (p. 479)

The writers maintain that though Bitzer has not used the term genre, his notion of rhetorical forms as emerging in response to recurrent situations has triggered scholarly discussion of rhetorical genres by the above rhetoric scholars. In addition, Yates and Orlikowski (1992), for example, have related Bitzer’s claim as a concept symbol to mean that ‘certain core features of a genre emerge within a particular context and are reinforced over time as a situation recurs. These features, in turn, shape future responses to similar situations’ (p. 479). In her well-known essay which exhibit a re-conceptualization of the rhetorical view of genres from a sociological perspective, the writers add, Miller (1984) proposes that “recurrence” does not refer to external conditions but rather is socially constructed:

What recurs cannot be a material configuration of objects, events, and people, nor can it be a subjective configuration, a “perception,” for these too are unique from moment to moment and person to person.
Recurrence is an intersubjective phenomenon, a social occurrence, and cannot be understood on material terms. (p. 479)

The writers continue that Miller's conception of genre owes a link to Schutz and Luckman's (1973) construct of "typification" as a socially constructed meaning making process. Miller argues, the writers state, that the "stock of knowledge" is based on types and is useful only insofar as [it] can be brought to bear on new experience: the new is made familiar though the recognition of relevant similarities; those similarities become constituted as a type . . . . It is through the process of typification that we create recurrence, analogies, [and] similarities. What recurs is not a material situation (a real objective factual event) but our construal of a type. The typified situation, including typifications of participants, underlies typification in rhetoric. Successful communication would require that the participants share common types; this is possible insofar as types are socially created. (p. 480; square brackets mine)

The writers object, that language reflects not only the stability but also the change. Situations resemble each other only in certain ways. The world changes both in its material conditions and in collective and individuals' perception of it. Incremental change in the typification must occur. In addition, they add, individuals have their 'uniquely formed knowledge of the world' (p. 481). Genres, therefore, they emphasize, are always sites of interaction between stability and change. The writers provide an example of the process of change from Huckin's (1987) own research on scientific journal articles published between 1944 and the late 1980s. Through analysis of the articles, he has found that experimental results are 'increasingly foregrounded in titles, abstracts, introductions, and section headings' while methods and procedures sections have been given a second status. Through interviewing some scientists, who regularly read and contribute to the scientific literature, Huckin has discovered that the above way, in which scientists have written their articles, reflects their awareness of the demands of the age. They have perceived the readers' need to read fast and skip the details. Berkenkottre and
Huckin comment that the writers have had to put information where the busy reader will look and easily skim the point of the article. Thus, Berkenkotter and Huckin conclude, on both a communal and individual or sociocognitive levels, scientists change genres to be responsive to their needs. ‘The result’, the two writers maintain, ‘is a continually evolving, not static, genre’ (pp. 481-482).

The second principle, situatedness, the writers emphasize, that genre knowledge, rather than explicitly taught, is transmitted through enculturation of apprentices into the ways of speaking in particular discourse communities. Because of the typification processes of genres, the writers clarify, individuals are able to make recognizable responses to the exigencies of the situations.

The writers use Bakhin’s (1986) distinction between “primary” and “secondary” speech genres as a useful framework to distinguish daily forms of responses (primary genres) and those removed from the daily context (secondary genres). Following Bakhtin, they maintain that “secondary genres” ‘codify activity in situations occurring over time and in distant locales’. They justify that for this reason ‘Bakhtin calls the secondary speech genres “complex”’. The primary genres, the writers compare, are in contrast “simple” because the formal characteristics are not foregrounded in them. Rather, only particular communicative activities are present (p. 482). Secondary genres are removed from their instantiations while primary genres are embedded in the milieu in which they occur.

Bakhtin’s perspective that is grounded in his concept of the dialogical nature of all oral and written communication, the writers argue, provides a solution for the issue of what kinds of communicative acts should be accorded “genre status”. For Bakhtin, the writers say, the responsive utterance is the basic unit of analysis of human communication. The utterance is a rejoinder made in response to the other. Therefore, communication, oral and written, is constituted by a number of turns’ (p.484). From Bakhtin’s dialogical perspective, academic discourse can be seen to take place on a “conversational continuum”. The conversational continuum involves for the language user a transition from “naturalistic” turns to extended and monological turns. Bergvall (1992), the writers quote arguing in similar vein that academic discourse takes place on a
variety of levels. Each of these, he continues, is a form of academic "conversation" with a variety of levels of formality. He maintains that usually the conversational natural pattern is learned in childhood. However, he continues, the appropriate use of voice in academic conversation requires 'enculturation into the modes of conversation sanctioned by academic discourse communities' (p. 485). The writers, building on Bergvall's argument, argue that 'genre knowledge is a form of situated cognition and drawing upon Brown et al (1989), they explain that this genre knowledge is indexical and "inextricably a product of the activity and situations in which it [is] produced". They continue, drawing upon Brown et al, 'learning the genre of academic discourse evolves "with each new occasion of use because new situations, negotiations, and activities inevitably recast it in a new, more densely textured form"' (p. 485). They clarify the meaning of enculturation as the apprentice's picking up of the discourse patterns and the activities of the academic community rather than being explicitly taught. Berkenkotter and Huckin observe connection between Brown et al with relevance to situated or everyday cognition and other researchers such as Lave, Wagner, Rogoff, Scribner, and the Russian activity theorists such as Vygotsky, Leont'Ve, and Wertsch. In this respect, they quote Wertsch's (1991) explanation of the similar ideas between Bakhtin and Vygostky:

First [they shared] the assertion that to understand human mental action one must understand the semiotic devices [such as language] used to mediate such action. . . . Second [they held] the assumption that certain aspects of human mental functioning are fundamentally tied to communicative processes. . . . that human communication practices give rise to mental functioning in the individual. (p. 486)

Commenting on the quotation, they argue that such view underlies much of the literature on the 'situated nature of individual concept development'. Then, the writers provide a quotation from Brown et al (ibid) in which an argument about the similarity between acquiring conceptual knowledge and learning the use of tools. They say that
Both situated and progressively developed through activity. People who use tools actively rather than just acquire them build an increasingly rich, implicit understanding of the world in which they use the tools and of the tools themselves. The understanding, both of the world and of the tool, continually change as a result of their interaction. The culture and the use of a tool act together to determine the way that practitioners see the world; and the way the world appears to them determines the culture's understanding of the world and of the tools. Unfortunately, students are too often asked to use the tools of a discipline without being able to adopt its culture. To learn to use tools as practitioners use them, a student like an apprentice must enter the community and its culture. (pp. 486-7)

Berkenkotter and Huckin argue that an activity-based theory of genre knowledge would therefore locate our knowledge of academic genres in the processes that Vygotsky calls 'socially distributed cognition'. These genres, they maintain, are inextricable of 'the conceptual tool kit of professional academic writers, linked to their knowledge of how to use the other tools of their trade' (p. 487). The writers contend that in contrast to this contention, undergraduate students, within the WAC movement programs, learn the university genre decontextualized and away from their rhetorical functions. They recommend that the genre of disciplinary discourse requires emersion and long period of apprenticeship and enculturation.

The third principle is form and content. Berkenkotter and Huckin forward the condition that if genres are dynamic rhetorical structures and genre knowledge is a form of situated cognition, it follows that both genres and genre knowledge are more sharply and richly defined to the extent that they are localized (in both time and place). They continue, in the dynamic grounded view of genre that we are advocating here, what constitutes true genre knowledge is not just knowledge of formal conventions but knowledge of appropriate topics and relevant details as well.
Another aspect of content that should be considered in defining a genre is background knowledge, that is knowledge (of world, of particular community, of a discipline, etc.) that readers of that genre are assumed to have. The writers provide an example from Giltrow (1992) in which a newspaper reports about sentencing for violent crime. Giltrow analyzed and compared two sets of journal reports over a two-month period in 1950 and over a three-month period in 1990. Giltrow focused on ‘how textual coherence is maintained via unstated assumptions of background knowledge’. She has presented three sentences from a 1990 article about a child molester. A naïve reader might ask how the last sentence is related to the first two. Here are the sentences:

The judge agreed with prosecutor Wendy Sabeau that Blakemore, 31, of Georgetown “poses a real threat to the safety of others.”

The judge was told that Blackmore has confessed to sexually assaulting at least 17 boys and girls ranging in age from 6 to 10.

Blackmore wants his mother, father, and Sunday school teacher charged for abusing him when he was a child, court was told. (pp. 489-490)

She notes that the assumption of the reporter in the above report is that a typical reader would be able to know that adult violence is usually a result of childhood abuse by family and surrounding members from the neighborhood. She adds that in contrast to the readers of the 1990 report, readers of the 1950s will not be able to grasp the idea of family abuse to their children. This is because the 1950s readers expect the family to be protective of its members. Thus, Berkenkotter and Huckin deduce that both genre knowledge and form change over time as community knowledge itself changes.

Another aspect of the background knowledge, the writers say, is the concept of surprise value or novelty. It can play a role in genre content and form. In studies by Bazerman (1985), Huckin (1987), and Kaufer and Geisler (1989), Berkenkotter and Huckin explain, show the demand for scholarly articles to make room for novelty through contributing to the existing literature. The writers use the example of the two philosophers’ articles studied by Kaufer and Geisler. The philosophers used their composing strategies to propose novel knowledge claims. Kaufer and Geisler have shown
the difference between the writing of the two philosophers that goes beyond consensual knowledge and the inexpert behaviour of two undergraduate students. The students have merely provided summary of the framework knowledge in one case and ignored it in the other. The novices’ written genres, according to Kaufer and Geisler, lack the concept of novelty as a design strategy for academic argument.

Berkenkotter and Huckin illustrate one more aspect of content which needs to be taken care of in much academic writing. This is *kairos* or rhetorical timing. They give two examples of articles written by Oswald Avery and two colleagues in 1944 and by Watson and Francis Crick in 1953. Both the articles talk about the discovery of DNA and its structural properties. However, the 1953 writers only got Nobel Prize. The way in which the writers wrote the two articles made the difference. The 1944 writers, according to Halloran (1984), have been very cautious in style: longwinded, depersonalized, and their writing has been dense with technical details. On the other hand, Halloran adds, Watson and Crick’s article has been ‘short, elliptical, and coy’. Halloran has made the implication that Watson and Crick have simply made better use of the genre than did Avery and his collaborators (p. 491). However, Berkenkotter and Huckin raise the point that according to Miller (1992) Avery was far ahead of his time and his assumptions of his audience is quite different from those of Watson and Crick. That led to the elaboration in the case of Avery and the ellipticism in the case of Watson and Crick.

Berkenkotter and Huckin conclude that epistemology, background knowledge, surprise value, and kairos have a major role to play in the selection and use of formal features in the instantiation of a particular genre. Therefore, they add, it makes more sense to understand that individual texts should be seen to contain heterogeneous mixtures of elements, some of which are ‘recognizably more generic than others’ (p. 492).

In order to clarify the forth principle, the duality of structure, the writers find it at the centre of the structuration theory developed in sociology mainly by Giddens (1979, 1984). In a criticism against theorists such as Durkheim (1964); Parson (1949); Altusser and Balibar (1970), Giddens has noted that according to these theorists, there is a separation between social structure and human action. Social structure is seen as a constraint of human subjectivity. Such a framework, Berkenkotter and Huckin regret,
gives little room for reflexive agent. Giddens, they say, has found a fault in the above schools of sociology as they pay little attention to humans' reasons for their actions and think of the institutional forces as the only real stimuli for people's action.

Giddens proposes a perspective in which human agency and social structure can be seen as implicated in each other. To support his perspective, Giddens invents the notion of *duality of structure*. In this notion, he explains, the structure can be seen as both medium and outcome of the reproduction of practices. 'Structure', he maintains, 'enters simultaneously into the constitution of the agent and social practices and 'exists' in the generation moments of this constitution' (p. 493). Berkenkotter and Huckin observe that duality of structure is a kin to Bourdieu's (1987) concept of *double structuration* in spite of the fact that Bourdieu emphasizes the struggle and the use of strategies more than rules. In similar lines along with that of Giddens, the writers find, the conversation analyst Wilson (1991) has attacked the Durkheimain assumptions of social structure as constraining individuals and their actions. He finds that the problem with this assumption is that it does not account for actors' selection of the social-structural contexts more relevant to their activities in particular time and place. Berkenkotter and Huckin argue, along with Wilson and using his words, that

the fundamental justification for a classification of occasions must be that the participants orient it [the occasion] as a type of situation, and moreover, orient to the present interaction as an instance of that type. (p. 495; square brackets are the authors')

Thus, they add, 'people appear to orient to genre as situationally appropriate and relevant to a particular cultural framework' (p. 495).

Concerning *Community Ownership*, Berkenkotter and Huckin state that works such as that of Swales and Najjar (1987) and Swales (1990) on academic writing genres established an understanding of genres' functions with relevance to the discourse communities that "own" them. In similar ways, the writers add, Bazerman's (1988) study of the experimental article's development in the natural sciences made a strong case of
the existence of important connection between formation of scientific discourse community and the emergence of appropriate discursive strategies for making claims about academic achievements. This, they say, reveal the inner workings of the natural world (p. 497).

Berkenkotter and Huckin mention a number of studies done by them that prove that genres of academic writing functions to instantiate the norms, values, epistemologies, and ideological assumptions of academic cultures. For example, in a study by Berkenkotter et al. (1988, 1991), a graduate student's socialization into a field of study has been observed. Notes also have been made about the extent to which the student’s acquisition of discipline-specific text conventions has been connected to his learning a research methodology. In spite of the fact, Berkenkotter et al maintain, that the conventions of the research methodology have not been made explicit to the student; he has ‘assimilated the rationalist/realist epistemology that constitute empiricist inquiry in the social sciences’ (p. 498).

Berkenkotter and Huckin go on giving similar examples of their works in different fields and levels of maturity of the students and find similar evidence. They, therefore, conclude that students acquire the assumptions, values, ideologies, and conventions of the academic communities imbedded in genres of the field in the process of their immersion into the practices of the community.

3.1.4.1 Discussion of the framework

Though the writers do not present this theoretical model as an instructional one, the researcher finds it a step away from the prescriptive models of academic writing in the genres instructional tradition. Models such as these are perhaps the result of awareness of genre theorists that they have been seduced by the concept of discourse community (Swales, 1993). Questions of whether the concept of discourse community ‘a convenient covering metaphor’ or ‘a deluding vision allowing the dubious facility of making tempting generalizations about the world and its words’ have been raised’ (Swales ,ibid, p. 694).

Berkenkotter and Huckin’s theoretical model represents both the individual and the academic community. This model also underlies the pedagogical attempts at implicitly teaching the genre in the American New Rhetoric School.
The researcher will present below a discussion of the five principles that form the base of the above writers’ framework from her perspective.

Beginning with the first principle, dynamism, the writers have made it clear that they perceive dynamism in genre creation as an occasion that happens incrementally when necessity occurs. Genres reflected through this principle are supposed to be dynamic. However, such dynamism is limited to rare occasions in response to necessity under the condition that the individual is no longer an apprentice. The change is allowed only when there is a social necessity for it. That is, when the society demands it. Otherwise, genres are typified forms that occur through repeated use. The typification occurs, the writers follow Miller (1984) in this regard, through intersubjectivity not through external occasions that are alien to the individuals. That is, when individuals sense the repeated occurrence of some social occasions or contexts, they tend to form a typified response to such occasions. For the writers, it seems, the dynamism is related to both intersubjectivity and individuality, with intersubjectivity representing consensus. The researcher argues that if intersubjectivity is dialogic, then, there would be no consensus. She agrees with Bakhtin (1993) who states that

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

domain of culture and at the never-repeatable uniqueness of actually lived

and experienced life. (p. 2)

From this perspective, there can be no complete consensus on any activity. There can only be a partial agreement. Therefore, the researcher argues, the intersubjectivity as complete agreement on the typification of a particular form does not initially exists. Then, we have the choice of seeing intersubjectivity as dialogic. That is when there is partial agreement on what, how, why, when, and where of the genre. But, first of all, does the genre itself exist as an external consensual entity? Swales (1993), for example, acknowledges that genres are abstractions. He asks:
'What are the boundaries between genres: how large or how small should they be drawn? And what kind of criteria should be used to determine whether texts A and B are not instances of the same genre: recurrence of rhetorical situation (Miller: 1984, Yates and Orlikowski: 1992); consistency of communicative purpose (Swales: 1990); existence and arrangement of obligatory structural elements (Halliday and Hasan: 1989)?

Nor is it even clear to (at least to me) to what extent the categorization of genres is open to agreement on the basis of empirical investigation. (P. 688)

Thus, there is no initial agreement on how to decide about when a particular genre is given the status of genre. Consequently, the researcher asks a question: why do we want to teach our students genres about its identifications there is no agreement? The researcher believes that we want to live the illusion that there are concrete genres about its typification the community makes agreement. This, the researcher believes, hampers our ways to discovering new genres because we want our students to practice those genres which represent the cultural capital. This, the writer argues, has dangerous implications against the possibility of the growth of new genres or the interaction between genres within cultures and across cultures. Rather than intersubjectivity as consensus, we need to perceive it as dialogic. Through dialogic intersubjectivity, we will be enabled to see change in each occasion we use genres. The stability is, the researcher claims, a research criterion. It enables genre analysts do their job for identifying what characteristics of genre become stabilized over time. It needs not be a teaching criterion. If we teach our students academic writing through which they are expected to grow as the researchers of tomorrow through whom cultural development and intercultural dialogue may occur, then, we must help them see genres not as stable but as something that emerges through their writing. If we teach genres with the impression that these are the cultural capital to be adopted, it will be difficult for students to write naturally. They will always be conscious to stick to the norms. They need to experiment with different forms or invent their own forms as they experience in knowledge production evolves. For academics who are expected to come up with their own ideas (to be responsive), it is more suitable to help them see the structure of their own minds as
providing the forms for their writing. Thus, the researcher recommends that the term intersubjectivity in Miller’s account which is also taken as the criterion for consensus in the model to be replaced with dialogic intersubjectivity. Dialogic intersubjectivity means the dynamics that allow partial agreement that enables a dialogue for change or responsivity. To conclude, the principle, dynamism, recommended by Berkenkotter and Huckin is a diluted model of the social constructivism. It gives very little space for manoeuvre for the individual. If this principle is to be set right, the researcher proposes that the two criteria dialogic intersubjectivity and responsivity as more suitable than the principle of dynamism to express and enable change as emergent.

Next, the principle of situatedness reflects, more than the first principle dynamism, the writers’ determinism to account for genre knowledge from a societal perspective rather than both individual and social. They maintain that genre knowledge is “transmitted” to the individuals through the processes of enculturation. They define these processes as “picking up” the discourse patterns of a particular discourse community. This happens through the individual detection of the typification processes and making “recognizable” responses to the exegesis of the particular situations. The researcher thinks that there is more emphasis on the societal nature of both the interpretation and the response of the individuals. Individuals are not given enough space to make interpretations that differ from the acceptable consensual discourse. The researcher wanders: what if the individuals are students who are to be taught how to interpret the world differently? What if the aim is to encourage them come up with their own meanings which may not be similar to those established/typified? What if their responses are not recognized by the existing discourse practitioners?

Berkenkotter and Huckin uses Bakhtin’ conception of primary and secondary genres to differentiate between everyday genres and academic genres. The aim from such a use is to claim that everyday genres are embedded in the real situations and the secondary genres are removed from the here and now situation to be reified (to use Bakhtin’s term) in the discourse of the academic community. The idea behind this distinction, which is not aimed for by Bakhtin himself, is to distinguish between academic and non-academic genres with relevance to here and now. Bakhtin, the
researcher argues, does not want primary and secondary genres to be alienated from each other. Rather, he in the discourse of the novel, talks about super genres and genres interaction as well as the creation of new genres. The writers argue that academic genres can be related to everyday demands while academic genres are abstract entities that relate to a limited time and place. To support their idea, the writers turn to the literature on situated cognition. They want to make the point that knowledge of genre is located in the processes of socially situated cognition. The social cognition of the reified academic community is meant by the writers. The researcher responds that circumscribing the individual within his/her special academic community is a narrow view of situatedness. Situatedness is multileveled. At one level, the individual needs to know what the here and now of his/her social needs; and through her/his particular field, a situated response needs to be made. The response to the need of the here and now situation may not be found in the academician's particular community. He/She needs to formulate the response borrowing tools from other communities and adapting them to own academic community. At a second level, the academician (who knows another language and thus may relate to academic communities through it) does have relations with groups outside one's culture in which he/she may use their tools for the response. He/She needs to be enabled to relate to such communities dialogically so that a new response may occur. Thus, the researcher proposes situatedness within a dialogic framework in place of the limited situatedness propose in the model.

In the third principle, form and content, the writers' sociocognitive perspective, the researcher argues, is more obvious. They begin by assuming that form and content are sharply defined by localized time and place. These, form and content, are grounded not only in formal conventions but are knowledge of appropriate topics and relevant details. With relevance to this convention on the part of the authors, they discuss different aspects of genre knowledge which reflect both the social and the individual aspects of genre knowledge. However, in the other aspects of genre knowledge their tendency to emphasize the societal aspect is more obvious.

The other aspect of genre knowledge is background knowledge which they say are knowledge "of the world, of particular community, of a discipline". These, they say,
are the genre knowledge which the readers are also assumed to have. The researcher believes that the genre background knowledge is not confined within the particular community. It draws upon all the knowledge that the individuals have and the way they get utilized in a particular situation. She claims that both the relevant and irrelevant knowledge comes to utility in a composing situation. Then, the individual sifts the most relevant in accordance to the situational needs which he/she also decides. Thus, from this perspective, the researcher claims that the knowledge that the community readers possess is not consensual. It is divergent and homogeneous. The researcher also claims that there is no guarantee that the kind of readers that the writers have in minds when writing need to be the same as the community readers. The writers, for example when they write about something new, may have future readers in mind which do not exhibit the same knowledge of the academic community. The researcher builds her argument on the basis that some writers are ahead of their time. Thus, it is very difficult to predict readers who will be able to completely grasp what they write. This has happened many times with geniuses who have written for readers in their times but have been understood only by future reader.

The second aspect of the genre knowledge which the writers present is that of surprise value or novelty. To explain this aspect they give an example of two philosophers and two novices. The philosophers have been able to propose new knowledge claims while the novices have been able to only summarize the existing framework. The researcher argues that this behaviour gets reflected in the novices' writing because the existing system of education treats them as such. It does not expect them to invent or to exhibit novelty. Therefore, they behave in the way expected from their discourse community. Novices are neither prepared nor enabled to exhibit behaviour like that of the two philosophers.

The last aspect the writers discuss of the genre knowledge is that of kairos or rhetorical timing. They give two examples from the field of science of two scientists who have written articles about the discovery and the features of the DNA within a nine-year gap from each other. The first article has not been appreciated by the community while the other has been allotted a Nobel Prize. Berkenkotter and Huckin attribute the difference in the reception of the two articles to the ways in which the articles have been
written and to the timings of the publications. They say that the article written after nine years has more proper sense of how the readers will receive a new discovery as such. Therefore, it has exhibited a language that properly tells the readers only that. The language has not been elaborate or full of technical details like that of the first article. Rather it has been ‘elliptical’ and ‘coy’. Berkenkotter and Huckin explain that what has happened in terms of kairos or improper timing. That is, the writers of the second scientific article have shown proper timing of the article publication. The researcher proposes that this will keep happening as long as there are scientists who exhibit knowledge ahead of their time. The researcher feels that the writers narrowly perceive the problem they are describing. They see the problem of timing the scientists’ problem. They do not look with similar accusation to the readers. The problem may be because the readers did not possess enough knowledge to understand the scientists in the first article. This implies, in contrast to Berkenkotter and Huckin, that it is unnecessary for the readers to exhibit all the knowledge of the academic community. What has happened to the writers of the first scientific article gives evidence that whatever knowledgeable the readers would be; they may not be able to understand what the writer attempts to say. The writer, in this case of the scientific article, does not lack the community knowledge. He is, rather, a head of his time. This is not his mistake. Shall we not write new knowledge if the academic community is not prepared for? The readers were prepared for such knowledge only after nine years. Thus, the researcher concludes that our conception of the content and form are inextricable from each other. They will remain in tension with each other and this is an irresolvable case. That is, we will keep writing information that our discourse community may not be able to understand. The form and content of our writing will always be in tension of what we believe more suitable to what we want to give in terms of information. It will always be both in similarity and contrast to whatever knowledge our readers hold.

The fourth principle, duality of structure, the researcher argues, shows more the writers’ bias towards a societal perspective than an emergent or dialogic one. They acknowledge that they are indebted to Giddens’ structuration theory. In this theory Giddens rejects Durkheim’s, Parson’s, and Althusser and Balibar’s formulations of social
structures as separate from human actions. In their formulations social structures are seen as constraining human subjectivity and the only stimuli for human actions. Rather, Giddens uses the concept of the duality of structure to propose that human agency and social structure are implicated in each other. However, the researcher maintains that if the human agency and social structure are seen as dual structure, they are still seen as separate. Though Giddens suggests that they affect each other and that humans can create the stimuli for their actions, still the writers did not change their strong societal position. They end the section on this principle saying: ‘people appear to orient to genre as situationally appropriate and relevant to a particular cultural framework.’

The researcher proposes that if this principle is seen from a dialogic perspective, then the situation itself must have the force to decide the interaction between the individual and the societal. Social forces are both in the person and outside him/her. There is no duality. There is, rather, an amalgam of multiple forces that are partly individual and partly social within the human being and outside as he/she faces a situation.

**In connection with the last principle, community ownership,** the researcher claims that Berkenkotter and Huckin have made it clear that the individual, in his/her academic enculturation in an academic maturity should aim at mastering conventional ways of doing things in this community. They state that the academic community “owns” genre. In the individual’s attempt to claim academic achievements, they say, he/she has to discursively negotiate a position within the discourse community. The researcher finds this an accommodationist position. The writers contend that the genre function is to instantiate the norms, values, epistemologies, and ideological assumptions of academic cultures. This means that there is no room for inventing new genres. From a dialogic perspective, however, the conventions must leave a space for inventions. Students of writing who are learning it to be better human beings and to make their society and the world a better place for living need to see how to make conventions better. If they just instantiate them, then, it will be like moving within the same circle.

To conclude, the researcher claims that though Berkenkotter and Huckin claim to be represent a sociocognitive model of genre writing, their model is biased for societal
conventions. This bias in the model is seen throughout all the five principles presented by the authors. They claim to have made a room for individual inventions but this, the writer finds, is to be allowed only when the individual is mature enough to instantiate conventions. This presupposition of the maturity before development is against one of Vygotsky's main claims which argue for a pedagogy which encourages development that is ahead of maturity (Bruner, 1985). It is not also in tune with the dialogic discourse that Bakhtin (1981) has aimed at and which gives equal weights to the internally persuasive discourse and the authorial discourse (academic discourse).

3.1.5 Conclusion

The researcher concludes from the discussions of the above instructional and theoretical models of academic writing that these may not enable cultural development and intercultural dialogue. They exhibit an accomdotaionist view of teaching and learning academic writing.

In the following section, the researcher will propose a tentative dialogic sociocultural approach of academic writing teaching in which intersubjectivity, responsivity, and situatedness are seen as dialogic criteria. These criteria have been present in the above models but not in the researcher’s proposed dialogic sociocultural perspective. The context for this tentative approach is an EFL pre-service teacher development in which student-teachers are prepared to make meanings/knowledge that are culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic in their academic writing.

3.2 Towards a Tentative Dialogic Sociocultural Approach for Teaching EAP

3.2.0 Dialogic Criteria for Teaching Academic Writing

The following is an attempt to introduce dialogic sociocultural criteria for teaching academic writing that the researcher proposes may lead to cultural development and intercultural dialogue. To remind the reader of the meaning given to the two concepts (cultural development and intercultural dialogue, the researcher reproduces the ones
given in chapter One here. Cultural development, the researcher defines here in a broad sense to mean an individual development in terms of meaning/knowledge construction that has a larger influence on the broad culture beginning with the field to which the scholar belongs and (when possible) ending with his/her national culture. Intercultural dialogue, the researcher defines in terms of cross-cultural interaction between scholars (or scholars and the to-be-scholars) within the particular cultures of two fields and/or two different social cultures. These two concepts are perceived by the researcher as intersecting with and leading to each other. The way the researcher discusses the criteria below is an attempt from her dialogic sociocultural perspective as possibly leading to cultural development and intercultural dialogue. She is proposing a tentative dialogic sociocultural approach in which the criteria (intersubjectivity, responsivity, and situatedness) are seen as criteria for teaching academic writing that may lead to cultural development and intercultural dialogue. The researcher will begin by exploring intersubjectivity as the first criteria in her approach.

3.2.1 Intersubjectivity

The basic aim of this section is to provide an understanding of the term of intersubjectivity as the basis of change; and to introduce a conceptualization of intersubjectivity for such a purpose. The understanding of the term, from the researcher's perspective, is entrenched in the idea that intersubjectivity can be a drive for a future change. The researcher argues for a conception of intersubjectivity from a dialogic sociocultural perspective. From a dialogic sociocultural perspective, there can be no complete agreement. The agreement is always partial. This conviction of the researcher comes from a Bakhtin who contends that if two persons completely agree to something, this will imply the vanishing of one voice. All in all, intersubjectivity from a dialogic sociocultural perspective is important to lay the foundation for change and to indicate the change.
3.2.1.1 Origin and meaning

The term intersubjectivity has come into the lime light of communication studies with the writings of Ragner Rommetveit. Marcová (1982) defines intersubjectivity as follows:

[... ]intersubjectivity refers to the ability to switch constantly from one’s own to the other’s point of view, to modify one’s present self-consciousness and other-consciousness, and thus to replace them both by more adequate concepts. (Square bracket are mine, P. 154)

She explains further that intersubjectivity in a broad sense means a continuous comparison and adjustment of the mind which enables it to acquire knowledge. It is a must according to Rommetveit, she continues, for initiating interpersonal communication. It leads to self-consciousness and at a more specific level; it is the process by which one partner in communication compares his/her own self-consciousness with a more adequate concepts of both consciousness (pp. 151,155). Therefore, the researcher finds that in this sense, intersubjectivity involves a change of both consciousness to a unifying position.

The origin for the adoption of the term “intersubjectivity”, the researcher finds, has been with studies which have investigated mother-infant interaction. In these studies both the mothers and the infants adapted their behaviours to reach an agreement and an improved understanding of each other (Marcova, ibid). When the idea was adapted to education, the idea of “motheries”/mother talk continued to occur with the aim of the change of the consciousness of the child only. The teacher’s consciousness, it has been believed, remains unaffected and the child’s is supposed to assimilate the care giver’s technique/strategic activity and use it contextually. Hence the idea of intersubjectivity as adopting the other’s perspective to mean decentring has come. Rommetveit (1978) relates intersubjectivity to the concept of decentring which he connects with the relational use of language. In a critique of Piaget’s uses of the term (i.e. decentring) Rommetveit finds out that Piaget uses it to justify children’s inability to decentre themselves from the general to the particular. In an experiment, Piaget asks children to identify the number of brothers and sisters they have. Piaget explains what happened saying that children were
unable to solve the task due to their deficient semantic competence. Rommetveit comments that Piaget has tested an unrelational/general semantic competence. Children, he clarifies, are unable to relate to Piaget’s understanding of the idea of kinship in the task because it involves, beside understanding kinship, the ability to count (p.117). This, Rommetveit identifies, is deficient intersubjectivity: ‘the child responds on presupposition different from those of the adult investigator’ (p.122). The intersubjectivity established in the task in Piaget’s experiments, Rommetveit proposes, must be attached to a dynamic semantic competence in a particular time and place rather than testing logical operations/conventional operative semantic competence. He defines operative semantic competence as ‘the capacity to achieve intersubjectivity in acts of verbal communication’ (p.146). He justifies children’s failure to successfully identify themselves out of the kinship relation in Piaget’s task to their ‘centration’ in particular experiential contingencies. He argues for an understanding of interrelationships between ‘operative semantic competence and Piagetian cognitive operations’ ‘as patterns of dependency of the kind encountered in an analysis of message structure’ (p.148). He suggests that cooperation between Piagetian students of thought and developmental psycholinguistics is recommended. This is because Piaget focuses on patterns of thought and neglects the use of language for which intersubjectivity is a must.

Rommetveit does not stop with the above conceptualization of intersubjectivity. He gives it a postmodern pluralistic twist. Rommetveit (1985) from a ‘constructivistic’ argues for an understanding of language and thought based on decentration in which both the Vygotskian symbolic regulation and Piaget’s decentring mean an ‘increased self-regulation via linguistic-symbolic structuring and control’ (p.183). His aim from this understanding and unification of both the concepts is to ‘integrate “pluralistic” and “relativistic” outlook on cognitive development.’ The assumption behind such aim is that ‘human discourse takes place in and deals with a pluralistic, only fragmentally known, and only partially shared social world’ (p.183). He derives a framework from Voloshinov’s ‘dialectical’ philosophy of language, Wittgenstein’s metaphor of “language games”/interaction rituals/metacommunication frames, G. H. Mead’s symbolic interactionism, the psychology of language and thought of Vygotsky, and his proposed
understanding of Piaget's view of decentring. On the basis of this framework he makes the following proposition:

An adult person's repertory of possible perspectives entails as experiential possibilities aspects that are immediately visible only from the position of her or his conversation partner, and an essential component of communicative competence in a pluralistic social world is the capacity to adopt the attitude of "different others." (p. 189)

The above perspective in his framework is derived from the following resources: from Wittgenstein's language games he draws upon Wittgenstein's understanding that the way an aspect of an object is perceived is not a property of the object, but an internal relation between it and the other objects. Therefore, understanding a concept is not the property of one's mind but a property of the relation between one's and others' minds. From Voloshinov, he gets the idea that consciousness and its social context are "inextricably fused"; and that consciousness develops only in the process of social interaction. From Vygotsky, he borrows the contention that "signs and words serve children first and foremost as a means of social contact with other people". Last, he borrows from Mead the theoretical framework of empirical semantics (p. 184, 185, 186, 188). The following example shows how Rommetveit uses semantics to account for the symmetric and asymmetric intersubjectivity:

An entire dialogue or a given stretch of discourse is characterized by a symmetric pattern of communication control if and only if unlimited interchangeability of dialogue roles constitutes part of the externally provided sustained condition of interaction.

An entire dialogue or a given stretch of discourse is characterized by an asymmetric pattern of communication control if and only if the interaction takes place under sustained constraints contrary to the basic or "prototypical" dyadic regulation of privileges and commitments. (Italics is in the original, p. 190)
If the communicants' relationship is a symmetrical one, i.e. not hierarchical, this entails a longer interaction and thus more democratic exchange of the authority. This shows that Rommetveit in his construction of the concept of intersubjectivity is aware of negative consequences on the growth of democratic consciousness if not dealt with symmetrically. Intersubjectivity is in first place an exchange of control. Later on in the paper, he clarifies that what he means by control is what he has previously termed decentring in Piaget's tradition and symbolic regulation or higher-order control of attention as defined by Vygotsky. Therefore, he further claims, that the Vygotskyan perspective is thereby expanded because a redefinition of growth/symbolic regulation as decentring has been added; that is when a child develops control of joint focus with the adult, he/she decentres.

Rommetveit (1988) expands his perspective of symbolic regulation in a social context by questioning the need for conventional meaning (which he calls a myth); and at the same time argues that it is a myth that we live as a reality among literate people. In an attempt to bridge the gap between two opposing forces in semantics, those who believe that meaning is conventional/tied to words and sentences' literal meaning (i.e. the position of structuralists as presented by Searle), and those who think that meaning is hermeneutic and contextual (i.e. the position of post-structuralists as presented by Derrida), he, from a Vygotskyan and Bakhtinian formulations and within a sociocognitive perspective, finds the solution in introducing a hermeneutic twist into situated semantics. He provides the following quotation from Bakhtin about intertextuality.

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

Rommetveit comments that Bakhtin's approach to linguistic meaning –something that cannot be captured by focusing on external referents of expressions- is futile as it reflects an essential feature of language alive. This, he asserts, is also reflected in
Bakhtin’s notion of “the loophole of consciousness and the word” which means ‘... the retention for oneself of the possibility for altering the ultimate, final meaning of one’s words’ (p.22). He adds, bringing both the thinkers, Bakhtin and Vygotsky into a meeting point, that both of them, in spite of a concern with language as a social activity, have been ‘intrigued by possible objective and invariant features of language underlying mutual understanding’. For example, he continues, ‘Vygotsky’s discussion of the impact of scientific concepts’ ‘may be interpreted as a concession that language may have “foundations in simple concepts”’ (p.25). To support his point, he quotes the following from Bakhtin (1973):

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

However, he asserts, Bakhtin and Vygotsky are seriously concerned with dynamic and interactional features of language alive (in other words, linguistically mediated intersubjectivity). But, their theoretical interest is not to find socio-interactional features that govern intersubjective negotiation of meaning. Therefore, Rommetveit takes the pain to clarify the dynamic nature of meaning negotiation through identifying how each, the 'literal' and the casual, plays a role in meaning making. To illustrate his argument, he uses two sentences ---1. Earnie: “I’m going to divide this banana up so both of us can have some”. 2. Earnie gives Bert the skin. “See, I took the inside and here’s the outside part for you.”--- presented in Olson and Torrance’s (1985) study of the development of metalinguistic awareness in children. The first-grader subjects in Olson and Torrance’s experiment have responded “Earnie lied.” in a first encounter with the sentences. When these subjects have become third-graders, they have commented that the sentence is both true and false. Olson and Torrance have interpreted subjects’ responses along with similar responses in systematic studies of development of metalinguistic awareness as indicating an increasing capacity to distinguish ‘what is actually said from what is
meant.' Rommetveit questions their stipulation of functional, "transparent", literal meanings prior to the stage of metalinguistic awareness; and argues that meaning is not only situated, and that literal meaning inherited in the minds of the communicants becomes casual as they work it out dynamically in a situation. He explains that if Earnie and Bert have been working in a botanic class, then the skin can be easily agreed upon as a part of a banana. But, with a friendship conventional framework, the part expected to be shared by friends definitely is not a skin. It must be an edible, delicious part with 'edible' as a word that cannot be understood in its literal sense but when situated (pp. 26-9). He also gives another example of two friends one of them says: "Jim tries to get me fired from the job by spreading false rumors about me". The other replies: "That's dirty". Rommetveit explains that the second person's reference can be a comment on what Jim has done; or it may be a reference to a cup that is dirty if the two friends, for example, have been sitting at a table with the first about to pour tea into the cup; and the other draws his attention to the cup that is dirty. The meaning here, he comments, depends on whether the participants' point of reference is the topic talked about, or the meeting of their eyes' reference on the dirty cup (pp. 29-30). He keeps on giving examples of persons referring to the same action as happening or not happening (Mr. Smith working and not working, though he has been doing one thing all the time; i.e. mowing the grass) when Mrs. Smith has been talking to different persons asking about her husband from different perspectives (p. 33). From all these illustrations Rommetveit, the researcher believes, wants to suggest that for the agreement to occur the interpretations of the two participants must also meet in the here and now in order for the communication to be intersubjective. Without a meeting of intentionality, there can be no meeting of viewpoints because there is a loophole of consciousness that is related to their intentionalities. Though Rommetveit states that intersubjectivity has to be taken for granted in order to be achieved, he is aware of where blind agreement can lead; the two children's anecdote is an example. In spite of all that, Rommetveit insists that mutual commitment needs to first precede intersubjectivity. He is also aware of the reverberation of his commitment to mutual understanding on literate activities. In order to illustrate his point further and relate it to literate acts of reading and writing, he draws on his own personal experience and sets the stage towards meaning-making in academic community.
He states that he has been a sort of a reader who used to read *under eraser* (i.e. with points of views of the writers of the texts have hardly held). This has led him to a lot of potentially fruitful misunderstanding. However, when he himself writes, with the belief that every word he writes has a loophole; and it can be understood differently by readers who hardly share him his background; and they can read his own text mercilessly under erasure, he has felt stun. This dilemma reflected in his own academic experience, he finds, is also reflected in different text genres: the scientific prose, representing the myth of literal meaning; and the genre of fiction writing, representing the anti-text movement. The writing in the first tradition is geared towards self-fulfillment as well as cumulative and consensual knowledge, though within restricted and world-version-closed dimension. This leads to a belief by language users that human world-like finished written texts are ontically closed and can be known by scientists in terms of atomic facts. The other tradition proponents, he maintains, ‘are self-destructive in their fight against literal meaning because they do not fully appreciate the components of plausibility and truth entailed within it’ (p.38). He continues:

> They do not only fight literal meaning endorsed by priests, sustained by unwarranted ontic trust in science and reinforced by Fregean semantics, but also reject collectively endorsed standard of correctness of a kind which appears to be essential even in a poetically conducted warfare against social conventions. (p. 38)

He concludes that the standard of correctness needs to be associated with orderly negotiation of what is meant based upon mutual commitment to a temporarily shared world. These, he maintains, are prerequisites for linguistically mediated intersubjectivity between writers and readers (pp. 34-38).

Therefore, reading and writing in are interpretive and productive social activities rather than decoding and coding processes. Moreover, both reading and writing are hermeneutically fulfilled and specifically situated. However, the researcher cautiously accepts Rommetveit’s argument on the basis that he believes that the literal meaning does not exist. Thus, Rommetveit does not really believe in the pre-existence of structures. For him, structures emerge in specific situations as we have seen in the case of the two
friends with the dirty cup. Although he, towards the end of his account, celebrates a sense of consensus and communal sense, he does not imply that the community will be the final authority on the individual’s achievement. He believes that each word has a loophole and basically the consensus will always remain partial. He also talks in his framework about the symmetrical interaction between communication partners. This implies that he is aware of the negative consequences of asymmetrical relationships. Thus, the researcher believes that Rommetveit is not celebrating intersubjectivity that is based on blind consensus. In addition, the researcher believes that Rommetveit’s sociocognitive model is more aware of the dialogic potential and that the consensus is not the final word on the individual’s judgment. This is because he believes in the fruitfulness even of misunderstanding. In this way Rommetveit’s sociocognitive model is not permeated with the idea of priori of structure as necessarily a force for human action as that perceived in Berkenkotter and Huckin’s model. He is as if telling that there is no priori as such but believing so to enable us to have a sense of achievement. However, the researcher feels that Rommetveit’s conception does not take the criterion, intersubjectivity, as far as it can contribute into a dialogic sociocultural perspective that aims at enabling students to exhibit cultural development and intercultural dialogue in their academic writing. This is why the concept of intersubjectivity as implying only agreement has got critiqued; and proposals for adding some terms for extending its implications for dialogue that does not imply agreement have been made. The following is a presentation of these critiques and proposals.

3.2.1.2 Intersubjectivity from a dialogic sociocultural perspective

According to Bakhtin, a person can never wholly be in the territory of the other. The individual will gain nothing by being another. His/her own value is in being different and because of that difference the dialogue occurs. The self can never transcend the difference between self and the other. Human consciousness is non-transparent. Therefore, there can never be a complete agreement between two individuals. This summarises the counter argument for the intersubjectivity as consensus. This is the basis of the following critiques of the concept of intersubjectivity as agreement and the proposals for adding different terms for connoting difference.
3.2.1.2.1 Matusov's critique of the term.

From a Bakhtinian concern, Eugene Matusov (2011), critiques the way developing consciousnesses are viewed in Vygotsky's paradigm. Unsatisfied with the view of intersubjectivity as implying only agreement, he states that there is no 'true meeting of two consciousnesses' in the paradigm. He explains that ontological development in the paradigm involves mutual understanding through agreement. The mutual understanding has to be reached according to the old Vygotskyan paradigm, 'not with a specific adult but with the universal consciousness', and that is 'closely approximated by the Western educated adult' (pp. 103-4). He supports his understanding with the following quotation from Vygotsky (1987):

Thus, the meanings of the child's words frequently coincide with those of the adult; the meanings of a given word for the child and the adult often intersect on the same concrete object. This allows mutual understanding between the adult and child. However, the mental paths or modes of thinking that lead to this point of intersection are completely different. Even where the meaning of the child's word corresponds partially with that of the adult's speech, it is derived from entirely different mental operations. The meaning of the child's word is the product of the syncretic merging of images that stands behind it. (Vygotsky (1987) as cited in Matusov, ibid, pp. 101-2)

In his response to Vygotsky and his followers, Matusov proposes two terms 'dialogic intersubjectivity' and 'interproblematicity' in place of intersubjectivity on the basis that Bakhtin's central concern is the relationship between two consciousnesses. These when they ontologically and dialogically interact, there is always a gap in and between their understanding for self and for the other which is 'a precursor and an outcome of dialogue and dialogic meaning-making' (Matusov, ibid, p. 103). Therefore, according to Matusov, from a Bakhtinian perspective Vygotsky's is 'monologic and inhumane; and from a Vygotskyan perspective the Bakhtinian is 'anti-developmental' (pp. 103-4). Matusov argues that the term dialogic interaddressivity 'implies that people
cannot, and even must not, fully know each other' (p. 103). The other term 'involves the participants' genuine interest in the problem here and now (i.e. their ontological engagement)' (Matusov, ibid, p. 104).

The researcher has the following to say in her critical response to Matusov. First, to begin with Matusov’s claim that the Vygotsky-inspired notion of intersubjectivity has to end with agreement. It is clear from the passage sited by Matusov that Vygotsky does not mean coincidence that occurs ‘always’ but the one that ‘frequently’ happens. It is a situated meeting of consciousnesses that is tied to a particular concrete object within a particular time and place limit. The researcher argues that the particular communicative event in Vygotskian paradigm in an educational setting is bound to the concept of ZPD (zone of potential development). ZPD, the researcher reckons, is Vygotsky’s conceptualization of two essential terms in Hegel’s phenomenology namely the ‘potentiality’ and ‘actuality’. In any communicative event between an adult and a child, the growth can be seen, from the researcher’s perspective, as the actualization of a potential in particular time and place. This actualization will again be the potential in a next encounter. Whatever is seen as a mutual understanding of today may turn to be the dogma of tomorrow. Vygotsky believes that the interaction is interpretive because the ‘paths and modes of thinking that leads’ to the intersection ‘are different.’ There is a struggle in the way such mutual understanding is reached from both directions; which means that a growth of some sort will occur for/in both the communicants.

Concerning the concept of the image of the society in the educated adult, there has been several discussions on the idea of how unnecessary for the dialogue partner to be the educated adult/more knowledgeable other. Wells (1999), for example, approached the matter from the perspective of a communicative activity perspective in which each member of the group contributes equally to the meaning making and needlessly for some to be more knowledgeable or able. With respect to the generalized other to be assimilated to the child, the researcher believes, it is due to Vygotsky’s concern with the relation between individual and society. In any meeting between individuals it is not only the individuals (microgenetic) who meet but also the milieus in which they are immersed (ontogenetic) are also in dialogue. Their meeting can also be at the phylogenetic level if the discussion took a reflective turn beyond the generation they belong to and the border
of their civilization (for example, if they make a comparison between the Arabic and the Western civilization) in which the individuals play their roles. The tools they physically and mentally use, apply, and produce are also in dialogue. Throughout the interaction, it is not only the individuals who change but also their understanding of the societal aspect of their understanding that changes and the way they develop, use, and produce tools for growth and for dealing with it and with each other.

The researcher, however, believes that we may retain the concept of intersubjectivity if we make it say more than it has historically been able to say. This, the researcher says, is out of her concern for the development of an 'individual talent' that emerges in a dialogic sociocultural encounter that aims at cultural development and intercultural dialogue. Before introducing the researcher's proposal, one more discussion of the concept is introduced by a Vygotskyan sociocultural scholar, James Wertsch (the one who gave the sociocultural theory its name and its sociocultural orientation), is to be introduced below.

3.2.1.2.2 Wertsch's critique of the term.

Within the framework of mediation in SCT, Wertsch (1998) associates the term intersubjectivity with another term which he calls 'alterity'. He states:

In any particular episode of social interaction, the relative importance of the two tendencies may vary, but both are always at work. Hence, the challenge is to “live in the middle” [...] and recognize how these two forces are part of an integrated, dynamic picture. (p. 111)

This, Wertsch says out of his convection coming from his understanding of Vygotsky's genetic law of development. It is inherent in Vygotsky's tradition that any mental process begins at the intermental plane and is taken over by the individual through interaction into the intramental plane. These planes are interrelated and each affects the other in several ways. During the taking over, the structure and the function run through transformation due to the transformational process the child goes through when internalizing them. Therefore, two forces are at work at the time of interaction the
transmissional and the transformational. That is the reason why Wertsch is suggesting that both tendencies, the alterity and the intersubjectivity, are at work.

Wertsch begins his argument with a statement that the term intersubjectivity comes from Rommetveit's attempt to explain the "architecture of intersubjectivity" as having ideal origin; i.e. out of a belief that there exists a pure intersubjectivity. Wertsch refrains from such Rommetveitian belief by drawing upon Rommetveit's (1979) distinction between the ideal and the reality. In reality, intersubjectivity is a fiction that helps us "pursue" our human communication "with scientific vigour, formal elegance, and academic success" (p. 112). This, Wertsch continues, we do when we evade basic questions of our existence, i.e. that we are different; and the very basic fact of our difference is that our understanding of and contributions to the world are supposedly different. This makes intersubjectivity a fiction or at least a very hard target to pursue. He adds that intersubjectivity operates in a dynamic tension with alterity and uses Yuri Lotman's view of the 'functional dualism' of the texts to support his argument. Lotman proposes that there are two simultaneous functions of a text: the univocal and the dialogic. The univocal function is a tendency of the text to "convey meaning adequately". This function occurs "when the codes of the speaker and the listener most completely coincide [...]"; and as a result "the text has the maximum degree of univocality" (p. 113). The consequence of such a function, Wertsch states, is the occurrence of artificial mental operations and an artificial language. On the other hand, the dialogic function "tends toward dynamism, heterogeneity, and conflict among voices." What matters is how the reader might use the text as a thinking device and respond to it 'in such a way that new meanings are generated' (p. 115). Wertsch maintains that the dialogic function of the text involves interaction of voices/perspectives. It leads to the creation of rhetorical encounter. The voice of the other, Wertsch draws on Bakhtinian tradition, forms the ground for the very existence of our voices; and the basic principle upon which the dynamics of our voices and the others' forms a constant exchange "between what is already and what is not yet" (pp. 116-7).

Wertsch proceeds by illustrating two different traditions of research: one uses the concept of intersubjectivity as indicator of self-regulation; and the other investigates it from the point of view of the interaction as a mediational tool for achieving self
regulation; and thus utilizes both the tendencies (intersubjectivity and alterity). In the first research tradition, intersubjectivity is not the aim but a metric device/term for measuring higher mental functioning in children. It has been regarded as both a prerequisite and a product of communication. Wertsch, following Matusov (1998), criticizes the first research tradition of emphasizing agreement of participants’ subjectivities and neglecting “‘the discrepancy or conflict that sparks cognitive development’” (pp.118-9). The second tradition focuses on the mediational role language plays in instructional discourse. With the instructional discourse being a genre as it follows a typical format (i.e. the I-R-E sequence or initiation-reply-evaluation sequence), Wertsch objects, it has persistently been formally used and thus reflected traditional assumptions about the classroom discourse. These can be listed as follows: first, the teacher is the question maker and the generator of most of the classroom discourse. This has dangerous consequences on the mechanism of power by putting it in the hands of the teacher. Second, the predominance of test questions over authentic or real questions; this rarely occurs in natural settings in which authentic questions are the most occurring. Third, the relation between the teacher and the students is asymmetrical. The students and the teacher are tangled within a circle of repeatedly played roles (the master and salve roles) through which students are denied “epistemic roles”. The utterances are considered as occurring within a pre-supposedly defined context rather than being viewed as defining or transforming the contexts. Fourth and last assumption, the instructional discourse identifies initiation and response within a context of knowledge transmission rather than thinking about knowledge. Thus, the discourse presumes the authority of an existing interpretation of knowledge and does not foster students’ academic achievement by giving them the chance to provide alternative interpretation. The latter underlies the alternative instructional discourse that Wertsch provides as an alternative for the above research tradition namely the reciprocal teaching (pp.121-4). He, in this regard, specially focuses on a study by Palincsar, Brown, and Campione (1993) which follows a trend of research about reasoning and reading to teach a set of strategies needed for effective comprehension. Wertsch describes these strategies, following the researchers, as the “‘the educational equivalent of polio vaccine’” and as being closed and drawn upon already-existing set of strategies used by experts (p.125). He, within a sociocultural perspective, describes these strategies as part of the ‘cultural
tool kit' that mediates teachers' interaction with the students. These have been used to re-mediate the action of poor readers to improve their comprehension. They are supposed to interfere into the organizational mental structure of the poor readers through giving the students the role to be question-givers and answerers. Wertsch suggests that this is a kind of the use of the dialogic function or alterity. Students are supposed to achieve a higher level of intersubjectivity of the use of the strategies introduced initially by the teachers. This intersubjectivity, Wertsch expounds, turns into a kind of utterance which itself shapes the dialogic encounter with others. He adds that the processes used for mastering the strategies can be understood, following Cazden, as "performance before competence" (p. 132). The students have mastered and 'appropriated' the cultural tool/strategies; they have slowly and gradually acquired them and made them their own. Wertsch refrains that though students have been successfully able to acquire and apply the strategies, they have taken them over without reflection or volition. He winds up by an optimistic outlook that it might be the case that the students may end up by transforming these cultural tools.

The researcher though shares Wertsch his uneasiness of using the term intersubjectivity alone as a measure of the occurrence of higher mental functions (due to its inherited implications of complete agreement), feels similarly uneasy with adding a counter term for implying dialogicality beside intersubjectivity. The way he conceptualizes intersubjectivity, the context in which it occurs, and the way both the tendencies (intersubjectivity and alterity) can work toward the creation of dialogic discourse are seen within a reproduction outlook of cultural tools. This can be seen from his implied agreement with teaching from the cultural "tool kit" with the hope that transformation of the cultural tool kit may happen by itself later through the students active efforts.

Wertsch in his defence for maintaining the concept mentioned two research traditions in which the concept has been used. In the first intersubjectivity has been used as an indicator of the child's control of regulative behaviour. The traditional I-R-E instructional discourse used intersubjectivity in this sense, and the result was students' submissive behaviour and lack of epistemic roles of their own. In the second tradition intersubjectivity along with another tendency (alterity) have been investigated and
activated. In the discourse of reciprocal teaching both the tendencies are at work since the students, in their attempt to appropriate the cultural tool introduced by the teachers namely the expert strategies of reading comprehension, do ask authentic questions and play epistemic roles in the sense that they exchange roles with their teachers. The question here is why intersubjectivity alone is not enough a tendency for the emergence of higher mental functions. Wertsch seems to give the following reason: with intersubjectivity alone the dialogue is not likely to occur between participants and if there is supposedly to be a meeting of points of view, then the students’ voices will be sacrificed.

3.2.1.2.3 A proposal for intersubjectivity in a dialogic sociocultural perspective.

The counter argument the researcher proposes is that intersubjectivity can be seen as a criterion through which we evaluate how we tend to approximate or to differ from others’ discourse. This criterion may not indicate an absolute value. Rather, it moves along a continuum of two extremes; negative intersubjectivity and positive intersubjectivity. Within the area of positive/negative intersubjectivity, one moves towards less intersubjectivity, more intersubjectivity, or zero intersubjectivity. The following figure shows a two-directional line at the end of its two non-finite directions the words, positive intersubjectivity and negative intersubjectivity, are written. The line is graded and two arrows are drawn to show the directions towards less, more, or zero degrees intersubjectivity.

(Figure No. 3.2)
Communication reflects positive intersubjectivity when the relationship between partners is symmetrical; and unlimited interchangeability of interactional roles is sustained and the partners are sharing controls. From this perspective, intersubjectivity involves alterity and is dialogic. So, from here onwards the words positive and dialogic will be treated as synonymous by the researcher. When it reflects negative intersubjectivity, the partners' relationship is asymmetrical, and the interchangeability of dialogic roles is limited with one of the partners practicing control over the others. Zero intersubjectivity occurs when the relationship lacks intentional control on the part of any of the partners. That is, when the communication is a conversation rather than a dialogue; see section 1.3 in Chapter One for the difference between dialogue and conversation.

With the researcher's new conceptualization of intersubjectivity, the liability of one turning voiceless appears within the area of negative intersubjectivity in the above continuum. The tendency should be towards positive/dialogic intersubjectivity where voices interanimate each other in a dialogic encounter. Then, there would be no need for another term beside intersubjectivity to make it account for difference. That is, the researcher does not need to use Wertsch's term (i.e. alterity). Moreover, when Wertsch introduces intersubjectivity as a mediational tool to be appropriated by students, he, along with that, attempts to argue for a developmental view of learning through which students are seen as taking over the use and the function of a cultural tool. The question here: is Wertsch trying to say that taking over an already existing tool is the end of development? Wertsch himself has given the answer to this question in the first and the last comments on reciprocal teaching above. He regards the interaction in the discourse of reciprocal teaching as closed and the strategy as prescribed since they are ready-made expert criteria for comprehension to be mediated to the students. He appreciates only the way students have taken over strategies, through intersubjectivity and alterity encounters between students and teachers, as dialogic. In spite of his belief that this encounter is dialogic, he acknowledges that students submissively have taken over the strategies without reflection. Their encounter, thus, with the cultural tools is certainly not dialogic. The researcher argues that for real cultural development which includes both the individual and the society, the cultural tools need to be critically examined by students in a dialogic encounter with others. The others, with whom the students have a dialogue, may be the
creators of these tools, for example, texts writers. Their efficacy and value for a particular cultural activity need to be examined in comparison with the values and efficacy of other existing or invented cultural tools within the same or different cultural context and activity.

To come back to the continuum above, positive/dialogic intersubjectivity within the dialogic sociocultural approach of the researcher does not indicate complete meeting of viewpoints; and therefore, may not be accused with closure like the original meaning of intersubjectivity. With the new conceptualization of positive intersubjectivity, which is obviously different from the meaning associated with the term intersubjectivity alone, it is supposed to play a role as both a prerequisite of dialogic encounter and as causative for diversity or ‘heteroglossia’ (in Bakhtin’s (1981) terminology). Positive intersubjectivity plays an important role in the emergence of voice and thus leads to change and development. The person that wants to make knowledge/meaning should experience positive intersubjectivity that enable it becomes an active participant in social dialogue. Bakhtin (1981) describes this process as follows:

The living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance; it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue. After all, the utterance arises out of this dialogue as a continuation of it and as a rejoinder to it — it does not approach the object from the sidelines.

(Emphasis is mine, pp. 276-7)

If, according to Bakhtin above, we are a continuation of our discourse community, then we cannot escape being in partial agreement with members of the discourse community. What we should, however, escape is to be in complete agreement with the other. The existential difference that academicians should exhibit and bring into the discipline/field community will be in danger. They will lose their ability to bring something that others cannot do because, according to Bakhtin, nobody can occupy our place in the world (Holquist, 1990). Then, the challenge for us, the educators, is to enable
our academic writing students to be intersubjectively positive. This can happen only when we bring to the interaction their responsive attitude. And, this how intersubjectivity and responsivity are related to each other. Bakhtin (1981) shows how the process of intersubjectivity can turn into heteroglossia.

As a living, socio-ideological concrete thing, as heteroglot opinion, language, for the individual consciousness, lies on the borderline between oneself and the other. The word in language is half someone else’s. It becomes “one’s own” only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention. (P. 293)

Morris (1994) as cited in Orr (2005, p. 71) calls this ‘responsive interaction between self and other’. She adds that ‘this constitutes the capacity of language to produce new meaning’ and thus to produce diversity.

Based on the above argument, the intersubjectivity in the researcher’s proposed dialogic sociocultural approach means partial agreement and may imply the additional sense proposed by Wertsch (i.e. alterity) and Matusov (interdiscursivity). In the proposed approach of the researcher, dialogic intersubjectivity generally refers to the dynamics of interaction between dialogue partners in terms of negatively/positively control sharing. It will be used, along the other two criteria (responsivity and situatedness), as criterion which is to be enabled and for evaluating the students’ responses.

Intersubjectivity can be related to intertextuality. Bakhtin points out what intertextuality means as follows:

Each utterance is filled with echoes and reverberation of other utterances to which it is related by the communality of the speech communication. Every utterance must be regarded primarily as a response to preceding utterances of the given sphere (we understand the word “response” here in the broadest sense.) each utterance refutes, affirms, supplements, and relies on the others, presupposes them to be known, and somehow takes them
into account. (Bakhtin (1986), p.91; slanted words in the original and the underlining is the researcher’s)

In considering intertextuality from a Dialogic perspective one must consider the relations that one writer as a meaner/knowledge maker has with other meaners/knowledge makers through texts. We draw upon each other not only to agree but also, according to Bakhtin, to refute, to criticize, to extrapolate. The rationale for this according to a Bakhtin is as follows:

The text lives only by coming into contact with another text (with context). Only at the point of this contact between texts does a light flash, illuminating both the posteriori and anteriori, joining a given text to a dialogue. We emphasize that this contact is a dialogic contact between texts. (Bakhtin ,ibid, P. 162)

Then, relating intersubjectivity with intertextuality broadens the scope of intersubjectivity because what remain of the past theorists are only their texts. There is no chance for the student to have a face to face intersubjective interaction with them. The past theorists no longer exist to be encountered and argued with for the correct interpretations of their texts. But, with the new conceptualization of intersubjectivity, we need to focus on interpretation which does not necessitate the meetings of points of views of the reader and the writer. Teachers should enable student-writers focus on how to use our interpretations of the ideas of the theorists to make meanings/knowledge. The same can be applied when enabling them interpret the recent theorists. The learner can be trained to dialogically interact with the theorists’ ideas and concepts through textual encounter, i.e. through reading and publication, or with them orally, i.e. in conferences to bring about new meanings. This is true even if students make use of the poetic function of language for creating makings/knowledge for a future context. The teacher should enable positive intersubjective encounter between student-writers and the theorists through playing the role of the theorist in the encounter. The interaction between the teacher as the theorists and the student-writers should enable them see the value of understanding how the original writer of the text will respond to their interpretation.
Student-writers may internalize this intersubjective encounter between them and the teacher in the role of the theorists in their future encounters with real theorists or with theorists through their texts. This internalization of positive intersubjective encounters may lead to development in meaning making and intercultural dialogue when they have dialogue with theorists from other cultures. Their intertexts may reveal to the teacher aspects of the nature of intersubjectivity that has taken place in the encounter and help them enable its improvement in students' written discourse.

Thus, the researcher operationalizes intersubjectivity in its dialogic sociocultural perspective for classroom use as follows:

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

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

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

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

The writer has advanced a proposal that for development and dialogue to occur, a
dialogic intersubjective encounter should be encouraged. In the first part of this section,
the origin of the term intersubjectivity has been presented and discussed. In the second
part two critiques of the term has been introduced one from a dialogic perspective
(Matusov’s critique) and the other from a sociocultural perspective. The researcher has
proposed in the third part to retain the term intersubjectivity with a dialogic sociocultural
perspective with two non-finite extremes positive and negative. A positive
intersubjectivity, however, is the extreme that should be encouraged and enabled in the
academic writing classroom for the purposes of development and dialogue. She has also
put in short the relation between intersubjectivity and responsivity as well as between
intertextuality and intersubjectivity. The researcher followed this by operationalizing the
criterion in terms of classroom interaction, students’ produced texts, selection of texts to
be read and responded to in writing, and in the nature of the tasks. All in all, the
researcher proposes that intersubjectivity is to be considered a necessary criterion which
is both a prerequisite of and a trigger for development and dialogue.

The second criteria in the approach, responsivity, will be discussed in the
following subsection.

3.2.2 Responsivity

The term the researcher believes is about finding a relation in a dialogue, in a text,
in a situation, or in an action. The following section will first give an idea of the origin of
the term in Bakhtin’s theory. Then, a discussion of its affiliation with the concept of
voice and how it differs from it will follow. Its affiliation with other terms like ‘surplus of
seeing’ and ‘authoring’ will also be discussed. The researcher will also attempt a
continuation of the discussion that she has begun in chapter one on the idea of discourse
community and its relation with the concept of responsivity. The last point will be
recommending the term as a criterion for academic writing classroom and
operationalizing it for classroom use.
3.2.2.1 Origin and meaning

Responsivity is a term coming from Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue, (Wells, 1999). It is an inherent property of any utterance to be responsive. Responsivity is the quality of taking ‘an active, responsive attitude’ when perceiving or producing speech (Bakhtin 1986 as cited in Braxley (2005), p. 13). Bakhtin (1986) explicates that the active response comes in the form of agreement, disagreement, augmenting, applying, or preparing for execution (p. 68). Thus, in the context of verbal communication, basically responsivity is a quality of attitudinal, active understanding that a person exhibits while interacting with another through language. All real and integral understanding must be responsive. Understanding is the ‘preparatory stage of a response’ (p. 69). It comes to ‘fruition only in response’. They (understanding and response) are ‘dialectically merged and mutually condition each other, one is impossible without the other’ (Bakhtin (1981) as cited in Orr (2005), p. 67). In a communicative situation both the listener and the speaker (and by extension the reader and the writer) are respondents. Braxley comments that in daily conversation there is a possibility to address a person face to face. In writing we are removed in distance or time from our respondents. This does not imply that writers do not have respondents. They have respondents in mind from whom they wish to elicit a response (p.13).

3.2.2.2 Responsivity in the writing theory (voice)

The researcher finds connection between voice and responsivity. Therefore, she finds relevant to present a historical account of how the term voice has been operationalized in the writing theory. She has observed a shift in the operationalizing of the concept “voice” throughout different schools of thought in writing theory. There is, she realizes, a shift from viewing self as an authoritative and unitary in the neo-romantic expressivist perspective, to a social position in the social perspective, to a point of view or ideology in the radical school, and to relational and authoritative in the social constructionist and externalist positions. The point the researcher wants to make is that these positions need not be in opposition to each other. They, rather, can be seen as representatives for the steps of the growth circle of the concept of voice in writing theory.
There are four broad views of the concept from the expressivist to the social turn in the writing theory.

**The expressivist/neo-romantic position**: it defines voice as an authentic and unitary self. It evolves from the 1970s affiliation with powerful writing (Matsuda, 2001). It is an authorial presence or identity in writing, and a way to establish relation with the reader (Hirvela & Belcher, 2001). It views writing as primarily an existential and a private urge for self. Voice is accumulatively constructed through experiences in the world and with others.

**The social perspective**: in the social perspective, voice is viewed as

... the amalgamative effect of the use of discursive features that language users choose, deliberately or otherwise, from socially available yet ever-changing repertoires. Simply put, voice is the quality that makes impersonation or "mimicking" possible. (Matsuda, ibid, p. 40)

According to the social perspective, students, to construct voice, have to be familiarized with the available social discursive features that lead to the construction of voice. This will help them ‘vary their style depending upon the rhetorical situation’ (Hirvela & Belcher, ibid, pp. 89-90). This implies that voice can change from one social situation to another adapting itself to various positions and social necessity. From a disciplinary perspective, this means that one should develop the voice while interacting with others in the field. In the process of ‘voicing’, the individuals adopt the voice of ‘academese’ as defined within a particular discourse community (Hirvela & Belcher, ibid, p. 91).

**The radical perspective**: the radical perspective of voice is that it is ideological, a point of view. Voice evolves through encounters with other social points of views (Lensmire, 1998). As this position is concerned with the way power is exercised and manipulated, the process of voice formulation is deliberate and selective. The voice is both an expression of self and a participation in the social encounter with/against others.
Voice in this perspective can be thought of as similar to ethos and persona as they all result from deliberate choice of self position (Matsuda, ibid). This perspective celebrates diversity and difference and borrows from Bakhtin that in the process of appropriation voices of people resist change on the hands of others:

Not all words for just anyone submit easily to this appropriation, to this seizure and transformation into private property: many words stubbornly resist, others remain alien, sound foreign in the mouth of the one who appropriated them and who now speaks them . . . it is as if they put themselves in quotation marks against the will of the speaker. (As cited in Lensmire (1998, p. 276))

The duty of the educators then in the writing classroom is to work of students’ experiences that they bring from home. They should enable active construction of students’ daily experiences with the formal/authoritative discourse in order to

Seek to humanize teaching and learning in schools through the acceptance and affirmation of student voice. Both encourage the active exploration by students of their worlds, rather than passive submission in the face of teacher control and knowledge. (Lensmire, ibid, p. 271)

The voice, thus, becomes a struggle over meaning, identity, and authority.

The social constructionists: the social constructionists see voice as evolving out of on-line interaction with others. Voice, from this position, is occurring between discourse and its subject position. It is a notion that “articulates the social identities of the discursive subjects it represents in relation to a discourse” (Brodkey & Henry (1992) as cited in Prior (2001, p. 61).

The externalist position has emerged as a counter current for social constructionism. It emphasizes texts as both ‘historical artefacts and situated moments’ of production (Ewald (1993), p. 339). Through this, externalists see voice as individual authoring of texts and this how they account for agency.
To conclude, the above conceptualizations of voice depict the way writing theorists have traced the journey of the writing self toward self knowledge. The journey begins with the self ignorance of the existence of others. In this way, it has no responsibility or obligation toward others. It needs to develop self knowledge that is necessary for its existence as different from others. The journey continues with self realization that it is formed within a social context that gives her its features and components. It finds its ways to express society through its essence. The journey takes a new twist with self beginning to doubt the other; the other attempts to be reflected through it. Self gets alarmed with this attempt and chooses to refract it rather than reflect it. Through this particular journey a big dilemma occurs as the self struggles to give birth to meanings of its own as different from others’. With the social constructionists the battlefield between the self and the other does not exist within the self. It is extended to bridge the gap between the individual and the social. This gap occurs again with the externalists. The battlefield is neither in the self nor in the society. It is there in the realm of knowledge; to exist means to produce knowledge, to be productive. The researcher summarizes the whole dilemma in the field of writing theory in the struggle over what it means to make meaning/knowledge through writing. Does it mean to write for self, for other’s satisfaction, for self responsibility as a proof of existence against depowering other, for acting self role in interaction with others, or for the purpose of producing meaning/knowledge? From the writer’s dialogic sociocultural perspective these meanings together can be meaningfully fused within the word ‘responsivity’. In the following section, it will be presented the meaning of responsivity from a dialogic sociocultural perspective and how it offers an alternative to those expressed through the term “voice”.

3.2.2.3 Voice in dialogic sociocultural theory (responsivity)

The whole purchase of Bakhtin’s dialogism is the formation of self as expression of its own existence (Holquist, 1990). Self is essentially a meaning maker. We exist to make meaning. ‘Self is a dynamic dialogue of many voices’ (Lysaker, 2007, p. 326). The consciousness is a confluence of self struggle to find an internally convincing voice through interaction with others; a distinctive voice that gives it identity.
The dialogic sociocultural perspective provides a methodological approach that shows the dynamics between the self and the other. Through its formulation of the activity, it depicts the relation between subject and object/other as mediated by tools and symbols. These tools and symbols are historically accumulated with the meanings of others. These tools and symbols work bi-directionally to affect the self and the world (i.e. internal and external), (cf. Section 2.3.1.1. on artefacts mediation, Chapter Two). For Bakhtin, the other and the world exist simultaneously; and tools mediate the interaction. Self in turn uses them to interact with others and with the world. Therefore, the dialogic sociocultural perspective involves a sociohistorical sense. The self in its effort to use the tools and symbols to express its purpose cannot escape the purposes of the previous users of the tools and symbols, for it is not its first user. Self cannot escape being a respondent. It treats the history infused within the tools and symbols within its situated use. Its utterance, or meaning making attempt, is a form of ‘co-action or co-production, a circuit that is complete only when actively produced and actively received’ (Prior, 2001, p. 70).

In the self attempt to author itself, it seeks to ensure a place of participation within a community (Danielewicz, 2008, p. 422). In this attempt of the self to author its position in a society, it does not mind hierarchy or more powerful others. It does not coexist only with them. What matters most is forming ‘contact zones’ (Danielewicz, ibid) where growth finds fertile spots for potentialities and possibilities. From this perspective, the radical approach is included and enriched within the writer’s perspective; growth is not restricted by asymmetries, it happens in spite of them. In each contact zone differences are calibrated and accentuated. The dialogic responsive self is by itself composed of asymmetries and symmetries which simultaneously exist within the social self through interaction with others. The responsive self forges for itself a response that is internally convincing. When the convincing response is formed, it needs to be acknowledged. It seeks the other to acknowledge it for in the first place it has come to life because of the other and through the other. This is because language in Bakhtin’s perspective is a form of life. It comes to life in the dialogue between people doing their life activity.

In summary, the word responsivity represents, in the dialogic sociocultural perspective, self in knowledge/meaning construction in relation to society and social
meaning. Therein, within the dialogic sociocultural perspective the self develops as a responsive being.

3.2.2.4 The dialogic and sociocultural affiliation of responsivity

Responsivity has inherited its dialogic characteristics from Bakhtin. Bakhtin (1986) states:

[...]

He considers the responsive behaviour of a person as a link in a chain of connected discourse. Each response is a part of or a ‘rejoinder’ in the particular discourse of a group or community. The response needs not be in a fixed or anticipated form. It can also take various forms depending on the intention/active responsive understanding of the speaker. Bakhtin (ibid) states:

The work, like the rejoinder in dialogue, is oriented toward the response of the other (others), toward his active responsive understanding, which can assume various forms: educational influence on the readers, persuasion of them, critical responses, influence on followers/ and successors, and so on. (pp. 75-6)

This implies that the way we write depends on the intention/responsive attitude of the speaker or writer. Bakhtin’s formulation of the way genres are perceived and produced is dynamic. The way one intends to respond governs the way he/she formulates the response whether in speaking or in writing. Therefore, there is always a great deal of tension between the typified speech genres and the way they realize in particular situation. This is the reason behind Bakhtin’s depiction of genre as ‘inexhaustible’. As far as there will be a communicative situation, there will be variation in the way we perceive
each other's intention and respond accordingly. With relevance to this Bakhtin (1986) states that

various genres can reveal various layers and facets of the individual personality, and individual style can be found in various interrelations with the national language [. . .] The transfer of style from one genre to another not only alters the way a style sounds, under conditions of a genre unnatural to it, but also violates or renews the given genre. (pp. 63, 66)

In this passage Bakhtin explicates the crisscross between the individual style and the conventionalized genres of speech or writing. As a particular person accumulates a particular point of view of life, or of knowledge, he/she begins to adopt a personal style that is distinct from others'. This gets reflected in the way a person uses genres. There is a tension between a particular style and how it realizes for example in the way he/she describes or argues for something. Bakhtin defines genres as typical forms of conceiving and producing reality, (Bakhtin & Medvedev, 1928/1994). They state:

If we approach genre from the point of view of its intrinsic thematic relationship to reality and the generation of reality, we may say that every genre has its methods and means of seeing and conceptualizing reality, which are accessible to it alone. [. . .] Every significant genre is a complex system of means and methods for the conscious control and finalization of reality. (p. 178)

By means of expansion the researcher perceives each discipline/field as a way of conceiving life and producing tools and means for dealing with and improving things in it. The theories are the particular forms in which disciplines/fields depict and deal with life; and, therefore, theories are genres. The concepts, methodologies, and heuristics are the tools and means through which these disciplines/fields actualize their particular conception(s) and production of life. By means of word relation (i.e. the word in the
world), these concepts, methodologies and heuristics combine with each other among and across disciplines forming a network of thoughts. By diachronically (i.e. vertical or across times) and synchronically (i.e. horizontal or across places) relating to each other they form a non-ending form of discourse. When cultural development is the aim of such discourse, then disciplines must scrutinize its tools and means (these are constitutive of and constitute theories) for improvements. The discourse should be seen as developmental and dynamic rather than conventional and static. Relations, in forms of responses, rather than boundaries have to be emphasized. This is because each discipline constitutes (a) particular attitude(s) and active understanding(s) of life. Therefore, when our conceptions of life are to lead to cultural development, then, it must be responsive. This implies that an active understanding of possible new relations should be the leading factor in seeing the relations between tools and means of disciplines/fields as well as across disciplines/fields. The modes of writing and reading for writing also need to show such flexibility and liability for refracting and reflecting new conception and production of reality. The history is full of examples of scholars such as Einstein and Vygotsky who studied theoretical understanding of the world in their assigned disciplines and found new ways of conceiving and improving the world. The theories/genres that they have created have enabled new typified forms of thinking modes of speaking and writing. For example, the idea of internet logs as ways of expressing particular and relative ways of thinking could have been impossible if the relativity theory is not there. The very idea of conferencing as feedback and as assisting meaning potential could not have existed without Vygotsky's heuristic concept ZPD (Zone of Potential Development). To conclude, the researcher sees responsivity in a broad sense as a way to enable meaning/knowledge making with the purpose to enrich one's field.

The ESP specialists, Swales (1990) for example, see genres as typical texts and typical situations that students should be trained to perceive and produce along with the practices and discourse of a particular community. For the purpose of getting the social perspective legacy to a prescriptive view of genre perception and production the concept of discourse community is brought to the literature. It binds genre writing to writers, texts, and readers to a supposedly discursive space (Hyland, 2003). The concept has been criticized by opponents of the post-modern school of thought. Kent (1991), for example.
rejected the very idea of the discourse community on the basis that it is a "conceptual scheme" representing "a structure of norms" which merges human subjectivity with reality, i.e. on the basis of regarding subject as nonresponsive. It also constitutes a frame of reference against which understanding is relative, regarding responsivity in comparison with norms or standardized conventions. The way out of this, the researcher proposes, is to adopt a sociocultural dialogic perspective that conceives discourse community as members who collectively share a discursive thematic space and time but sociohistorically coexist in different times and places. The collective discourse of a community need not be the total accumulation of similar views and issues. These would supposedly differ in the way they see reality and the way in which this particular understanding of reality is realized in concrete activity. This further means that not the conceptual scheme that is shared by the community members, but the part of life their disciplines/fields deal with and is supposed to contribute to. From this perspective, each and every individual is responsible for developing a view of the world/reality which may bring into use tools/means that have not been used before in the academic and the broad culture. This is the meaning of one's responsivity/contribution to a discipline or a field to life. This is in Bakhtin's term one's surplus of seeing.

A part from the post-modern criticism is the political-critical position by Canagarajah. He argued in his seminal book, *A geopolitics of Academic Writing*, that academicians living outside the Inner Circle countries are unable to publish in the L1 prestigious journals. This is due to the norms laid upon them by the publications norms held by the academic discourse community living in the Inner Circle. This puts in front of the researcher a big question. Is the discourse community composed of multiple communities? Then, what is the norm? Whose norm we are supposed to follow, the academicians and professionals of the ELE discourse community? This is not to mention the disciplinary discourse communities within a particular discourse community. If we follow the ESP division we will have even more discourse communities: the academicians and the professionals or the practitioners. Taking into account also that the foreign speakers of English language belong to a local community which speaks a different language, we will even have additional communities to consider. Then, shall we through the concept a way and replace it with the Derridian relativity or celebrate
diversity? The researcher suggests that we can ecologically contribute to each other rather than reifying or excluding each other. We need to have/build relation not relativism. Relationality creates the dialogic context for interaction. So in place of one single discourse community we have multiple discourse communities which constitute a network of related communities which work simultaneously and cooperatively contribute to each other’s work. This will create what Shotter (2005) terms dialogical juxtaposition. He explains the term as follows:

Such dialogical juxtapositions work in a living way to create a circumstance in which differences are realized and articulated: here, we use our words like this; there, we use them like that. That is, in providing new occasions for the realizing of new differences, they create a new ‘movement’ of thought, a new ‘gesture.’ (P: 9)

Though Shotter expounds the term in a linguistic context, the researcher broadly borrows the implications to dialogical juxtaposition of communities. However, she hopes that not only the contrasts are only seen but also the similarities. In addition, this juxtaposition must be shown to reflect a moral relation in which each community is seen as a cell doing its role in the very fabric of the globe. Hence, each community’s work will be collectively responsive not only to itself but the whole world. It will also address by its work other responses from other communities. Consequently, the definition of genre must be seen against the context of a flux. Fluidity rather than rigidity must be the driving force in genre teaching and learning. As a result, communities will be seen as a network of interrelationships and situations should also be relationally seen. That is, members of a particular community can use a particular genre for a context it has never been used in their discourse community; and vice versa. One could ask: how should then we know whether this is a genre we know or not? The researcher responds with another question: do we need to have limitations for what a particular genre is? Can anyone suggest a comprehensive list of the characteristics of a particular genre or the situations in which it might occur? If we consider genre within a context of knowledge/meaning construction in which knowledge/meaning is seen as a flux, then, we have to ask ‘is the report genre more important or how you situate your knowledge within a particular theory or a
particular knowledge?’ When we consider the theory or the discipline as contributors to
the human heritage of mental and physical activity, what will the situation and the text of
a particular genre look like? All this will be secondary to knowledge/meaning
construction. This does not deny the value of generic features of any text or the need to
identify the particularity of the situation for the use of knowledge. What the researcher
proposes is a shift from the focus on teaching generic features and situations to teaching
and learning how to create and interpret knowledge and produce them in dynamically.
For this position, she is indebted to Gordon Wells (1999). She differs slightly from him in
regarding theories and disciplines the source of unlimited generic features rather than a
source of cultural tool kit of genres. She also, as different from Wells’ position,
celebrates the cross-disciplinary and cross-culturally genre development. This she gets
from her culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic aims.

If the above is to be considered, genre construction will be able to cross
community boundaries. The dynamism which Berkenkotter and Huckin (cf. above) have
recommended as occurring between novices and their academic community will be
broader. It will be a dynamic transgression across boundaries of disciplines/field and
across ethnic cultures. The bound to this is a member’s commitment to perceive and
contribute to a world’s store of dynamic knowledge for life. The possibilities as seen by
Devitt (2004) and Reiff in John et al. (2006) in genre composing for ideological and
rhetorical awareness will be possibilities for knowledge creation in genres. The sense of
responsivity proposed here has some affiliation to Eliot’s principle of historical sense.
‘[The] historical sense involves, not only the pastness of the past, but of its presence . . . ’
(part 1, p.1)). Thus, responsive relations situated to contribute to the thematic orientations
of (a) particular field(s) and are intersubjectively fluctuating need to be guided toward
potential growth. The potential growth will be relative to the intersubjective response that
is oriented to a situated understanding of life within a particular disciplinary/field
community. Thus, for a response to be regarded as a relational active understanding and
production, it needs to be tightly connected to the other two criteria; intersubjectivity and
situatedness. This definitely means that each criterion leads and is interrelated to the
others.
Responsivity, the researcher operationalizes as follows for teaching academic writing classroom:

- The choice of texts: the texts that present ideas to be responded to should be given priority for selection as reading texts.
- The types of tasks: tasks that require students to respond to other texts must be given. They should demand students’ formulation of their own relational responses to an existing problem/idea. These tasks demand problematizing an existing situation, question existing solutions for problems through critiquing and finding solutions which will be regarded as responses to the existing problems/ideas.
- Teacher-student talk: teachers should help students come up with their own responses whatever be the forms in which these are written. They should assist students step by step to enable them come up with mature responses through dialogue. Teachers need to adopt a dialogic stance in their interaction with the students. This because some of the students may lack self confidence and may resist forming responses of their own. Here the role of the teacher as a dialogue partner will play a major role in encouraging students to do so.

3.2.2.4. Conclusion

This section on responsivity presents the meaning and origin of the term. It also presents its roots in the long-celebrated term “voice” in the writing theory. It has been argued by the researcher that the term “responsivity” represents all the characteristics of the term “voice” and suits as an alternative for the purpose and the approach adopted by the researcher. Thus, the researcher recommends the term as a criterion for teaching academic writing. At the end of the section, the researcher presented its correlation with the other two criteria (situatedness and intersubjectivity) and operationalized it for classroom use.
The following and the last criteria in the approach, situatedness, will be discussed in the following section.

3.2.3 Situatedness

The researcher traces the origin of situatedness in order to come up with a description for the criterion as enabling cultural development and intercultural dialogue. Situatedness as outsideness is proposed here which means across situations and outside the boundaries of one’s situations. The section winds up showing the relation between this criterion and other criteria (intersubjectivity and responsivity) and operationalizes it for classroom use.

3.2.3.1 Origin and meaning

‘[The] impulse to situate is ... Bakhtinian’ (Ewald, 1993). This criterion in Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue is closely connected with the idea of outsideness. Thus, for Bakhtin you should neither be situated nor totally outside the object of your understanding. For him, a meeting of subjects and objects as well as between subjects and other subjects always takes place at the contours of each. If a total immersion in the other’s thoughts or ideas is attempted, one might encounter the incompatibility of motives and may either get completely involved in that of the other or concentrate on his/hers forgetting other’s. In interaction among cultures this is also the case. Cultures also meet at their contours. Following Bakhtin’s recommendation, we should keep the dialogue going on between cultures.

There exists a very strong, but one-sided and thus untrustworthy, idea that in order to better understand a foreign culture, one must enter into it, forgetting one’s own, and view the world through the eyes of this foreign culture ... Of course, a certain entry as a living being into a foreign culture, the possibility of seeing the world through its eyes, is a necessary part of the process of understanding it; but if this were the only aspect of this understanding, it would merely be duplication and would not entail anything new or enriching ... In order to understand, it is immensely
important for the person who understands to be located outside the object of his or her creative understanding — in time, in space, in culture. (Bakhtin (1986) as cited in Marchincova, p. 178)

Thus, intercultural dialogue occurs only when we try to understand the other culture by not immersing too much into its way of understanding. We examine it through our eyes by putting ourselves in the contours with it. The same idea is also fit for understanding another and the self. The following Bakhtinian insight Emerson (1997) makes as a comment on this aspect of Bakhtin’s thought, situatedness as outsideness.

Those who surround themselves with “insiders” — in heritage, experience, appearance, tastes, attitude, toward the world — are on a rigidifying and impoverishing road. In contrast, the personality that welcomes provisional finalization by a huge and diversified array of “authors” will command optimal literacy. It feels at home in a variety of zones and can learn new ones without trauma. (Emerson (1997) as cited in Marchincova, p. 178)

Therefore, situatedness as outsideness creates the possibilities for both the dialogue and the development. On the level of particular disciplines/fields which can also be regarded as cultures’ intersections rather than boundaries should be seen. In this context, Bakhtin (1986) says the following:

In our enthusiasm for specification we have ignored questions of the interconnection and interdependence of various areas of culture; we have forgotten that the boundaries of these areas are not absolute, that in various epochs they have been drawn in various ways; we have not taken into account that the most intense and productive life of culture takes place on the boundaries of its individual areas and not in places where these areas have become enclosed in their own specificity. (P. 2)

This happens only when the disciplines/fields transcend their traditional ways of constructing meanings of life; when they find in the other disciplines/fields the other through which they can decide their share of contribution to life. The other
disciplines/fields are areas where life has expressed itself differently; and a member in a particular discipline/field seeing theories, heuristics, tools, or means of the other discipline(s) can find both expansion and enhancements for the role his/her discipline/field can play in life. Bakhtin (1986) clarifies this in the following quotation:

A meaning only reveals its depths once it has encountered and come into contact with another, foreign meaning: they engage in a kind of dialogue, which surmounts the closedness and one-sidedness of these particular meanings, these cultures. (P. 7)

When the development of the field is the aim, meaningful borrowing from a field to another must be the focus of the educational enterprise. Seeing relations which through the criterion of situatedness as outsideness will dialogically enable members of a particular field to trigger development in their field using heuristics, tools, means, or even whole genres (theories in this context) from another. Through this dialogic sociocultural view of situatedness the researcher escapes the dilemma created in the field of ESP/EAP (See section 1.2.3. in Chapter One and section 2.1.1. in Chapter Two) for a presentation on the dialogic sociocultural perspective on the issue of narrow-angles vis-à-vis wide-angled ESP/EAP.) The researcher with this proposal of dialogic situatedness solves the dilemma with a developmental and dialogic view of situatedness within and among disciplines/fields. Intercultural dialogue can occur among different ethnic cultures of the members of the disciplines. It can also happen across disciplines/fields in the same culture. When the development and dialogue are the main factors for disciplinary/field focus, the narrow and wide angles will be in dialogue.

3.2.3.2 Situatedness in the dialogic sociocultural perspective

The sense of situatedness that we get from the dialogic sociocultural perspective is one that is related to both development and mediation. Vygotsky defines development in terms of the emergence or transformation of form of mediation (Egan, 1998). The emergence is related to a dialogue between more and less capable persons which takes place in a particular place and time in which tools and means are used. Thus, situatedness
is defined by a real time and a real place. However, the situatedness should not be strictly confined to a particular time and place only. This implies that situatedness is sociohistorical.

In using the compound term “sociohistorical” rather than the simple term “historical,” commentators appear to be singling out for emphasis one of Vygotsky’s uses of history – history as the chronology of event involving humanity as a whole. (Scribner, 1985, p. 121)

Sylvia Scribner defines the chronology of events as series of events and presents them as follows: general history (indicates ‘historical development’, i.e. a transition from the biological (phylogeny) to higher order functioning), ontogeny (means ‘subject’s individual history’ which is in Vygotsky’s sense not a replication of the general history. Scribner introduces another level of history to Vygotsky’s original scheme: (the cultural level which can be studied in relation to a society (or societies in general) or in relation to individuals who live within these societies. This explanation can be supported by the idea that development in Vygotsky’s approach begins as microgenetic and can be transformed into ontogenetic and phylogenetic. Therefore, it can be safely said that history and situatedness are related in dialogic sociocultural understanding of development.

This above understanding of the relation between situatedness and historicity can be fruitfully extended by relating it to Bakhtin’s (1986) three-step dialogic movement.

Stages in the dialogic movement of understanding: the point of departure, the given text; movement backward, past context; movement forward, anticipation (and the beginning) of a future context. (pp. 161-2)

From the above explanation of the dialogic movement by Bakhtin, we may predict that Bakhtin dialogic orientation extends the concern about the past in the sociocultural view by extending the dialogic movement to present and future for development.

Situated development is related to the other but the other need not be more capable. He is an equal and a different dialogue partner. It has been argued in the dialogic
sociocultural literature that the dialogue partner need not be more capable to enable the child take over the control (see Wells, 1999, for a discussion and theoretical and experimental support for this point.) The situated development has two phases: the internalization and the externalization; cf. section 2.3.2.2 on the critiques against the concept of internalization, Chapter Two. The internalization and the externalization, the researcher believes, keep on occurring at every cycle of microgenetic and ontogenetic development. This guarantees incremental change in higher mental functions.

In addition, Scribner (1985) has clarified that individual development is not a replication process of general history.

Ontogenetic development is influenced by its particular sociocultural milieu; not only are modern children unlike primitive adults in "real life" but they are unlike children in other times and places. (p. 131)

She supports her interpretation with the following passage from Vygotsky in which he rejects the Piagetian outlook that sees children development as similar in all places and times:

the world outlook and causal concept of the contemporary European child of intellectual background and the same outlook and concept of a child coming from primitive tribe, the outlook of a child from the Stone Age, that of the Middle Ages, and that of the XX century - these are all conceived as being basically identical; one and the same in principle, always equal one to the other. (p. 131)

The above passage shows that the situatedness development of (a) particular individual(s) in a particular society as unique. Bakhtin's argues that this is a dialogue of existence in which the self and the other perceive everything from a unique position. Whatever is understood by each will be shaped by the place from which it is comprehended. The place in which we exist affects our cognitive positions; that is our non-alibi in being/surplus of seeing in Bakhtin's terminology. This makes our cognitive experiences unrepeatable. The existence for Bakhtin is 'the unique and unified event of
being' (Holquist, 1990). For example, no one can experience our deaths in the way we do (i.e. no one can die in our place). However, the 'meaning' arrived at through I-other perception is not a single one. For Bakhtin there is no one meaning to wish to arrive at. The world is full of various and 'contesting meanings' that no single term capable of unifying its diversity is possible (Holquist, ibid). This can be specifically illustrated using the following quotation from Discourse in the Novel where Bakhtin (1981) expounds his idea of active understanding:

[Active] understanding, one that assimilates the word under consideration into a new conceptual system, [is] that of the one striving to understand. [. . .] It is precisely such an understanding that the speaker counts on. Therefore his orientation toward the specific world of the listener; it is in this way, after all, that various different points of view, conceptual horizons, systems for providing expressive accents, various social "languages" come to interact with one another. (Square brackets are mine, p. 282)

From the above passage illustrates that understanding that is situated derives its strength through contact with others. Thus, according to the researcher above (see the section on intersubjectivity above), positive/dialogic intersubjectivity is important for the understanding to identify a position in relation to the other. After all, the whole utterance is directed functionally to the other; that is to exercise an effect on the other. The above is an aspect of democratic authoring (or responsivity). It springs from Bakhtin's belief in the 'surplus of seeing', things I see but you have no access to them and things you see but I do not have access to. Bakhtin (1990) explains the excess of seeing as follows:

When I contemplate a whole human being who is situated outside and over against me, our concrete, actually experienced horizons do not coincide. For at each given moment, regardless of the position and the proximity to me of this other human being whom I am contemplating, I shall always see and know something that he, from his place outside and over against me, cannot see himself: parts of his body that are inaccessible to his own gaze
(his head, his face and its expression), the world behind his back, and a whole series of objects and relations are accessible to me but not to him. As we gaze at each other, two different worlds are reflected in the pupils of our eyes...

This ever-present excess of my seeing, knowing, and possessing in relation to any other human being is founded in the uniqueness and irreplaceability of my place in the world. (Cited in Olson, 2002, p. 6)

Therefore, unless there is a dialogue between selves, a dialogic version of the event of their joint existence will not be achieved. Consequently, positive intersubjectivity is a must for the situated visionary self to formulate a response. This particular situation of our life experience gives coherence and concreteness to the values which become a necessity of a particular experience rather than imposed through cultural heritage. As a result, our whole life experience has not only one meaning; that is, the meaning that we think it has. Our experience will always be an object of interpretation for the life to come. If the aim is development, no one community meaning is striven for. When the aim is to develop heuristics, tools, and means, the individual can develop in the process and vice versa. That is, sometimes, when the aim of the task is to develop tool and means, the end turns with the development of the individual and/or the means and tools being intact.

We have seen from the above attempt to see the criterion situatedness as enriched in a dialogic sociocultural approach. For Vygotsky, the situation has necessarily historical implications; and for Bakhtin the situation has a determinate effect in the way we reason through time and place fluctuation. Thus, we, educators, need to help students invent in their situated understanding and production of texts using language as the factors for change and development. The ability to define, for example, can be enabled through making them define different things on their own. But, the ability to bring about real cultural and intercultural changes into the very nature of disciplinary/field knowledge happens when we give them the chance to define some things that are not already defined in their disciplines/fields.
Thus, the researcher operationalizes situatedness for classroom use as follows:

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

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

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

### 3.2.3.3 Conclusion

In the above section, the meaning of situatedness is introduced. It means understanding and production that occur in a particular time and place. It has been argued for the use of situatedness as a criterion in a dialogic sociocultural approach for teaching academic writing. For the sake of using this criterion for the purpose of development and dialogue, relating it to the other criteria is useful. This has been proposed by the researcher above and the criterion has been operationalized for classroom use for this purpose.

### 3.2.4 Conclusion for the Approach Proposed

The above section is the researcher’s attempt to introduce a dialogic sociocultural perspective in which some criteria (dialogic intersubjectivity, responsivity, and situatedness) can be used for teaching academic writing that has dialogic and developmental orientations. The context for which these dialogic criteria are to be used is that of advanced student teachers in English department who are to be enabled to make meaning/knowledge.
Positive intersubjectivity is seen from the researcher’s perspective as the dynamics for dialogic exchange. Responsivity is the active relation/understanding that the rejoinder in dialogue makes with a particular partner, idea, author of a text, or a situation. It is an agentive act which constitutes a person’s dialogic ability to make writing an authorial act. Situatedness is viewed as the ability to transcend one’s situation in universe through dialogue with others. It is the dialogic way of living outside one’s own loafed way of being into co-being and co-existing within and among cultures. All the criteria are attempted by the writer within an ethical view of knowledge construction as an authorial act of living and expressing existential meaning. The criteria are related to each other; and they condition each other.

Comparing the above tentative approach which consists of the three criteria (intersubjectivity, responsivity, and situatedness) with the previously discussed representative instructional and theoretical models of academic writing, one can find many differences. The suggested approach deals first with the issue of the narrow situatedness found in all the models of academic writing. These models deal with situatedness as a problem of the confined space and time of the discipline/field and/or culture. The proposed approach opens up the time and space of the discipline/field to include reading for and borrowing from past theorists who may or may not belong to the same discipline/field of the students. It also argues for the future contexts of new ideas which might not be perceived by a present academic community. It also sees interaction as situated among different disciplines/fields and among different culture. Because of this broad perspective, the approach accepts the mixing of genres and the inventiveness of new ones.

Whereas intersubjectivity is seen as meeting of viewpoints in the previous models, the suggested approach gives it a dialogic and developmental stance. The researcher has proposed positive/dialogic intersubjectivity to deal with the negative associations of the term intersubjectivity. This criterion implies that there is always partial meeting of opinions and thus there is nothing called complete agreement. This criterion is supposed to enhance the value of dialogue inside the classroom and in the way the students interact with the theorists through the assigned reading texts.
Responsivity is the dialogic sociocultural parallel to community ownership in the previous models. It demands that students author their knowledge/meaning. In this way the approach differs from the previous models.

After the above section conclusion, a brief conclusion of the whole chapter will follow.

3.3 Conclusion

The researcher, in this chapter, presented some instructional and theoretical frameworks of mainstream academic writing. These models and the frameworks have been discussed with relevance to whether they may enable development and dialogue. It has been argued by the researcher that they lack some basic orientations to these aspects. The researcher attempted to highlight the presence of the criteria (though sometimes not with the same names) she has opted for her dialogic sociocultural approach for teaching academic writing for cultural development and intercultural dialogue in these models. However, it has been argued that these criteria have been conceptualized and used in the above models and framework in a way that may not lead to cultural development and intercultural dialogue. The researcher, then, argued for conceptualization and operationalization of the criteria for the proposed aims from a dialogic sociocultural perspective.

In the following chapter, the writer will attempt to explore the use of the approach with the three criteria presented above for teaching academic writing to a group of student teachers, in the English Department in the university in which the researcher teaches, and in evaluating their written responses. Thus, the following chapters will constitute the methodology and the analysis chapters of the empirical study that the researcher has conducted.