CHAPTER FOUR
The Empirical Study

4.0 Introduction

In the previous chapters the researcher has established the conceptual framework of her proposal for a new specific purpose for teaching a foreign language (i.e., cultural development and intercultural dialogue) with three criteria (intersubjectivity, situatedness, and responsivity) proposed as the catalysts for this to happen in the academic writing classroom in an EFL context. The researcher decided to explore her proposal further in an empirical study. She chose her Yemeni context to concretize her proposal with a selected group of student-teachers. This chapter presents the different stages of the empirical study. The chapter has the following sections: statement of the research questions, description of the institutional setting, discussion of the teaching programme in the English department focusing on the writing courses, the process and the criteria for selecting participants, methodology (including the tool development phase and the intervention phase), the analysis, the difficulties, the limitations, and the conclusion.

4.1 Statement of the Research Questions

The study is an attempt on the part of the researcher to explore the relation between the dialogicality of three criteria (responsivity, intersubjectivity, and situatedness) in students’ written discourse on the one hand and the emergence as well as scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue on the other. The researcher will attempt to find answers for the following research questions:

1. What makes students’ responsivity, intersubjectivity, and situatedness dialogic?

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

The following description gives a picture of the locale in which the study was conducted.

4.2 The Institutional Setting

The study has been carried out mainly in the College of Education, Zabid. The researcher works as a teacher assistant in this college. It is one of the colleges of Hodeida University. Hodeidah University is located in the capital of the province, Hodeidah. Zabid College of Education is located in Zabid, one of the rural towns in Hodeidah province. Zabid is situated in the middle of the road between Taiz and Hodeidah provinces. Therefore, students mainly from other rural towns such as Beit Al-Faqih, Hais, Al-Jarahi, Al-Huseinia, and many other surrounding villages go to study at Zabid College.

The building of the college is a modest one, like those commonly seen in rural areas. It consists of four main buildings: the Administration building, the labs, the large teaching halls, and the auditorium with the small teaching halls. All the buildings are two-storey buildings. The teaching time mainly extends from nine o’clock in the morning until two o’clock in the afternoon. Some proficiency courses are taught in the evening along with the Continuous Education Unit. Therefore, the meetings with the students were held in the library in the Administration building. When the college was closed because of the Eid vocation, the meetings were held in the researcher’s house in Zabid with the Zabidi students and in Beit Al-Faqih with the Faqihi students. The other students from Hais and Raimah were met after the Eid Vocation in the college.

There is no great variety in the subjects taught in the college. They range from Quran and Islamic studies, Science, and to Humanities including English and Arabic languages. The base for all these branches is education. The students study to become teachers. In spite of the fact that the students are going to graduate as teachers, most of the subjects related to education such as Teaching Practice, Preparing Teaching Aids, and Educational Psychology are called “requirement subjects;” and are allotted two hours of teaching. The other courses related to the subject matter such as the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) are called “core subjects” and are allotted three hours of teaching.
After giving the above details of the infrastructures of and the main courses taught in the institutes in which the selected participants were studying, it is necessary to give an idea of the main courses they studied with the focus on the writing courses to provide a rationale for the empirical study.

4.3 Courses of the English Department

In English department students are taught to become teachers of English. The course of study extends within four years after which students become B.Ed. graduates. Students study Linguistics, Literature, Language Skills and some of the subjects related to education in English. The subjects related to education are Curriculum and Methodology, Preparing Teaching Materials, Testing and Evaluation, and Research Methodology. Other subjects related to education such as Preparing Teaching Aids, Educational Psychology, the System of Education in Yemen are taught in Arabic while some such as Curriculum and Methodology and Teaching Practice are taught half in Arabic and half in English. The justification given for teaching these two courses in Arabic and English is that English is taught as a foreign language in Yemen. The literature taught in Arabic is mainly written by Arabic scholars while the literature taught in English is mainly written by non-Arabic scholars. There is no dialogue between both taught literatures, the Arabic and the non-Arabic. For example, in a course called Curriculum and analysis the students are taught that the Islamic philosophy is one of the resources that shapes teaching curriculum. In a parallel course taught in English called Curriculum and Methodology, the students are taught about the theories of language and language learning and teaching as the basis for language curriculum. There is a gap between the secular ideology presented by the non-Arabic curriculum scholars and the obvious Islamic ideology reflected by Arabic curriculum scholars. Students are left with no ability to make a dialogue between both ideologies. From here, the need to promote a dialogue between the foreign ideology fused in the materials written by non-Arabic scholars and the Islamic ideology of the Arabic writers comes.

There are five courses for teaching writing: Writing 1, Writing 2, Writing 3, Writing 4, and Advanced Writing Skills. These courses are taught one course per
semester from the first semester throughout to the first semester in the third year of study. From the guide of course objectives of the college of education of Hodeidah University, department of English 2005-2006, the objectives of the above writing courses are as follows:

Writing 1: to give practice in writing simple, grammatical, and acceptable English
Writing 2: to widen the writing skills acquired in Writing 1
Writing 3: to introduce the idea of outline, to introduce the concept of topic sentences, and to introduce kinds of paragraph structure in relation to the position of topic sentences.
Writing 4: to enable students write coherently, and to enable them deal with their life in the faculty as well as their roles in the Yemeni society later on in their life.
Advanced Writing Skills: to further develop students’ ability to write short essays on topics of professional interest. The focus is more on stylistic acceptability. (pp. 136-140)

It is obvious from the above description that the courses focus on the teaching of mechanics, bottom-up instructional approach. There is no indication of attention to teaching writing or conceptualizing written discourse as a tool for promoting dialogicality, cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

The following section provides a description of the research participants and the criteria for selecting them for the study.

4.4 The Research Participants

The subjects of the study were from third- and fourth-year undergraduate students of Teacher Education program for teaching English as Foreign Language, who completed the five courses of writing (i.e. 1,2,3,4, and Advanced Writing Skills). Fourteen students from both fourth and third year were selected, nine from fourth year and five from third year. The chosen students were selected in collaboration with the head of the department. The basis for selection was that all of the students should have got from “good” to “excellent” as grades in all the five writing courses. Those who got “pass” or “fail” as

---

15 See appendix 8 for the list of the objectives of the five courses of writing.
grades were not included in the study. The rationale behind this criterion was that those who would participate had to have aptitude for writing. That was because the study explores the achievement of dialogicality in students’ written discourse and the effect it has along with that of the audience on cultural development and intercultural dialogue. That needed students who were able to express using writing and did not have a lot of problems of using English for doing so. Otherwise, instead of focusing on the development of dialogic discourse, the researcher would be busy understanding what they wanted to say due to their low proficiency level. The researcher got fourteen students who were suitable for this criterion from both third and fourth years. The fourteen students’ oral consents were granted to the researcher who explained to them the objectives and the procedures of the study as well as the time and effort needed to complete it.

Due to the above condition, choosing students who got from good to excellent as grades, there have been only two males who suited the criterion of participants’ choice. The rest of the fourteen students were females. In addition, the participants were very near from each other in age. Most of them were between twenty two and twenty three. There was only one participant who was in her late twenties. She got married at early age and gave birth to children before joining the department of English. She was not the only married student in the group. There were other two females who were married. One of them was newly married and the other was married for few years and pregnant. The participants have come from different towns. Seven of the students were from Zabid, the town in which the college is located as well as the house of the researcher in which some of the meetings with them have been held when the college was closed. Four of them were from Beit Al-Faqih, a town about half an hour by car from Zabid, where the meetings with the Faqihi students were held in the married student’s house because her husband did not allow her to go to the researcher’s house in Zabid. Thus, an arrangement was made so that all the students would meet the researcher in this particular student’s house. These were all female participants. One more female participant was from Heis, a town about one hour by car from Zabid. The participant was precisely living in a village near Heis. It was difficult for the researcher to reach it by car, and therefore, a special arrangement was made to meet this particular student after the vacation was over. This
particular student always lagged behind the rest of the group in timings of submission of the written responses due to her pregnancy condition. The two male students belonged to two different towns, one from Beit Al-Faqih and the other from a village in Raymah. Raymah is a province that is situated to the east from Hodeidah Province and is about three hours by car from Zabid. According to the participant from the Raymi village, he had to walk for about fifteen kilometers by foot to find a car to take him to the car station in Raymah. He had been generous enough to walk this distance to meet the researcher in Ramdan while fasting. To add two more particular details about the participants, all the participants belonged to middle-class families upper or low. Some of the parents of the participants were educated but the majority of the parents were not.

After selecting the participants, the actual study has commenced. The following section gives a detailed description of the various phases of the empirical study.

4.5 The Methodology

The empirical part of the investigation is a study of students' perception of dimension of dialogicality in written communication, and of its presence in their learning of writing in the regular syllabus. The researcher also attempted to locate traces if any of aspects of dialogicality in the successive drafts produced by the students as required by specifically designed tasks. There thus were two stages:

The first: a study of students' initial perceptions for which a questionnaire was used as a tool. The first task was also administered before intervening and thus the students’ first drafts/responses to the first task were used to evaluate their dialogicality before the talk with the researcher-teacher.

The second: an intervention designed to create conditions under which students' awareness and application of elements of dialogicality could be displayed. This involved (a) creating suitable writing tasks (three in all), (b) analyzing the responses in drafts produced using the criteria developed in the earlier chapters. The students wrote several drafts for each task except the last one. After the students wrote each draft, they met the researcher who asked them several questions relevant to the way they interacted with the theorists and developed their ideas. The study extended over a three-month period. The
researcher waited for one week to collect the responses to the questionnaire. To get the responses for tasks one, two, and three, it took her about two months and twenty days. The participants were given time to reflect, collect resources, and respond to each task. There were meetings after first drafts for every task and meetings after they finished writing last drafts of each task except for the last task for which the students wrote only one version. On average, it took about two to three weeks to explain the nature of every task, hold the meetings, and collect the responses to tasks one and two while it took about two weeks to wait for the participants' responses to task three.

Thus, this section consists of two main sections: the first gives detailed descriptions of the procedures and decisions made for tool development and the second highlights the various phases of intervention.

4.5.1 The research tools
The research tools consisted of a questionnaire, three selected summarized texts of three philosophers' views about morality, and three tasks.

4.5.1.1 The questionnaire
The questionnaire consisted of four main sections: A, B, C, and D. Each section included a number of questions. The questions and the rationale for addressing them are presented below.

Section A included the following questions: 1. How many courses have you had on writing in your undergraduate study? 2. What average grade did you get in writing? 3. Do you like writing; if "yes", why; if "no", why not? 4. How would you define writing?

These questions aimed at getting some background information about the students, their aptitude for writing, how they conceive writing, and the nature of their attitude towards writing.

---

16 See appendix 1 for a copy of the questionnaire.
A part from obtaining background information in the above section, the second, the third, and the fourth sections explored whether the students had an idea through the writing courses that they had studied about the criteria of writing explored in the study.

Section B consisted of the following questions: 1. Do you find the content and methodology of teaching in writing courses related to your field of study as an English teacher; if “yes”, how; if “no”, why? 2. Beyond you area of specialization, do you think the courses are useful and relevant to your culture? 3. If the writing courses useful or relevant to your culture, are they relevant and beneficial for community practice (including the academic community), cultural values, or cultural interests (economic, industrial, or social)?

This section addresses the idea of situatedness. The questions target the relation between the writing courses and the students’ culture. They also sought the nature of relevance and utility seen and the reasons the students gave in case they felt no relevance or utility was there.

Section C consists of the following questions: 1. Were you required to provide academic responses of the sort that you encounter in content courses (i.e. defining, justifying, explaining, etc.)? 2. Were you instructed to provide justified substantiated opinions in any of the courses? Were they generalized, specific, or personalized? 3. Did you read to write? Was the reading done in the writing courses exploratory, interpretive, or informative? 4. Did the writing tasks and methodology in the writing courses orient you to the responsibilities, duties, and practices of your academic community?

This section inquires about responsivity. The four questions in this section investigate the idea of whether the writing courses have encouraged dialogic construction of meaning. They also explore nature of the reading-writing connection (if any in the writing courses) and whether a sense of responsibility in meaning making was encouraged in these courses.

Section D: 1. Have you been asked to discuss your writing with a teacher, peer, a friend or a parent? 2. What attitude did you develop during discussion: enmity,
friendliness, membership, or indifference? 3. Did you change the “what”, “why”, or the “how” of your writing after the discussion? 4. Were you asked to write something in response to a theorist from another culture? 5. When you respond to the foreign theorist, do you feel that both of you belong to an international academic community or to two different communities?

This section addresses intersubjectivity. The five questions explore students’ awareness of the nature of interaction they have had in the writing courses. They also inquired about whether they had been given opportunity to have cross-cultural interaction and the nature of the attitude they have developed during interaction.

All in all the, the aim of the questionnaire was to get some background information about the students in relation to their attitude towards, aptitude for, and conception of writing gained directly or indirectly in their study of the previous writing courses. Moreover, the idea of whether the previous writing courses were targeted developmental and dialogic aims in relation to the criteria (intersubjectivity, responsivity, and situatedness) were given.

Following the administration of the questionnaire and collecting the students’ responses, some writing tasks have been given to the students.

4.5.1.2 The task-response phase

This is the second phase of the study. It involves presenting students with texts that would evoke a response in them. After scrutinizing students’ initial responses to the first task, the researcher intervened. In the following subsections the aims and rationale of the tasks are presented as well as the nature of intervention by the researcher.

4.5.2.2.1 First task

This subsection consists of three subsections: task description, aims, and rationale.
4.5.2.2.1.1 Task description

Students in this task had to read summaries\textsuperscript{17} of the philosophical perspectives of three Western philosophers (Immanuel Kant, John Stuart Mill, and Aristotle) about morality; summarize, explain the perspectives adopted by the philosophers; and respond to them by expressing their own perspectives on morality. As the summaries had been taken from an advanced book for teaching writing, the researcher made the participants read the texts before they did the task and demanded from them to ask her if they faced any difficulty understanding the texts. After that, she asked them to summarize, explain, and respond to the texts. The texts represented page-length perspectives about morality beginning with Kant’s absolutism, to Mill’s utilitarianism, through Aristotle’s growth orientation. Each of the three philosophers has a well-articulated opinion on morality and each one clarifies the reason for which such an opinion is adopted. The three theorists give reasons for their positions on morality that show their concern with Man’s fruitful relation with others. The three theorists belong to a Western culture that is different from the students’ culture (i.e. Arabic or Eastern culture). The possibilities that can emerge due to the difference in culture are that the students may become more aware of their cultural perspective; or they may adapt or adopt the other cultural position; or they may maintain a mix of both the cultures. Furthermore, the chosen texts are from a field (philosophy) other than the students’ field (ELE). The rationale behind this is to examine whether an interaction between the two fields (that of the students’ and that of the texts) may occur; and if it occurs, what its nature is.

4.5.2.2.1.2 The aims of the first task

- To gauge students’ ability to formulate an opinion about the topic and the themes (i.e. meaningfully respond) mediated through the texts. Meaningful response means that students are able to substantiate and explain a personal, adopted, or adapted point of view.
- To evaluate how students have culturally situated themselves in relation to the writers and the field of the texts (i.e. what cultural position will they reveal in

\textsuperscript{17} The summaries are taken from an advanced writing book by Mary R. Colonna and Judith F. Gilbert (2006). The summaries were done by Dr. Joseph Chuman on pages 170-172 cited by the above authors. These will presented in appendix 2
their answers? Will they be able to situate themselves as teachers or they will choose another social role to reflect?).

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

4.5.2.2.1.3 The rationale of the task

The presupposition of the first aim according to the dialogic sociocultural perspective is that texts are meditational tools. The meditational tools mediate the activity of their users. They at the same time are not neutral as they embed the ideas and thoughts of other persons. The authors of the ideas in the above texts are philosophers. According to Bakhtin the texts carry with them the authoritative voice of these philosophers who have expertise in their field. The authoritative voice of the philosophers who belong to another cultural background may be faced by another authoritative voice which is the culturally adopted conviction about morality assimilated by the students from their own culture. The dialogue between the two authoritative positions might result in an IPD (Internally Persuasive Discourse, IPD hereafter). There are three positions for using this notion in the literature on education according to (Matusov & von Duyke, 2010). The first is appropriation which means making someone else’s words, ideas, approaches, knowledge one’s own. The second is the authorship position in which ‘a student’s authorship is’ encouraged to later be ‘recognized and accepted by a community of practice, in which the students generates self-assignments and long-term projects within the practice’. The third position, which is Matusov & von Duyke’s, is viewed as ‘a dialogic regime of the participants’ who keep examining the ideas and looking for the differences and similarities of ‘personally-vested truths’ against others’ (p. 174; emphasis in the original). The authors above offer a critique of the first two positions from a Bakhtinian broader perspective of dialogue. In the first position, they argue, ‘internal’ is understood as ‘internal to the individual’. It becomes deeply-rooted in the individual’s conviction and passionate belief. They question this position on the basis of three main objections. First, students’ understanding of any idea is neither an individual property nor
can be enclosed within an individual. This is, they maintain, because the individual truth has limitations and needs to be tested through dialogue with others. Second, the individual conviction may entail free adoption of non-negotiated assimilation of ‘nationalism, prejudices, chauvinism, racism, and fanaticism’ (p. 177). They explain that this acceptance of preconceived ideas and knowledge without serious dialogue stands in opposition to the very nature of dialogue which entails investigating truth rather than unconditional acceptance. Third, they add, open-mindedness that results from disagreement is more important than voluntarism or imposition as the source for one’s ideas. The second position, they continue, involves enabling students to become members of a discourse community to which they are anticipated to contribute and own distinct voices. They, however, contend that this position lacks a critical stance and can be characterized as gate keeping. They convincingly maintain that examining one’s ideas and their purposeful origins is of much educational value than being accepted in a particular discourse community through active participation. They, therefore, introduce their third position which they name as testing ideas and responsibility. Rather than the diachronical position to the speech community adopted in the second position, they present a synchronical position to the internally persuasive discourse (IPD) and justify its affiliation to Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue. They convincingly claim that an individual’s participation becomes persuasive if it is ‘dialogically tested and forever testable’. They define their dialogical approach to IPD as follows:

Teaching in a dialogical IPD approach means that the student’s learning emerges through their guided engagement in historically and topically valuable internally persuasive discourse where the students become familiar with historically, culturally, and socially important voices, and learn how to address these voices, and to develop responsible replies to them. (p. 179).

Thus, the meaningful response, referred to above as the first aim of the task, in the context of the above writers’ definition means being aware of the various approaches to a particular idea or theme and being able to develop a response to such a discourse. With reference to the first aim of the task and how it may lead to cultural development and
intercultural dialogue, the researcher, following the above writers, borrows Argyris and Schöns’s (1978) framework in the field of organizational learning. In this context, they define two types of learning 1 and 2. Learning 1 is a ‘problem solving of how to return a system back to some pre-established norm’. The second type is seen as ‘critical examination and re-definition of the norms and values themselves’ (as reported by Matusov and von Duyke (ibid), p. 183). The researcher argues based on this definition of the second type of learning that enabling students to question the established values and redefine them should be the aim of education. This is because this leads to cultural development as it may lead to the change of the established norms and inventing new ones. This can be connected to intercultural dialogue in the following way. Here the foreign culture may trigger questioning of the national cultural norms of the students. The questioning may lead to adopting or adapting different values from the foreign culture, or developing a personal view that is different from those existing in the two cultures. This, the researcher considers a personal development as a qualitative change has taken place in the individual. This individual development if considered from the point of view of his/her being a member in a particular culture; and if directed toward investing into achieving similar changes in the national culture, will lead to cultural development. Thus, the achievement of the first aim is related to cultural development and intercultural dialogue. The idea of intercultural dialogue can be presented using the following figure:

(Figure 1)
In the figure above, students' understanding (IPD), the dashed area, is seen to happen within the boundaries between their cultures (broad and narrow/social and academic) and between the other culture (broad and narrow/social and academic. When a student responds some kind of cultural understanding and intercultural dialogue may occur. Working definitions of the two concepts ('cultural development' and 'intercultural dialogue') have first been introduced in Chapter One. Here they are re-produced with the purpose of reminding the reader. Cultural development, the researcher defines here in a broad sense to mean an individual's 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 second aim can be related to cultural development and intercultural dialogue in the following way. There are two fields presupposed by the task developer (the researcher): that of the students and that of the philosophers (ELE and the philosophy of morality). These two parties also belong to two different national cultures. This will create a state of mind in the students known as “outsideness” in the Bakhtinian terminology (cf. the explanation of meaning of situatedness as outsideness in subsection 3.2.3.1 in Chapter Three). The outsideness will be at two levels: intercultural and interdisciplinary. If the interaction between two cultural and two fields’ positions is serious and meaningful, it may lead to active questioning of one’s cultural and disciplinary convictions and practices. The disciplinary convictions and practices are seen as related to the cultural convictions and practices because the former originates as a response to a cultural necessity. The two field knowledge and practices of the philosophers and the students interact within the students’ zones of potential development. Thus, the supposition of the possibility of the occurrence of two-directional development for the academic and the national culture in the students’ minds may be dialogic. This arguably may occur if serious dialogue is attempted on the part of the
students. Multiculturalism\textsuperscript{18} in terms of inter-culturalism or additive multiculturalism (cf. researcher's understanding of multiculturalism as additive multiculturalism in subsection 2.3.3.1 in Chapter Two) is seen here. Thus, the heuristics or ideas or conceptual framework (or cultural tools, in the sociocultural terminology) developed in the field may be viewed or used in a different context which may give it a new nuance of meaning or new practice-oriented interpretation. This, in the researcher's view can be called intercultural dialogue and cultural development at the same time.

The third aim of the first task is connected to cultural development and intercultural dialogue through relating intersubjectivity to the idea of change. The idea from introducing different positions on one topic is juxtaposing them in a way that might lead to a fruitful dialogue. The presupposition here is that juxtaposing students, who must have particular perspectives about morality, with the theorists' perspectives on morality may make students aware of nuances in the ideas. They might attempt mixing more than one perspective and that may lead the students to, to use Matusov's (1996) terminology, coordinate their contribution in the joint activity [of knowledge construction] through agreements and disagreements [with the philosophers]' (p. 26). Or, rather, they might develop agency through negotiation to develop their own notions or definitions of morality. Here, intersubjectivity transcends a particular time- and place-limited joint activity. Matusov (ibid) clarifies this perspective in the following way.

Through participation in sociocultural practices mediated by other people organized in social groups and institutions and by sociocultural tools (e.g. books, computers, technologies, goods), intersubjectivity as the social glue of sociocultural activities makes possible the development of

\textsuperscript{18} It is worth noting here that the aim of multiculturalism that the researcher celebrates in her thesis is not that adopted in the mainstream American multicultural education. In the American context Wintergerts and McVeigh (2001) point out the aim of multicultural education is to look "at education from the point of view of those individuals who are different from the mainstream and how they can be better included in the educational process", p. 172. Rather, the writer sees it as a way to initiate dialogue so that it can lead to cultural development and intercultural dialogue. This has been elaborated in chapter 1 in the narratives and the examples given by the researcher to explain her view of cultural development and intercultural dialogue.
communicative discourses, languages, and finally cultures that constitute the global sociocultural and historical fabric of the human world. (p.30)

Thus, though the philosophers and the learners belong to two different academic and social cultures, their interaction, through texts, transcends the different times to which they belonged and the countries in which they lived. The interaction between the past and the present time spans to which the two groups belong may result in the students’ seeing the mutual object in a different way. Or, rather, it might lead to tertiary intersubjectivity which means ‘the focus on the ways that others approach the problem’, (Tomasello, Kruger & Ratner, 1993, as reported in Matusov, 2001, p. 386). This may be a drive that facilitates development in meaning making that might be new to the learner, in the field, or in the social cultural knowledge. The other’s ideas also may get changed through the new context that they may put in by the students and similar series of developmental changes in the field and the other culture may be traced.

The researcher here also uses the sociocultural perspective of internalization in a dialogic sense. As the students internalize the interaction between themselves and the philosophers, the perspectives that they have internalized in their minds might undergo a transformational processes. As the exchange becomes internalized and the philosophers’ as well as the students’ previous conceptions in their minds might change.

The conclusion from the occurrence of all the three criteria in a dialogic way may cause a qualitative change to emerge. This will supposedly happen through students’ new conception of an object in the light of another’s; situating self in relation to the other, and through dialogic intersubjectivity with the other. This qualitative change may be reflected in the way they think about their cultural problems and solve them leading to cultural development; and this might reflect intercultural dialogue.

4.5.2.2.2 Second and third tasks
Like the above subsection on the first task, this subsection consists of three parts: the description of the tasks, the aims of the tasks, and the rationale of the tasks.
4.5.2.2.2.1 Tasks description

For the second task, the students were asked to write a research article to be presented in a national conference on ELE in Yemen. They were directed to look for a research problem that is relevant to their context. The morality theories were still to be used with relevance to this problem. The students were chosen research problems and begun investigating them either theoretically or using research tools. The fourth-year students, they had only one research project and it has mainly depended on a copy-paste kind of work. The third-year students did not any formal training in how to do a research project. However, the idea here was not to improve the way they make research. Rather, the aim was to explore how they would use the response they had developed in relation to the morality theories in their field with relevance to a local problem that is to be presented to a local audience.

For the third task, the students were given the choice to either work on the same topic or to pick up a different topic for research. Their perspective of the morality and the morality theories was still demanded in this task. There is only one small difference between the last task and the second one. In the last task, they were asked to imagine that they would publish their topic in a journal whose readers belong to different countries other than Yemen.

4.5.2.2.2.2 The aims of tasks two and three

- To gauge the dialogicality of the criteria in the students’ writing that is specifically related to their field.
- To see whether still there is a connection between the dialogicality of the criteria on the one hand and cultural development and intercultural dialogue on the other hand.
- To evaluate the effect of the audience (local and non-local) and the setting (publication inside or outside the country) of the problem on the dialogicality of the criteria.
- To see whether there is any improvement in terms of the potentiality for cultural development and intercultural dialogue.
4.5.2.2.3 The rationale of the tasks
The rationale for using these tasks was to explore further whether there was a positive/negative relation between the dialogicality of the criteria use by the students on the one hand and the emergence and scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue on the other hand. Moreover, the effect of the perception of difference audiences on dialogicality of the criteria first and second on the emergence of cultural development and intercultural dialogue in meaning making was to be examined.

4.5.2 Intervention
This section consists of four subsections: the first highlights the researcher’s approach to students texts and drafts, the second is about the roles played by the researcher at the time of intervening; the third gives an idea of the nature of the talk between the researcher and the students; and the fourth provides the rationale for the talk between the researcher and the students task-wise.

4.5.2.1 Approach to students’ texts
They are to be considered as meaning/knowledge that is dialogically constructed by the students. The researcher’s aim is not to enable them to conform but to construct, to have a real dialogue. The incomplete and even mistaken drafts in this context are not viewed as unsuccessful writing but rather as steps towards reaching a more mature stage of meaning construction. The researcher draws the participants’ attention to the important points written in each draft and how they may be used in the final drafts through dialogue. Students are encouraged to make connections within the drafts so that when they reach the final stage, they will be able to have a rich understanding of the points made in it. Students need to understand that there is no end for the improvements that can be made for a draft because the dialogue knows no end.
The intertextuality in students’ drafts were used to explore how (non-)dialogic were the criteria used and reflected. The conceptualizations of the criteria from a dialogic sociocultural perspective were used for this purpose.

In addition, the texts produced by the students are not intended to be standardized ones. They are also not necessarily written in the tradition of particular genres. The idea is not to train students to produce texts that conform to a certain genre form. The texts produced may be a mixture of the national rhetoric and the foreign rhetoric. This mixture may naturally occur especially in the papers that they write for the national conference in the second task or for the foreign readers in the third task. The final drafts can also be hybrids of different genres. The focus is on meaning rather than on the form in which the meaning takes shape.

4.5.2.2 The roles of the researcher while intervening

The researcher was not a detached person from the research procedures. One of the roles played by the researcher was that of the teacher-researcher. As the students wrote multiple drafts for each task, except for the last task, the researcher found the first (sometimes the second in the case of some students) drafts suitable occasions for intervention. The intervention took place in dialogic form between the researcher, who played both the roles of the researcher and the teacher, and the students. The dialogue was in the form of questions directed to students. The number of times in which the dialogue occurred depended on both the quality of the students’ writing as well as their consent to improve their drafts. This is because there is no end for the kind of improvement that can be attempted by the students for developing the quality of their papers. The teacher-researcher stopped the dialogue/intervention when the students had announced or implied that the versions they had written were their final drafts.

Another role that was played by the researcher, a part from being a researcher and a teacher, was that of a friend. The case of Ameera\textsuperscript{19} below is an example. She was shy to express the difficulties she faced in writing. She did not know how to relate morality theories to her field. The researcher attempted to give her several examples on how this

\textsuperscript{19} A pseudonym of the student
could be done. All the attempts were useless. The researcher got the idea that if this particular student had seen other students' writing, she might be able to make her mind. That was also a chance for the dialogue to occur between the students on how to address and solve problems with the help of each other. And that what happened. The following sketch illustrates this attempt on the part of the researcher and the Ameera’s attitude towards it:

R: Yah, and uh let me say, um, you have seen some examples of some of the work of your class. I mean, these uh stu I mean of other subjects of this research. How did they affect your understanding of the theories and writing YOUR understanding of writing and the theories, of yourself, of your style of writing, of your understanding?

A: (In Arabic) do you want to ask me with which theory I have been impressed?

R: You have read the work of your uh of other people in this research

A: (In Arabic) I didn’t get you.

R: (In Arabic) didn’t you read Aisha’s and Abdo’s work?

A: (In Arabic) yes

R: Ok, how did it affect your understanding of the theories, your writing, like this?

A: Yes, uh, in the first I don’t know what I want to say.

R: Hm hu

A: I didn’t know to relate to my, to my education as a teacher. But, after I read uh uh the other uh models, I I think that I have many many opinions.

R: I see

A: yes

R: I gave oh you some example, why didn’t you understand from my understand from my examples? You understand only from your peers?

---

20 The researcher did not correct the mistakes in the students' speech. She has written students' verbatim as it has occurred in the students' speech. The single letters represents sounds made by the students similar to these letters.
A: But, uh, it is not clear (some background speech irrelevant to the topic of the conversation)

R: So, that’s all? Do you want to add something about, you know, the effect of your reading of your peers’ writing?

A: Yes, you gave me some examples but uh you are as a a teacher, as a doctor, I, I, it is not clear, clear, exactly clear,

R: Hum

A: But uh, when I read uh other models, they are thinking as me.

R: I see, small small

A: (Laughs) I understand them.

R: You feel it is easier?

A: Yes

R: I see. That’s all?

A: yes

R: in which way, I mean, specifically, how did they, specifically, how did they affect your development, understanding, progress, writing, in which way? (In Arabic) in which way? You told me in general about their effect on you.

A: Ha (said with an intonation that indicates a sudden discovery of something that was not known before), for example, in their writing.

R: Hum ha

A: Uh, they are uh uh, they are used used uh simple words,

R: words

A: Yes, I understand them. (In Arabic) I mean, (in English) directly.

R: I see

A: Yes, and uh their thinking simple as me

R: I see

A: for that I, (in Arabic) I mean, (in English) directly, I understand them
R: I see
A: Yah
R: That's all? Do you want to add anything?
A: No, thank you so much
R: (Laughs) most welcome. Ok. (She blows off a sigh of relief.)

The above conversation is a sketch from one of the meetings with Ameera. The researcher attempts to know the effect of others’ writings on Ameera. Ameera acknowledged that the other students’ writings (models, in her attitude) were easier to understand than the examples given by the researcher. She used different words to justify her inability to understand the researcher’s examples such as “unclear” and “as a doctor ... it is not clear” while she used these sentences “… they ... used ... simple words;” “I understand them directly;” and “and [...] . . . their thinking [as] simple as [mine]” to describe why she understood other students’ writing. The very idea that Ameera was able to express the idea of not being able to understand the researcher’s examples shows that the researcher based the interaction on a ground of friendliness and trust.

Another role that was played by the researcher was that of the participant. The researcher’s previous understanding of the theories did not remain untouched during and after the interactions that occurred between her and the students. For example, her unspoken, initial unease with Mill’s philosophy of morality because it depended on material cause in terms of utility as the happiness of self and others changed in the process of dialogue with the students and reading their responses to the theories. For example, Asma’a connected the utility to the benefit of society (seeing the group and the individual as complementary) and our consciousness of the demands of the situation (the care of consequences in Mill’s) to the responsibility towards God and the total good. In this way the two major ideas of Mill’s perspective (the use of imagination and the utility as both individualistic and collective) were preserved in Asma’a’s perspective of morality. In addition, it was given an Islamic touch which diluted the materiality of the moral cause; see the analysis of Asma’a’s second draft for the first task, next chapter. As
a result, the researcher changed her unspoken position to another unspoken position under the convincing argument of Asma'a.

Another role was that of a resource person. When the students were clueless on how to imagine the demands of a foreign journal, the researcher took them to an internet café and showed them the ELT Journal website. She made them read the instructions for authors in order to be accepted in the journal. When they also were still unable to imagine the different personalities and organizations who might attend a national conference on ELE, she gave them examples. When the students expressed the lack of materials for the second and the third tasks, she suggested names of individuals to borrow from.

4.5.2.3 The nature of intervention

The interaction between the research participants and the researcher may be called dialogic. The reason for that was that in most cases the interaction was accumulative, aiming for meaning-making for both the research and the participants, serious, and occurring mainly in a question-answer format. These characteristics are those of a dialogic interaction. One more point has to be mentioned with relevance to dialogue. The nature of the talk between the researcher and the participants was to a large extent symmetrical in the sense that students were free to exchange control with the researcher. They shared with her the decision when to end the dialogue; and they were given the freedom to choose which version of their writings to be the last; c.f. subsection 1.3 for the difference between dialogue and conversation in Chapter One. The questions of the dialogue emerged from the students' papers. For example, the questions were often directed to improve a particular point or to get clarifications about unclear issues in their drafts. The length of the dialogue depended on the aptitude of the students and their follow up move. If they were engaged, they tended to give long answers and to be more attentive to the researcher's inquiries. Thus, the dialogue was a student-centered one.

It began with concerns emerging from their papers and ended when the students wanted. It is worth mentioning here that not all the dialogues were recorded. Many of the initial dialogues went on for hours. They were rather lengthy and time consuming. Some of them extended to several meetings for more than two days. Therefore, only the dialogues that occurred after writing the last drafts of each task were recorded.
4.5.2.4 The rationale of the intervention task-wise

The rationale of the dialogue and feedback from the researcher’s perspective was to make the research participants’ academic writing dialogic (in some cases) or more dialogic (in other cases). The researcher reproduces the conceptualization of dialogic writing provided in Chapter One: Writing from this perspective is an aesthetic responsive, situated, and intersubjectively dialogic activity. The researcher read the initial drafts of the students and decided asking further questions. The mechanism of the dialogue was built around a number of questions that the researcher found relevant with the dialogicality of the criteria when reading the first drafts. The idea was to help students to focus on the use of the criteria dialogically.

First, in the first task the focus of the researcher’s feedback was to help students formulate a substantiated response of their own in relation to others’ (i.e. the criterion of writing responsiveness). That is to enable them to develop a personal understanding of morality in relation to those perspectives of the theorists’. The teacher’s task through the feedback and the dialogue was to make them aware of the possibilities of seeing morality differently through drawing their attention to the number of views presented in the classical moral texts offered to them for reading and those that were available in the students’ background or those that might be created due to the interaction among these worldviews. What happened was that most of the students expressed worldviews that did not reflect dialogic responsivity. That is, active understanding of the position of the other in relation to one’s own position was not reflected in the students’ writing. For example, Kant’s view of morality celebrates absolutism which ignores the consequences in moral decision making while Mill’s view promotes the use of imagination to evaluate moral decisions in terms of consequences. Both these aspects were clearly reflected in the texts given for reading to the participants. Some of the students adopted these two views without showing in their writing how to make them compatible. Besides, they expressed a position on morality that clearly reflected an Islamic worldviews or a personal perception without trying to relate this to the three theorists; see the analysis of the first draft of the first task. The researcher’s duty was to draw the students’ attention to this aspect of their writing. In the case of some students they attempted to make Kant’s and
Mill's views compatible by using the word "consistency" which is more liable to accepting exceptions than the word "absolutism". The following sketch shows Ameera's attempt to use both the theories in the field of teaching in the first draft of the first task.

1.R: Ok. If you remember we talked about three criteria that we want to apply in responding to any person in writing, ok, or in our writing in general. One of them is responsivity. How did you apply responsivity in your writing? Let's begin with that.

4.S: I when I think of them of the uh theories, I uh I uh make summary.

5.R: Ok

6.S: Ok. And uh I (in Arabic) what is “amalgamate”?

7.R: Integrate

8.S: and the uh integrate my opinion with the uh with the opinion of *the Kant.

9.R: Umhu (uttered with an encouraging tone)

10.S: Uh rh according to my according to my religions, religious,

11.R: Hm

12.S: and uh my society

13.R: Hm

14.S: Also, my education

15.R: Ok

16.S: as ac as a teacher, as academic teacher,

17.R: Ok

18.S: uh, for example, uh according to con according to consistence

19.R: Huha

20.S: of uh Kant

21.R: Huha

22.S: for example, in my. in my practice uh of the, in the cllo, in the uh school
23. R: Huha

24. S: uh (remembrance prayer) (in Arabic) what did I say? (In English) when I put uh the
25. uh the exam, when I put the exam,

26. R: Huha

27. S: I, I uh must uh put uh, I must put specify marks

28. R: Huha

29. S: uh, for any questions,

30. R: Hmhu

31. S: Ok? Uh when I (in Arabic) what is the word for “correct”?

32. R: When I grade

33. S: when I grade, uh, yes, when I grade, I must not change it for any person in any
34. student

35. R: Huha

36. S: with any student

37. R: I see

38. S: Uh

39. R: you must, you must, you must not differentiate between students

40. S: Yes

41. R: You, you give higher marks for one question

42. S: yes, regardless uh regardless of their uh

43. R: Level

44. S: levels, (in Arabic) yes.

45. R: You should, you you should you should be consistent, you mean

46. S: Yes

47. R: I see, ok.

48. S: to change to the uh another, to the second theories uh theory.
55.R: And then, you uh discuss the second theory.

56.S: Yes, uh, according to the Mill

57.R: Huha

58.S: uh, about his theory, uh, I think that also as a teacher

59.R: Huhu

60.S: we , we must be, we must be (in Arabic) what is the word for “ready”

61.R: ready

62.S: ready to, we must be ready to, to produce to the student a lesson, a good a lesson.

63.R: Huha

64.S: a good uh, a suitable style, a suitable way

In the above sketch, Ameera described how she had integrated her opinion with the two theories of Kant and Mill. As it is clear from the Sketch above, she used the word “consistency” rather than “absolutism” to describe the morality of being consistent in assigning marks to questions and not changing them in favor of some students. For integrating Mill’s view in education, she described the image of a teacher who was well-prepared and equipped for teaching lessons. She wanted to bring the idea of planning “to produce to the students . . . a good lesson” (using imagination for moral action) in Mill’s view with the “consistency” in Kant’s. This was how she perceived integrating her opinion with those of the two thinkers. The very idea of using her mind to apply and integrate the two theories meant integrating her opinion with the two theorists; see the lines from 1 to 21 in the sketch above. The fact was that she expressed an opinion about morality as “a group of behaviours [sic] that grow up from a [sic] religious social principles and become *in [sic] complete picture when all individuals of the society apply it[sic]” at the beginning of her essay. The difference between Ameera’s personal opinion and that of the thinkers was no demarcated in her paper. It was the researcher’s duty to use dialogue to enable Ameera to improve her responsivity in relation to others, in this particular case with the thinkers.
Next, for the first task *situatedness*, the researcher drew the participants’ attention to the fact that they were language teachers who belonged to a particular area in the world. Situating themselves dialogically as language teachers who lived in a particular area in the world would then mean using examples that reflected re-contextualizing the theories’ meanings as they explained the theories on their own. For example, they might use their Yemeni teaching context to agree with or reject a particular theory. They might use examples from Islamic Sharia to refute the absolutism of using lie (in the summary of Kant, Shuman used an example of a person who told a criminal the place of the person to be killed to explain the absolutism of Kant; see the texts of morality by the thinkers in appendix 2) and proving that it can be used if a person’s life was endangered.

Third, for the first task research participants (all/some) were to be encouraged through dialogue and feedback to make their interaction with the theorists *intersubjectively* dialogic. This entailed helping them observe the dynamics of their interaction with the theorists, for example, and enabling them not to submerge the theorists’ views to a previously adopted view (the Islamic view).

With relevance to the second task, the dialogue and feedback were also focused on the responsivity, intersubjectivity, and situatedness. In addition, the researcher had to draw the students’ attention to the nature of the audience. The demand in the second task was to connect the opinions formulated about morality and morality theories in the first task with an ELE issue, problem, idea, or topic relevant to the local context. This was to be written and presented in a national conference. The researcher’s task through dialogue was to make them aware again of the possibilities in formulating the paper. The students, as it turned, never attended any ELE conference. So the *variation of the audience* that might attend such ELE conferences in Yemen was not anticipated by the research participants. The researcher expounded to them that ELE students, ELE teachers, supervisors, ELE university professors, principals, representatives from the ministry of educations, authorities, the British Council, the AMIDST, the press, etc. could be the attendants of such conferences. By showing the students such a variety, she aimed at enabling them to predict and vary the content of their topics. Moreover, she had to deal with other problems that ranged from the students’ inability to design the questionnaires.
to the difficulty in interpreting the responses to the questionnaires, to the lack of awareness of how to properly report the interviews, etc.

Apart from the audience, and the technical problems the three writing criteria were also attended to by the researcher.

First, responsivity was addressed in the dialogue between the researcher and the participants with the researcher encouraging the students to develop the response in the first task and make it suitable to the audience, the setting, and the purpose. Responsivity in terms of opinions about morality and the theorists’ views in the second task was to be connected with the concepts, heuristics, or theories of the fields that the students will pick up to talk about the ELE issues in their papers. The researcher’s task was to tab this aspect of the task in the dialogue and feedback through dealing with the problems and issues of dialogicality that might occur during the students’ attempts to formulate their responses. For example, in the second task some of the students in their first drafts for the second task Mayasah used the concept of “good teacher” as the title of her first draft in her attempt to explain the image of a moral teacher. The researcher used dialogue to ask Mayasah to define the term “good teacher” from her perspective. Through dialogue they reached a conviction that the notion of the “good teacher” could not be explained properly as the word “good” cannot be measured. As a result, both decided the concept of “effective teacher” to be used in the place of the notion “good teacher”. Long stretches of dialogues then followed to relate the concept both to a moral conception of a teacher as well as to its operationalization in the ELE field. In addition, dialogic intersubjectivity was examined and promoted. For example, the researcher identified problems with the dialogicality of Mayasah’s intersubjectivity. Mayasah usually tended to impose her interpretations on the morality theorists. This tendency moved with her from first task to the second task; see for example the analysis of her intersubjectivity in the second draft of the first task and the last draft of the second task. In the case of Mayasah, the researcher was unable to talk her off through pointing to the problems of non-dialogicality of her intersubjectivity. She continued to have the same problem till the last task. The last criterion, situatedness, was addressed in the dialogue by the researcher drawing the students’ attention to the demand in the second task to choose a local research problem in their papers. Having a local setting to provide them with the research
problem, a local audience to listen to them; and an ELE field to theoretically and experimentally draw upon; the researcher’s duty was to enable them set a dialogue between their interpretations of the perspectives of theorists on morality, their own conviction of morality whether personal or cultural, and the way they address the issue in their locality, for their audience, and through their field. One of the problems that the students had to deal with in promoting dialogic intersubjectivity was the complexity of setting a dialogue between apparently unrelated fields. Abdullah commented on this aspect of their effort that it needed “high thought”. However, the researcher was of some help in this regard by recommending some topics and issues for the students to work upon like the morality of effectiveness in teaching and its role in promoting quality learning, the immorality of cheating and its effect on achievement, etc.

With relevance to the third task, the researcher’s task through dialogue was to observe how students predicted and worked towards arousing the interest of the non-local reader in the students’ speech and writing. Before doing the task the researcher explained to the students that the issue that they chose for a local audience might not be of interest for the non-local audience. Furthermore, she advised them to be convincing and use whatever tools in hand to make the local issue discussed in the paper of an international scope; thus, enabling the national-international interface. There were no drafts for this task so the researcher asked students to compare the last draft of the second task with the written products for the third task. Her purpose was to enable them reflect on the experience and see on their own the differences between written products for every task.

When the intervention was over, the researcher began analyzing the students’ responses. The following section gives an account of the different stages and decision made during the analysis.

4.6 The Analysis

The analysis can mainly be divided into two main phases. The questionnaire analysis and the analysis of the text response phase. The decision making stages for how to go about
the analysis varied in these two phases. The questionnaire analysis consisted of only one stage while the text response phase involved three stages.

4.6.1 Questionnaire analysis

The researcher started by analyzing the questionnaire. She decided to divide the different stages of the analysis into themes in accordance with the themes of the different sections in the questionnaire. The result of the questionnaire gave the researcher the rationale for the intervention.

4.6.2 Text response analysis

The researcher in deciding about how to analyze the data collected from the students' responses to the tasks went through three stages of decision making. The most difficult stage was that which she went through in deciding about how to present the first task. She got a sense that all the students' first drafts reflected a common cultural position that emerged from their religious beliefs. However, she did not know how to present it. Comparing students' first written drafts she conceived another pattern. Some of the students came up with their own opinions about morality that seemed not directly relevant to their religious beliefs while others did not. She then decided to listen to the conversations21 between the students and her in which they themselves reflected on the differences between their first and last drafts. She looked at both the written texts and the conversations to examine the written texts in the light of the dialogues between the students and her. That also did not help her come up with a solution of how to present them. Not all the students were conscious of their cultural positions. They thought that these were their personal positions. That was not true because the researcher found that the roots of the Islamic perspective were similar in all the students' written products. She found this through the students' using the same/similar words to express more or less the same moral perspectives. One more pattern the researcher detected was that due to a particular understanding of her instruction for the first task in which she explained that the response means providing an opinion on morality in relation to the position of the three theorists, students provided opinions of the three theorists' understanding of morality. That resulted in one more pattern; that in which they expressed opinions about the morality theorists. The solution that the researcher came up with was to confine her investigation to the first drafts at least as a first stage of

---
21 A sample of the conversations with one student is given in appendix 9
investigation so that she could present the detected three patterns. She coded the data in four tables to present the three patterns. The first two tables presented the students' detected Islamic perspectives about morality, the third the supposedly personal opinions about morality, and the fourth their interpretations and value judgments of the morality theories. The whole idea from the tasks was to examine the dialogicality of the three criteria (intersubjectivity, situatedness, and responsivity) as well as their effect on cultural development and intercultural dialogue in students’ written products. Therefore, the researcher commented on the tables with reference to the dialogicality and titled the section “gauging the criteria”. Following the idea of the tasks, she also sought to look at how the dialogicality of the criteria or its absence would affect cultural development and intercultural dialogue. She then titled the second section of the analysis “the scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue”. The whole analysis of the first drafts of the first task was to be considered a pre-intervention stage. It reflected students' use of the criteria before intervention as well as the scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue in their writing.

The second stage of analyzing the written products of the first task was examining the last drafts of the students. As the tables from the first drafts were coded, the researcher decided to code the last drafts in tables and compare the drafts before and after intervention. But, before detailing the procedures of the analysis, it is necessary to point out that of the fourteen students' written products only five students' final drafts were selected for the later stages of the analysis. For the last draft of the first task and the next two tasks the researcher needed to go deeper into the main differences between the first and the last drafts of every student. This was a demanding and a time-consuming examination to be done for few students' responses; how about if it would be done for fourteen students' responses? Besides, the idea was not to generalize the findings of the study but to explore whether the criteria use was dialogic or not, and to examine the connection between the dialogicality of the criteria on the one hand and the potential for cultural development and intercultural dialogue on the other hand. That would be possible through comparison, contrast, and connection between the two drafts. Doing this, the researcher was able to examine at more depth the minute details that might reflect differences and similarities in the dialogicality of two responses of each student. Consequently, she chose five participants out of the fourteen participants that she analyzed in the first draft. However, choosing five out of the fourteen students was still quite a load. Moreover, these five students were not selected randomly.
These students were hard working, more honest in admitting understanding and misunderstanding of the theories, more punctual in coming to the meetings, and more interested and engaged in doing the work. After the process of selecting the five students (Asma’a, Ameera, Mayasah, Thakiah, and Abdullah), she started the coding for the last drafts of the first task for the five students. The researcher chose the parts which included the student’s definitions, characteristics, and features of morality. These were set against the four main categories coded in the four tables in the analysis of the first drafts; i.e. students’ personal opinions, opinions on the theorists, cultural opinions, and the theorists’ ideas. This was done to make the comparison between the two drafts easier. Moreover, the students’ last drafts became longer and more detailed than the first drafts. As a consequence, the researcher summarized the anecdotes and examples written by the students to be able to make the tables brief and concise. For the same reasons she avoided including repeated examples and elaborations of the student on the same idea in the tables. The students’ writings were presented in the tables without attempting to correct any grammar, spelling, or punctuation mistakes. Samples of students’ drafts will be presented in appendixes 5 and 6.

From the second drafts and on the researcher began the analysis with a descriptive and explanatory accounts of the changes that she perceived between the drafts of every student. The descriptive-explanatory accounts were followed by interpretation of the dialogicality of the criteria and the scope of cultural development and intercultural dialogue. This time, unlike for the first drafts, these three sections were done for every one of the students. In addition, graphics were used to help the teacher make connections and make the description and the interpretation reader friendly. The section was concluded by two tables that summarizes the major findings of the analysis.

The last stage of the analysis was to compare the students’ written products for the second task with those written for the last task. For this part of the analysis the researcher continued analyzing the written products of the five students that she worked with in the previous section. As almost all the students did not make major changes in their topics, the researcher found it reasonable to compare students’ produced documents for both the tasks for analyzing students’ written documents. The same procedures were followed for analyzing the students’ written products of both the tasks. She picked up similar themes and compared them using two-column tables. The only difference was that one more section was added due to the emphasis on different audience in both the tasks. The second task’s writing was to be presented to a local audience and the last task’ writing was to be presented to a non-local audience. It was an
interpretive section which aimed at tracing the differences that might be caused by the students’ awareness of the different audience in both the tasks.

The following section explains some of the difficulties faced by the researcher while conducting the study.

4.7. The Difficulties of the Empirical Study

The first difficulty was the timing of the study. The study took place when the revolution in Yemen was in its peak. In addition, the semester was winding up. Thus, a major part of the study was conducted during the vacation. Because the participants were just doing the end of semester exams, they were a little uneasy with the idea of beginning another serious study which was also demanding. However, the researcher explained to them that she would try to make it an interesting and useful study for them. Thus, the study commenced with the students’ consents.

During the vacation Ramadan also commenced. The researcher arranged for the meetings to take place in evenings so that the students who were fasting in the daytime would feel more comfortable. Besides, since most of the students belong to a city other than Zabid, namely Beit Al-Faqih, the researcher had to travel in the evening time. And, since she had to meet four girls (the Faqih girls), she usually left late for her home town.

For every empirical study, there must be some limitations. The following section highlights some of the limitations perceived by the researcher.

4.8. The Limitations of the Empirical Study

One of the limitations of the study was that the sample included only two males with the rest of the sample consisting only of females. The sample selection might be accused of being biased. But, it had been explained above that the choice of the participants was based on a criterion. That is, the selected students should have got an average grade between good to excellent in the five writing courses. Only three males met the criterion. All the other males, to the surprise of the researcher, scored less than good as the average grade for the five writing courses. Of the three males who met the criteria, one could not be a participant in the study because he had to work during the vacation to afford for the expenses of his education. So, the researcher was left with two male participants. In addition, as the researcher chose five of the fourteen students’ written products for the analysis of the second draft of the first task as well as the second and the third task, only one of the two males was chosen; see the reasons why the
researcher chose five out of the fourteen students in the analysis section. So, the researcher was left with one male participant along with four female participants.

One more limitation is the size of the sample, fourteen students which was cut down into five for the analysis of the second draft of the first task onwards. However, the researcher argues that the small sample is justifiable as she is not aiming to make generalizations. The idea from the study was to explore three research questions: (1) what makes students’ responsivity, intersubjectivity, and situatedness dialogic? (2) Is there a positive/negative relation between the dialogicality of the criteria (responsivity, intersubjectivity, and situatedness) on the one hand and cultural development and intercultural dialogue on the other hand? (3) Does the audience local and non-local have some effect on dialogicality? If there evidence that a positive relation occurs between the dialogicality of the criteria and the emergence of cultural development and intercultural dialogue, the researcher hopes that the ideas and the insights gained from this study may be a guide for further research. The area for teaching academic writing in an EFL context for the special purpose of cultural development and intercultural dialogue is a road not yet taken for research. All in all, a big sample is not an essential requirement of the study.

4.9 Conclusion

This chapter gave a detailed account of the different phases and stages of the empirical study. It consisted of eight sections under some of which some subsection were enlisted. The main sections in this chapter were the statement of the research problem, description of the institutional setting, the aims of the writing courses, the methodology, the analysis, the difficulties and the limitations of the empirical study.

The following chapter presents the analysis and the discussion of the findings.