



## AN OVERVIEW OF DIALOGIC TEACHING AND ITS IMPACT ON LEARNING

Şeyma Yıldırım <sup>a \*</sup>, Şebnem Uzun <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a,b</sup> *Hacettepe University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, 06800, Ankara, Turkey*

---

### Abstract

Dialogic teaching supports the view that an individual's speech and learning can be formed through continuous interaction with others and their talks. Thanks to its close relationship with the social aspect of learning, this concept of teaching has grasped the interest of many researchers over years. This study aims to gather some of these studies together and present the effectiveness of implementing dialogic teaching in relation to four language skills as well as grammar and vocabulary development. Moreover, revealing the problems of deploying dialogic teaching in the teaching/learning environment and possible solutions to overcome these is also taken as another scope of the study. The study showed that dialogic teaching is an efficient way to trigger students' language development since it enhances their intellectual abilities, critical thinking, questioning skills, and metacognitive awareness by increasing student talk in class. Moreover, not only four language skills but also students' vocabulary and grammar knowledge could be enlarged along with the improvement on their phonological awareness. However, this teaching approach can be hard to implement in classrooms since it requires knowledge, skills, suitable curriculum, and school culture along with other possible problems.

**Keywords:** Dialogic teaching, language learning, challenges, solutions, evidence

© 2021 IJETS & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Education Technology and Science (IJETS)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

### 1. Introduction

It is widely regarded that learning is achieved through the learner's involvement in co-constructing knowledge with interactive activities (Kim & Wilkinson, 2019; O'Connor, 2013; Wells, 2015). By ensuring students' participation in interchange, dialogic teaching is an

---

\* Corresponding author: Şeyma Yıldırım.  
E-mail: [sseymavy@gmail.com](mailto:sseymavy@gmail.com)

approach that maximizes learning through interactive dialogues during which students exchange their ideas by reasoning, discussing, critical thinking, and voicing their notions. Sharing the authority and responsibilities, students and teachers work collaboratively to engage in dialogic discussions for productive learning outcomes. Reznitskaya (2012) sorts some basic components of dialogic teaching out as follows: open and divergent questions which lead learners to think creatively, shared responsibility between teachers and students, meaningful feedback to negotiate meaning with justification and challenge, metacognitive reflection for clarifications, and collaborative co-construction of knowledge in a social environment by interacting with others. Additionally, Lefstein (2006) calls using dialogic practices as democratic education because dialogue requires equality, reflexivity, openness, and opposition to authority through collaborative participation in the meaning-making process.

Underlining the social and interactive nature of language learning, this paper intends to present current studies which employ dialogic teaching in different language learning settings, specifically in relation to teaching four language skills, grammar, and vocabulary. With this purpose, first, the historical development process of dialogic teaching is given. Starting with its relation to sociocultural theory, Vygotsky's and Bruner's effects on the development of dialogic teaching are explained. After the explanation of the notion on which dialogic teaching is based, Bakhtin's differentiation between monologic and dialogic talk is explicated in detail. Focusing on the specific scholars in the field, the part on historical development ends with Alexander's framework including dialogic teaching essentials which are commonly accepted today.

After tracing the discussion back to its developmental phase, the paper draws on the evidence which portrays the efficacy of implementing dialogic teaching in language classes. Narrowing the scope down to teaching four skill, grammar, and vocabulary, the authors explain the dynamic nature of dialogues in language learning. Regardless of its good sides and advantages, some challenges and constraints of performing dialogic teaching are given to have an objective and informative approach. Finally, recommended solutions and acts in relevant studies are provided as well, to consolidate the drawbacks and challenges.

### *1.1. Emergence of Dialogic Teaching*

Not only the appearance and evolution of dialogic approaches related to teaching and learning but also discussions related to them owe their existence to the contributions and opinions of Russian Psychologist Lev Vygotsky with his social overview of language development which is called Sociocultural Theory (Lyle, 2008; Huong, 2003). Individuals' communicative and interactive acts with their social and cultural environment constitute the essence of sociocultural theory. According to Vygotsky, in addition to the effects of biological factors, external factors emerging from one's environment plays an important role in the cognitive development of the human mind since every single person in a social environment and their interaction with each other have an impact on cognitive development (Shooshtari &

Mir, 2014; Fahim & Haghani, 2012). When a person first meets and communicates with a more knowledgeable and capable one in his social surrounding, he learns new information, reviews and enhances his thinking and interpretation processes (van der Stuyf, 2002). After this social level, which is the first appearance of a psychological function, he creates new concepts and reshapes the existing schemas in his mind on the individual level by internalizing what he acquires in his social environment as a result of an interactive act in order to use them in the future (Sedova & Salamounova & Svaricek, 2014). In relation to this theory, Vygotsky also mentioned the term called Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Central to the sociocultural theory, ZPD indicates the gap between the real development level and the potential development level that can be reached “under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peer” (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86). Therefore, this zone includes both the yesterday which contains the real amount of knowledge in people’s minds and the tomorrow of development which shows the potential reaching point in people’s development with the help of outer forces (Verenikina, 2008). When a novice interacts with an expert in a social environment, the expert can help the novice to reach the potential development zone through providing explanations, giving strategies, and modeling (Lee, 2016). As a result, the novice takes place in the process of constructing knowledge instead of being a passive recipient and acquires the necessary skills to deal with a problem himself in the future by using his new capabilities in new contexts (Hammond & Gibbons, 2001; Zangoei & Davoudi, 2008; Wells, 1999).

Thanks to Vygotsky’s emphasis on people’s active contribution to their learning process through socializing and interacting with others in social and cultural environments, educators have realized the importance of language as the driving force for the improvement of the human mind’s cognitive development. It has also stimulated investigations on the effect of language as collaborative interaction with others on children’s learning (Lyle, 2008; Lee, 2016). As one of these investigations, Bruner and his colleagues put a new complexion on the term ‘scaffolding’ by considering sociocultural theory and its principles in 1976 (Gonulal & Loewen, 2018). Even if scaffolding was seen as parents’ assistance to support the development of children in the beginning (Puntambekar & Hübscher, 2005), later, with the integration of scaffolding into the education area as a part of teacher-student interplay, it has expressed the assistance given by peers or teacher in a classroom to novice learners so as to handle a cognitive problem or a task by acquiring new and necessary skills, knowledge and concepts (Kavanoz & Yüksel, 2010). However, this temporary support is transferred gradually to novices when they have the capability to deal with similar tasks themselves (Bruner, 1983; Puntambekar & Hübscher, 2005). Hence, by increasing students’ motivation to learn a language and prepare them to solve a problem on their own, scaffolding makes them self-regulated and autonomous learners in the future phases of their learning journey (Amerian & Mehri, 2014).

In addition to Bruner and his collaborators’ contributions to the literature by designing the term ‘scaffolding’ under the influence of sociocultural theory, being a contemporary of

Vygotsky, Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) focused on social and contextualized talk in terms of language learning and knowledge building. By explaining how different voices are interwoven into writing and talking, he projects that meaning-making arises from the dialogic exchange of ideas and interactive acts between different speakers (Bakhtin, 1981). In doing so, dialogic engagement emphasizes the intersubjective nature of language learning between different interlocutors, in which meaning is co-constructed through dialogic speech. Mutual understanding within social interaction through dialogue is stressed because speakers expect a responsive understanding from their listeners. As people interact with each other, they exchange their ideas, stimulate their thinking, internalize topics, build, and generate knowledge when different social voices are heard in a dialogue. Therefore, Bakhtin (1986) claims that the meaning of an utterance depends on the time and places as it is given in the following lines:

“an utterance is a link in the chain of speech communication, and it cannot be broken off from the preceding links that determine it both from within and from without, giving rise within it to unmediated responsive reactions and dialogic reverberations” (p.94).

In these lines, he provides a perspective that stresses meaning-making through active participation in the chain of communication speech (Teo, 2016). Also, he adds that there is always a gap between what speakers mean and what they say. Hence, meaning is co-constructed within tension and gap between two consciousness. Because of there needs to be a dialogue to voice the thoughts and interchange, Bakhtin (1981) considers language and thought dialogic by nature. It is also seen that his works have led to remark the concept of dialogic pedagogy. He claims that we need to focus on utterances, namely talk, to investigate dialogic engagement because learners play an active role in their learning by constructing meaning through dialogical turns (Bakhtin, 1986).

Regarding utterances of communication speech, Bakhtin (1981) asserts two terms: monologic utterance and dialogic utterance. As for the classroom context, monologic utterances and teaching can be categorized as traditional teaching because monologic teachers aim to transmit the knowledge to the students. In this concept, the teacher has the power and the knowledge, while students are passive and obedient to the instructions given by the authority figure in the class. Instead of promoting interactive act through the exchange of ideas, communication and interaction are seen as just tools to achieve teachers' goals. Similarly, Freire (1993) resembles monologic teaching to “the ‘banking’ concept of education, in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filing, and storing the deposits” (p.53). Like in passive technicians asserted by Kumaravadivelu (2003), monologic teaching impoverishes students from developing their skills such as problem-solving, critical thinking, creativity, and working as a member of a team. Stressing the importance of freedom and different ideas, Nesari (2015) claims to replace a shared and universal meaning with dialogism. Lyle (2008) characterizes monologic teaching with the Initiation- Response- Feedback (IRF) pattern, in which the teachers evaluate the response

given to their questions and give feedback to them in class. This type of teaching is dominated by the teacher and includes student talk just in the response part. Mercer (1995) criticizes the IRF pattern on the ground that it diminishes the amount of student talk, in which they can develop the level of understanding through interchange. Also known as recitation, the IRF pattern controls students' learning by hindering their critical thinking through the transmission of pre-packaged knowledge (Lyle, 1998). Additionally, Bakhtin (1981) alleges that monologic teaching hinders the potentials and the process of dialogue in classroom by not allowing the mutual understanding of students gained in interactive practices. As an alternative to this issue, he acknowledges dialogic teaching.

On the other hand, dialogic utterance differs from monologic utterance in many ways. According to Bakhtin, "any utterance, whether spoken or written, that people use in communication with each other is internally dialogic" (Bakhtin, 1986 as cited in Hall et al., 2004, p.72). In the dialogic talk, speakers actively listen to each other, share, and build new meaning collaboratively through mutual understanding. They do not accept the shared meaning. Instead, they reshape the existing meaning by adapting them to their own understanding (Bakhtin, 1981). Accepting and regarding different ideas as valuable, dialogic teachers encourage dialogue and collaboration between students and their ideas within peaceful and free learning settings. Therefore, Michaels, O'Connor, and Resnick (2008) link dialogic teaching to democratic education because learners have an active role in their education, and their ideas are viewed as significant to construct new knowledge. Some features of dialogic teaching support their statement such as being open to new ideas, equal contribution to discussion, collaborative engagement, and opposition to authority. In contrast to the IRF pattern, dialogic teaching uses questions to evoke provocative answers which also prompt new questions. In this chain of exchanges, teachers and learners reason and build on their ideas through collaborative engagement because they work together, negotiate, and discuss to co-construct meaning. Hence, in contrast to monologic teaching, dialogic teaching focuses on how to teach rather than what to teach (Reznitskaya et al., 2009).

These approaches and understanding with regard to the dialog and social interaction in learning/teaching environment pave the way of a new teaching approach. Inspiring by Vygotsky, Bruner, and Bakhtin, Robin Alexander (2017) developed a framework of dialogic teaching. As the name itself suggests, dialogic teaching values dialogue and communication between teacher and students since it is believed that continuous interaction between people's utterances have a power to shape students' speech (Zayed, 2016). Hence, "the cumulative quality of talk between teacher and students" (Lee, 2016, p.3) lies in the heart of dialogic teaching.

According to the framework developed by Alexander (2017), dialogic teaching includes four main elements. The first component is justification on which other components are predicated while the second one is the principles. There are five principles, which encourage collaborative engagement in education and enhances the interaction: collective, reciprocal,

supportive, cumulative, and purposeful (Alexander, 2017). Ensuring joint learning within mutual understanding, dialogic teaching facilitates a supportive learning setting for education. Stressing why the ethos of the classroom is important, Alexander integrates the culture of the classroom in the first three principles (Nystrand, 1997; Lefstein & Snell, 2014). As for the last two principles, it can be stated that speakers build on interlocutor's ideas in line with the intended goals. On the other hand, Alexander (2017) finds cumulation as the most difficult one because it deals with the meaning-making nature of the dialogic turns and teachers' ability to have insight into learners' uptake. All these principles can be employed in different talks. Therefore, there needs to possess different types of repertoires to avoid pedagogy encompassing shared and universal understanding.

The framework comprises 6 repertoires key to dialogic teaching: interactive settings, everyday talk, learning talk, teaching talk, questioning, and extending (Alexander, 2017, pp. 37–40). Organization of interaction in classroom setting is given and expanded in the framework within different modalities of interaction like whole class, group work, pair work, and individual work. How successful these organizations depends on the use of different talks in other repertoires. Therefore, teacher talk should enhance students' interaction and learning talk through dialogic turns. This is in line with the claim that learners need to have some discourse practices like negotiation, reasoning, narration within learning talk (Kim & Wilkinson, 2019). Although teacher talk comprises some traditional features such as rote and recitation, dialogic teaching underscores dialogue and discussion among these features because dialogue and discussion enable students to advance their higher-order thinking and co-construct knowledge. Apart from learner and teacher talk, the framework comprises everyday talk as a repertoire by emphasizing the need for equipping students with the requirements to manage social practices through interaction. Reminding of the distinction between the test and authentic questions asserted by Nystrand et al. (1997), Alexander (2018) utters the necessity for questioning by teachers and students as well. Similar to Bakhtin (1986), he urges students' responses to pose further questions to ensure the knowledge of intended outcomes. When it comes to the last repertoire, it prompts to extend turns when teachers use students' responses to extend the discussion and generate learning and ideas upon them. To actuate these repertoires and principles, Alexander lays out 61 indicators in his framework to explicate dialogic teaching in practice (Alexander, 2017). Because of space, they will not be listed here. However, it can be said that they include the content, classroom conditions, and the properties of talk following a heuristic purpose without prescribing some dos and don'ts for practitioners.

## **2. The Effect of Dialogic Teaching on Learning**

### *2.1. The Relevant Studies*

Dialogic teaching has been put into practice in different settings with different students by various researchers. As a part of these studies, the effect of dialogic teaching on learners' productive skills has become a research interest. Thanks to them, it becomes possible to see the benefits of dialogic teaching on both speaking and writing skills. To begin with, the literature shows that dialogic teaching prompts to advance speaking skills together with critical thinking (Mohammed Elhassan & Adam, 2017; Niknezhad Naeijabad, Khodareza, & Mashhadi Heidar, 2020), increase in students talk and reasoning (Sedlacek& Sedova, 2017), communicative competence (Liubashenko & Kornieva, 2019), and questioning (Davies, Kiemer & Meissel, 2017). Conducting research on how a teacher development program affects learners' dialogical discussion, Davies, Kiemer, and Meissel (2017) have proven the increase in the quality of questions which students ask in dialogic discussions in small groups. Analysis of audio and video recordings and interviews showed that teachers' perception of dialogues to advance students' deeper thinking was positive. Similarly, Sedlacek and Sedova (2017) investigated whether a teacher development program has an influence on performing dialogic teaching. For that purpose, eight teachers were video recorded before and after the development program to monitor changes in classroom discourse. The results showed that teachers' implementation of dialogic practices after the development program increased students' participation in class and the quality of student talk in terms of reasoning, discussion and thought.

Similar to the outcomes of speaking skills, dialogic teaching has also been proved as a successful approach to enhance students' writing abilities in several contexts. In their study to investigate how dialogic teaching influence students' writings and the practicality of dialogic teaching with regard to teachers' opinions, Barjesteh and Niknezhad (2020) found that thanks to dialogic teaching, by fostering their' intellectual abilities, students started to write in critical and creative mood rather than descriptive and personal. Besides, even if teachers stated the impracticality of dialogic teaching in reality at some points, they also strongly supported the implementation of it for the sake of improving writing skills. Hence, it was clearly seen that the establishment of dialogic teaching was a promising approach in language teaching. In another study, Tamış, Şensoy, and Atay (2020) examined the impact of three different pre-writing instructions on writing abilities. At the end of the study, the results revealed that in addition to the participants' positive reflections on dialogic instructions in the pre-writing stage, the students in the groups which were instructed through the use of dialogic teaching either in L1 and L2 got higher grades than the students instructed monologically. They also found more opportunities to discuss, raise their voice, reason ideas, and interact with others in a class. Lastly, like these studies, the amount of dialogic talk was proven to be a significant indicator for the improvement of students' persuasive essay scores, thanks to the contributions of Al-Adeimi and O'Connor (2021) to the literature with their study which aimed to observe the teacher-initiated dialogic talk as underpinnings of students' persuasive writing. Moreover, it was also found that dialogic talk gave students a chance to be exposed to different

perspectives and analyze several viewpoints. As a result, students could defend their positions to an idea better by evaluating it from a variety of angles.

Not only productive skills of learners but also their receptive skills, namely listening and reading skills, have been a topic of interest among researchers. Firstly, dialogic teaching has been proven to improve listening skill through interaction in terms of meaning-making (Edwards-Groves & Davidson, 2020; Huang, 2020; Ozcelik, Van den Branden & Van Steendam, 2019) listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness (Bozorgian& Alamdari, 2018), and co-production in talk (Edwards-Groves & Davidson, 2020). Considering the general tendency to remark listening as a passive or behavioral performance, Edwards-Groves and Davidson (2020) investigated active listening in a dialogic setting. From a fine-grained CA perspective, they analyzed data taken from Critical Participatory Action Research (CPAR) projects (Kemmis, McTaggart & Nixon, 2014) including 12 primary teachers who implemented dialogic teaching strategies in their class. Video recordings were transcribed and analyzed to define interactional features in whole-class discussion in which students practiced active listening in a dialogic discussion. They concluded that different responsive practices were used in dialogic whole class discussion, which promoted active listening. Stressing the multidimensional and embodied features of responses in active listening, researchers called all stakeholders in education to shape pedagogical practices in line with it. Questioning interactive listening performed by undergraduate EFL learners during a problem-solving task within a dialogical approach, Huang (2020) used the stimulated recall procedure for retrospective interviews to explore their thoughts on co-constructing their understanding in listening. Using both thematic analysis and conversational analysis to analyze the collected data in terms of the students' thinking process during the engagement in problem-solving and interactional features, Huang demonstrated the evidence to meaning-making process during interactive listening activity informed by dialogical approach. He presented the dialogic nature of co-constructing meaning during which interlocutors were active listeners and co-regulators of the discourse.

Luckily, the same positive results with listening can be extended to reading skill. However, unfortunately, the existing studies that examine the effect of dialogic teaching on reading skill development of students majorly concern young children. As one of these studies, Suryati, Furaidah, and Saukah (2017) investigated the impact of dialogic reading strategy on reading comprehension skills of forty primary school EFL students in Indonesia. The results revealed that thanks to dialogic teaching, a more dynamic and engaging learning process that supported students' higher reading comprehension abilities could be placed in class. Hence, a dialogic reading strategy was found to be a promising and efficient application for the improvement of reading comprehension abilities. In another two studies which targeted preschool students, dialogic reading was examined to observe its effect on children's overall language development. Firstly, Grolig, Cohredes, Tiffin-Richards, and Schroeder (2020) studied the influence of narrative dialogic reading method so as to understand if dialogic reading may improve inferential and literal narrative comprehension. At the end of the study, the results



showed that narrative comprehension and vocabulary skills of children could be enhanced with dialogic reading strategy. Secondly, with their study which compared three different reading methods, namely dialogical, traditional and digital, Simsek and Işıkoglu Erdogan (2021) revealed that compared to the other two groups, children's expressive and receptive language scores increased significantly with dialogic reading. Furthermore, thanks to this study, the importance of the interaction between class members and their teacher was unfolded and emphasized as one of the reasons why dialogic reading strategy supported language development more. Along with the interaction that is the core concept of dialogic teaching, prompts and feedbacks given during the interaction also were also considered as a way of fostering preschoolers' language development. In addition to the students' improvement during the process of investigations, the study of Ergül, Karaman, Akoğlu, and Sarıca (2016) examined if students' achievements through dialogic reading may turn into long-term results. At the end of the study, it was proved that the positive effects of dialogic reading could continue after dialogic reading treatment ended. According to their study, the students who experienced dialogic teaching as a part of their preschool education could perform better, answer more comprehension questions, and read faster and correctly even if they no longer experienced dialogic reading. Lastly, Serrano, Mirceva, and Larena (2010) extended the positive impact of dialogic teaching on adults. Through dialogic literary gatherings in which adults not only read and talked about literature but also created meanings by sharing their ideas, they could enhance their abilities in reading, arguing skills and, both vocabulary and language knowledge.

Similar to the positive impacts of dialogic teaching on four language skills, it has also been observed that dialogic teaching is fruitful and effective for both vocabulary and grammar development of learners. As for vocabulary development, unfortunately, there are not a lot of studies that directly focused on the relationship between learners' lexicon and dialogic teaching in different age groups. In one of these studies, Chow, Hui, Li, and Dong (2021) aimed to investigate the influence of dialogic teaching on phonological awareness and English vocabulary knowledge of seventy-two primary school students with diverse vocabulary levels in Hong Kong. After twelve weeks long intervention on a group of students, it was found that compared to the control group, the students in the experimental group enhanced their vocabulary development regardless of their existing level of vocabulary knowledge. Moreover, the increase in the level of phonological awareness could also be observed in the students who had high vocabulary knowledge. Therefore, dialogic teaching was proved to be a fruitful approach to improve students' metalinguistic level of language learning. Apart from this study, most generally, dialogic reading has been considered as a contributing force to improve students' vocabulary knowledge. In their study which investigated dialogic reading approach to improve eighty students' expressive vocabulary during four weeks period, Opel, Ameer, and Aboud (2009) found that dialogic reading had the power to increase students' vocabulary scores as well as their expressive vocabulary knowledge. Similarly, Boer (2017), who investigated the power of dialogic reading on vocabulary acquisition of 4-5 year-old

children, and Kotaman (2013), who examined receptive vocabulary gain and reading attitudes of preschoolers through dialogic storybook reading by involving parents' support, achieved the same results. The preschoolers who experienced dialogic reading strategies could increase their vocabulary knowledge compared to the other students in the studies. Hence, dialogic teaching was found to be a significant factor in the development of children's lexicon. Lastly, Çetinkaya, Öksüz, and Öztürk (2018) studied if dialogic reading strategies may influence vocabulary enhancement of thirty-eight fourth grade students. Post-test results showed that in addition to the positive effects of dialogic reading on students' storytelling capabilities, approaching a reading interactively improves the students' use of syllables, words, and sentences while forming a story through story cubes.

This positive influence of dialogic teaching on vocabulary can be extended to learners' grammar knowledge. There is evidence in the literature about improvements in some grammatical aspects caused by dialogic teaching through dialogical employment of gestures (Matsumoto & Dobs, 2017), dialogic feedback (Alemi, Miri & Mozafarnezhad, 2019), linguistic account of dialogic principles (Jones & Chen, 2016), teacher development programs with dialogic group activities (Robertson, Macdonald, Starks, & Nicholas, 2018), and revisioning grammar instruction (Collet & Greiner, 2020). In one of these studies, Matsumoto and Dobs (2017) investigated if dialogic use of gestures as interactional resources leads to learning in grammar classes by analyzing data including video recordings from beginner and advanced-level settings. Sequential analysis of interaction showed that dialogic gestures are a vital interactional resource for grammar teaching and learning. Similarly, Jones and Chen (2016) used the speech function analysis to analyze teacher talk and student talk with the purpose of investigating if contextualized grammar teaching advances dialogue in class. They performed a participatory research design, which included workshops, design of practices to integrate dialogic pedagogy in grammar teaching, implementation of these designs in class, and teacher's reflection on their teaching. Grammar teaching was performed in three stages: orientation to grammar points, collaborative activities, and review of the teaching in which dialogic principles were integrated. The results indicated that dialogic teacher talk and moves prompted to efficient pedagogy for constructing grammatical knowledge. It was also found that tasks designed to foster dialogue in class facilitated collaborative languaging in grammar teaching.

## *2.2. Constraints to Implementing Dialogic Teaching in Class*

Although it is proven that dialogic teaching increases student talk and engagement in class (Sedlacek & Sedova, 2017) through dialogue between interlocutors and develop their skills such as critical thinking, questioning, and reasoning (Elhassan & Adam, 2017), some authors state that dialogic teaching is unrealistic (Lefstein, 2010; Sedova et al., 2014) and not practical to implement its all practices in everyday teaching (Howe & Abedin, 2013; Howe et al., 2007; Mercer & Howe, 2012; Reznitskaya & Gregory, 2013). In a development program focusing on

principles, methods, and indicators of dialogic teaching, Sedova (2017) found a full implementation of dialogic teaching complicated and too demanding for teachers. Additionally, Sedova et al. (2014) aimed to clarify what troubles Czech teachers had in order to perform dialogic teaching. Analyzing the data from a project through micro ethnographic discourse analysis, they concluded that there was limitation by curriculum and teachers' skills, lack of argumentation, and semantic noise in the implementation of dialogic teaching. Also, open lesson plans could be face-threatening for teachers who do not know how to respond to students' contribution, about which they do not have any ideas. They also stated the conflict of the principles proposed by Alexander (2017) because practicing one principle could endanger the other one. Therefore, teachers found it hard to deploy in everyday teaching.

As in the study by Sedova et al. (2014), lack of guidance and knowledge on how to plan classroom dialogue is given other constraints in different studies (Howe, et al., 2007; Lyle, 2008). Likewise, Mercer and Howe (2012) stressed a gap between the theoretical concept of dialogic teaching and its practices, so they had some implications for filling this gap. They also remarked the school culture shaped by traditional ground rules that supported teacher-fronted classes as obstacles to dialogic teaching. Similarly, Leifstein (2010) sorted three issues to dialogic teaching: populated classrooms, curricular content with predetermined objectives hindering questioning, and institutional roles assuming teachers as the authority and the source of information while regarding students as passive recipients. Lyle (2008) also presented dominant teacher talk as a constraint to maximizing student talk and enhancing meaning-making process. She took national curriculums accountable for obstructing dialogic practices because of rushing to cover it. In addition, Burbules (1993) listed some challenges such as pressure on timing, standardized testing, and strict discipline. Lastly, Myhill and Fisher (2005) asserted that the lack of thought-provoking activities to make students engage in reasoning hinders dialogue and discussion in class.

### *2.3. Suggestions for the Constraints of Dialogic Teaching*

Regarding the challenges to dialogic teaching, there are also some suggestions in relevant studies to overcome these barriers (Leifstein, 2010; Lyle, 2008; Sedova et al., 2017). Leifstein (2010) recommends using pair work or group work in crowded classes to enable each student to contribute to the talk and discussion actively. Besides, he finds putting students in pairs and groups of three or four as a remedy to avoid some students from dominating the whole class discussion and causing the others to be passive and silent. He also asserts that it is normal to have some dominant and conversant students in class discussion. In those circumstances, the teacher should ensure that the discussion is meaningful and pleasant for the whole class to achieve their listening. As for the prepackaged curriculum, Leifstein (2010) suggests having a conversational curriculum that uses open and provocative questions and allows students' voices to be heard, linking curricular and out-of-school talk to construct knowledge, and encouraging students to share their perspectives thanks to critical inquiry. When it comes to

teachers' role as the authority, it is recommended to maintain communicative ground rules, extend waiting time to enhance students' contribution to discussions, pose challenging questions, take a caring attitude to have a friendly learning community, encourage students to take the floor, arrange classroom atmosphere and seating for engaging discussion, and integrate humor during interactive activities (Leifstein, 2010).

In addition to the suggestions mentioned earlier, Lyle (2008) proposes asking open and authentic questions to enable students to change the topic and the flow of discussion when necessary. This can emancipate students from being passive recipients in the class and break the traditional teacher role as the strict control mechanism. Also, educating teachers on how to implement dialogic practices with teacher development programs is listed as one of the solutions by Niknezhad Naeijabad, Khodareza, and Mashhadi Heidar (2020). They concluded that dialogue can be enhanced if teachers use students' responses for clarification and justification, ask open and authentic questions to extend students' turns, encourage students to initiate talk, and increase instruction which facilitates student engagement in discussion and conversation in class. Besides, Mercer and Howe (2012) call teachers to analyze and evaluate social interaction and interchange from a sociocultural perspective to question the efficacy of what is done in the classroom. Additionally, they suggest teacher development programs equipping teachers with some practical strategies to balance teacher-student talk, perform dialogic practices, and enable learners to involve in learning through dialogues. As their last recommendation, they suggest raising learners' awareness about the importance of interaction and the benefits of talk. All in all, they stress the metacognitive awareness in terms of the effects of interaction rather than just focusing on improving interaction.

### **3. Conclusion**

With reference to relevant literature around the world, this study aims to introduce the concept of dialogic teaching, its possible benefits and drawbacks on the development of language skills, and improvements in grammar and vocabulary knowledge along with several solutions to deal with drawbacks of dialogic teaching. When the outcomes of the studies are considered, it can be said that dialogic teaching is an effective tool to promote learners' language skills as well as their grammar and vocabulary development. By creating opportunities for discussion and interaction, dialogic teaching supports students' critical thinking, questioning and intellectual abilities, metacognitive awareness, creativity, and negotiation abilities as well. However, the relevant studies have demonstrated that contrary to its benefits to both students' language development and learning environment, dialogic teaching has some challenges to perform it in class due to some reasons such as classroom environment, curriculum design, ground rules, traditional teaching and learning roles, demanding nature of the approach, and time constraints. Luckily, the literature has also showed some ways to eliminate these problems and place dialogic teaching as a core concept in the teaching/learning environment.

Thanks to this study, teachers' awareness towards dialogic teaching and the ways to implement it in language classes can be increased. As a result, a better learning/teaching environment can be created by teachers to reveal their students' full potential. Besides, not only the good sides of dialogic teaching but also its constraints towards the implementation of dialogic teaching in the classroom are covered as a part of the study along with several solutions. Therefore, teachers may consider these problems before using dialogic teaching and plan their own ways to overcome future drawbacks of dialogic teaching with the help of possible solutions.

Finally, even if this study is significant in terms of presenting some dimensions of practicing dialogic teaching in class, it only covers four language skills, vocabulary, and grammar. However, dialogic teaching and its principles have also been investigated in terms of assessment practices, teacher education, and material development and design. Hence, by bending together relevant studies on these subjects, the future direction of a new study can be shaped. This kind of research can enlarge the scope of the current research on language learning. Moreover, this study has showed that the effect of dialogic teaching on vocabulary knowledge and reading skills needs further research with different age groups to better understand the concept and not only its benefits but also its side effects on the teaching/learning environment.

## References

- Al-Adeimi, S. & O'Connor, C. (2021). Exploring the relationship between dialogic teacher talk and students' persuasive writing. *Learning and Instruction* 71, 1-9. doi: 10.1016/j.learninstruc.2020.101388
- Alemi, M., Miri, M., & Mozafarnezhad, A. (2019). Investigating the Effects of Online Concurrent Group Dynamic Assessment on Enhancing Grammatical Accuracy of EFL Learners. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 9(2), 29-43.
- Alexander, R. J. (2004). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (1st ed.). York, UK: Dialogos.
- Alexander, R. J. (2017). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (5th ed.). York, UK: Dialogos.
- Alexander, R. J. (2018) Developing dialogic teaching: genesis, process, trial. *Research Papers in Education*, 33(5), 561-598
- Amerian, M., & Mehri, E. (2014). Scaffolding in sociocultural theory: definition, steps, features, conditions, tools, and effective considerations. *Scientific Journal of Review*, 3(7), 756-765
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Barjesteh, H. & Niknezhad, F. (2020). Fostering Critical Writing through Dialogic Teaching: A Critical Thinking Practice among Teachers and Students. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(2), 91-107.
- Bozorgian, H., & Alamdari, E. F. (2018). Multimedia listening comprehension: Metacognitive instruction or metacognitive instruction through dialogic interaction. *ReCALL: the Journal of EUROCALL*, 30(1), 131.
- Boer, M. (2017). Dialogic reading and building children's vocabulary (Master's thesis, Northwestern College, Orange City, IA). Retrieved 21 May, 2021, from [http://nwcommons.nwciowa.edu/education\\_masters/42/](http://nwcommons.nwciowa.edu/education_masters/42/)
- Bruner, J. (1983). *Child's talk: Learning to use language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burbules, N.C. (1993) *Dialogue in teaching: theory and practice* (New York, Teachers College Press).
- Çetinkaya, F. Ç., Öksüz, H. İ., & Öztürk, M. (2018). Etkileşimli Okuma Ve Kelime Hazinesi Dialogic Reading And Vocabulary. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 11(60), 705-715, doi:10.17719/jisr.2018.2825
- Chow, B. WY., Hui, A. NN., Li, Z. & Dong, Y. (2021). Dialogic teaching in English-as-a-second-language classroom: Its effects on first graders with different levels of vocabulary

- knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-23, doi: .o0r.g1/107.171/1773/61231626186828029098811399.
- Collet, V. S., & Greiner, A. C. (2020). Revisioning grammar instruction through collaborative lesson study: A new apprenticeship of observation. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 59(2), 95-120.
- Davies, M., Kiemer, K., & Meissel, K. (2017). Quality Talk and dialogic teaching—an examination of a professional development programme on secondary teachers’ facilitation of student talk. *British Educational Research Journal*, 43(5), 968-987.
- Edwards-Groves, C., & Davidson, C. (2020). Noticing the multidimensionality of active listening in a dialogic classroom. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 43(1), 83-94.
- Elhassan, I. B. M., & Adam, M. I. (2017). The Impact of Dialogic Teaching on English Language Learners’ speaking and Thinking Skills. *Arab World English Journal*, 8 (4), 49-67.
- Ergül, C., Akoğlu, G., Karaman, G., & Sarıca, A. D. (2017). Effects of Dialogic Reading Program on Later Reading Skills: Follow-Up Study. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, 10(2), 191-219.
- Fahim, M., & Haghani, M. (2012). Sociocultural perspectives on foreign language learning. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(4), 693-699, doi: 10.4304/jltr.3.4.693-699.
- Gonulal, T., & Loewen, S. (2018). Scaffolding technique. In Liantas, J. I. (Ed.), *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Teaching* (1st ed., pp.1-5). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. doi:10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0180.
- Groligi L., Cohrdes, C., Tiffin-Richards, S. P. & Schroeder, S. (2020). Narrative dialogic reading with wordless picture books: A cluster-randomized intervention study. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 51, 191–203, doi: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2019.11.002
- Hall, J. K., Vitanova, G., & Marchenkova, L. A. (Eds.). (2004). *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning: New perspectives*. Routledge.
- Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2001). What is scaffolding?. In Hammond, J (Ed), *Scaffolding teaching and learning in language and literacy education* (pp. 1-14). Australia: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Howe, C., & Abedin, M. (2013). Classroom dialogue: A systematic review across four decades of research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 43(3), 325-356.
- Howe, C., Tolmie, A., Thurston, A., Topping, K., Christie, D., Livingston, K., ... & Donaldson, C. (2007). Group work in elementary science: Towards organisational principles for supporting pupil learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 17(5), 549-563.
- Huang, A. (2020). The dialogical nature of language use in interactive listening: revisiting meaning in context. *Language awareness*, 29(1), 21-40.
- Huong, L. P. H. (2003, July). The mediational role of language teachers in sociocultural theory. *English Teaching Forum*, 41(3), 32-35.

- Jones, P., & Chen, H. (2016). The role of dialogic pedagogy in teaching grammar. *Research papers in education*, 31(1), 45-69.
- Kavanoz, H. S., & Yüksel G. (2010). Scaffolding strategies applied by student teachers to teach mathematics. *The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, 1(Special Issue), 25-36.
- Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R. & Nixon, R. (2014). *The action research planner. Doing critical participatory action research*. Singapore: Springer.
- Kim, M. Y., & Wilkinson, I. A. (2019). What is dialogic teaching? Constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing a pedagogy of classroom talk. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 21, 70-86.
- Kotaman, H. (2008). Impacts of dialogical storybook reading on young children's reading attitudes and vocabulary development. *Reading Improvement*, 45(2), 55-61.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lee, R. (2016, April). Implementing Dialogic Teaching in a Singapore English Language Classroom. *RELC Journal*, 1- 15. doi: 10.1177/0033688216631171
- Lefstein, A. (2006). Dialogue in schools: Towards a pragmatic approach. *Working articles in urban literacies*.
- Lefstein, A. (2010). More helpful as a problem than a solution. *Educational dialogues: Understanding and promoting productive interaction*, 170-191.
- Lefstein, A., & Snell, J. (2014). *Better than best practice: Developing teaching and learning through dialogue*. Routledge.
- Liubashenko, O., & Kornieva, Z. (2019). Dialogic interactive speaking skills assessment in the experiential teaching of technical English to tertiary school students. *Advanced Education*, 6(13), 18-25.
- Lyle, S. (1998) *Collaborative talk and making meaning in primary classrooms*. PhD dissertation, University of Reading, UK.
- Lyle, S. (2008) Learners' collaborative talk. In M. Martin-Jones, A-M. de Meija and N. Hornberger (eds) *Encyclopaedia of Language and Education Vol. 3: Discourse and Education* (pp. 279–290). New York: Springer.
- Lyle, S. (2008). Dialogic Teaching: Discussing Theoretical Contexts and Reviewing Evidence from Classroom Practice. *Language and Education*, 22(3), 222-240.
- Matsumoto, Y., & Dobs, A. M. (2017). Pedagogical gestures as interactional resources for teaching and learning tense and aspect in the ESL grammar classroom. *Language Learning*, 67(1), 7-42.
- Mercer, N. (1995) *The Guided Construction of Knowledge: Talk amongst Teachers and Learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.



- Mercer, N., & Howe, C. (2012). Explaining the dialogic processes of teaching and learning: The value and potential of sociocultural theory. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 1(1), 12-21.
- Michaels, S., O'Connor, C., & Resnick, L. B. (2008). Deliberative discourse idealized and realized: Accountable talk in the classroom and civic life. *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 27 (4), 283–297.
- Mohammed Elhassan, I. B., & Adam, M. I. (2017). The Impact of Dialogic Teaching on English Language Learners' Speaking and Thinking Skills. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 8(4), 49-67.
- Myhill, D. & Fisher, R. (2005) Informing practice in English: A review of recent research in literacy and the teaching of English.
- Nesari, A. J. (2015). Dialogism versus Monologism: A Bakhtinian approach to teaching. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 205, 642-647.
- Niknezhad Naeijabad, F., Khodareza, M. R., & Mashhadi Heidar, D. (2020). Promoting Dialogic Talk in a Speaking Classroom: Rethinking Bakhtinian Pedagogy. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 13(26), 160-181.
- Nystrand, M. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- O'Connor, K. (2013). Class participation: Promoting in-class student engagement. *Education*, 133, 340–344.
- Opel, A., Ameer, S. S., & Aboud, F. E. (2009). The effect of preschool dialogic reading on vocabulary among rural Bangladeshi children. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 48 (2009), 12-20.
- Ozcelik, H. N., Van den Branden, K., & Van Steendam, E. (2019). Listening comprehension problems of FL learners in a peer interactive, self-regulated listening task. *International Journal of Listening*, 1-14.
- Putambekar, S., & Hübscher, R. (2005). Tools for scaffolding students in a complex learning environment: what have we gained and what have we missed?. *Educational Psychologist*, 40(1), 1–12
- Reznitskaya, A. (2012). Dialogic teaching: Rethinking language use during literature discussions. *The Reading Teacher*, 65(7), 446-456.
- Reznitskaya, A., & Gregory, M. (2013). Student thought and classroom language: Examining the mechanisms of change in dialogic teaching. *Educational Psychologist*, 48(2), 114e133.
- Reznitskaya, A., Kuo, L. J., Clark, A. M., Miller, B., Jadallah, M., & Anderson, R. C. (2009). Collaborative reasoning: A dialogic approach to group discussions. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 39(1), 29–48.
- Robertson, M., Macdonald, S., Starks, D., & Nicholas, H. (2018). Enabling change in EFL

- teachers' ideologies about grammar and grammar teaching through alternative pedagogies. *System*, 72, 75-84.
- Sedlacek, M., & Sedova, K. (2017). How many are talking? The role of collectivity in dialogic teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 85, 99-108.
- Sedova, K. (2017). A case study of a transition to dialogic teaching as a process of gradual change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 278-290.
- Sedova, K., Salamounova, Z., & Svaricek, R. (2014). Troubles with dialogic teaching. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 3(4), 274-285.
- Serrano, M. A., Mirceva, J., & Larena, R. (2010). Dialogic Imagination in Literacy Development. *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 15(2), 191-205.
- Shooshtari, Z.G., & Mir, F. (2014). ZPD, tutor; peer scaffolding: sociocultural theory in writing strategies application. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1771-1776, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.605.
- Simsek, Z. C., & Işıkoğlu Erdoğan, N. (2020). Comparing the effects of different book reading techniques on young children's language development. *Reading and Writing*, 34, 817-839.
- Suryati, N., Furaidah, & Saukah, A. (2017). The effects of dialogic reading strategy on efl young learners' reading comprehension skills. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 23(2), 176-182.
- Tanış, A., Şensoy, H. & Atay, D. (2020). The effects of L1 use and dialogic instruction on EFL writing. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 1–21. doi: 10.32601/ejal.710178
- Teo, P. (2016). Exploring the space for dialogic teaching: A study of teacher talk at the pre-university level in Singapore. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 56, 47–60.
- van der Stuyf, R. R. (2002). Scaffolding as a teaching strategy. Retrieved 7 August, 2019, from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Scaffolding-as-a-Teaching-Strategy-Stuyf/59e6466c1360b0a8b3f53535668ea3ab2cf35081>
- Verenikina, I. (2008). Scaffolding and learning: Its role in nurturing new learners. In P. Kell, W. Vialle, D. Konza, & G. Vogl (Eds.), *Learning and the learner: Exploring learning for new times* (pp. 161–180). Wollongong: University of Wollongong, Australia.
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: the Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge University Press, MA.
- Wells, G. (2015). Dialogic learning: Talking our way into understanding. In: T. Dragonas (Eds.), *Education as social construction: Contributions to theory, research and practice*. Chagrin Falls, OH: Taos Institute.
- Zangoei, A., & Davoudi, M. (2016). Socially constructed mechanism in EFL writing: A case study of scaffold planning in a remote area. *Sociala Sciences and Humanities*, 24(4), 1279-1291.

Zayed, J. (2016). Dialogic Teaching to Improve Students' Learning: A Discussion with Reference to Teacher Education in KSA. A Paper Presented at Higher Education in Arab Homelands towards International Competitiveness. Retrieved 15 May, 2021, from, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED583668>.

---

### **Copyrights**

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).