

Is it possible to have a dialogic English language classroom? Challenges and advantages

Selen Beyazbal* , Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Canakkale, Turkiye <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7326-3424>

Osman Yilmaz Kartal, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Canakkale, Turkiye, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2922-0069>

Suggested Citation:

Beyazbal, S. & Kartal, O.Y. (2024). Is it possible to have a dialogic English language classroom? Challenges and advantages. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 19(1), 17-31. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v19i1.9286>

Received from July 10, 2023; revised from September 19, 2023; accepted from January 21, 2024.

Selection and peer review under the responsibility of Prof. Dr. Hafize Keser, Ankara University, Turkey (retired)

©2024 by the authors. Licensee United World Innovation Research and Publishing Center, North Nicosia, Cyprus.

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

iThenticate Similarity Rate: %8

Abstract

The research aims to investigate are opportunities and challenges in English language teaching classrooms for dialogic teaching. To achieve the aim of the research, a multiple case study design was chosen. The cases were determined by considering the socio-economic, socio-cultural, and success levels of the schools. The data are obtained from qualitative techniques which are observation of the class and interviews with teachers. The study group consisted of students in 5th grade and English Language Teachers. The findings of the article consist of observing the dialogues in the classrooms using a structured observation form and interviews with teachers using a semi-structured interview form. In the results, 3 monologic cases, semi-dialogic case and a dialogic case was observed. In the interviews, although teachers' positive views about dialogic teaching in language classroom, in observations, the monologic learning environment was predominant. The main reason of the challenge is that teachers didn't have competence how to use dialogic techniques in language classrooms. For advantages, it was observed that willingness of teacher and student to interact in classrooms. The research offers new insights for further practice and research, in terms of identifying challenges and advantages for the application of dialogic teaching.

Keywords: Dialogy; dialogic classroom; dialogic teaching; English language; language teaching

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Selen Beyazbal, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Canakkale, Turkiye
E-mail address: beyazbalselen@hotmail.com

1. Introduction

The use of language in education, which dates back to Socratic dialogue, has recently been preferred as an instructional method in the classroom. It is claimed that the use of language in the classroom constitutes the social foundations of thinking and learning in Bakhtin and Vygotsky's views (Renshaw, 2004). Alexander (2005) also, constructed the use of language in the classroom and formed the structure of dialogic teaching which is a learning approach.

Recently, the reasons for the widespread use of language as a method in classes may be the rise of constructivism in education, emphasis on student-centered classes, encouraging the active participation of students, and the facilitator role of the teacher (Zhang & Zhang, 2020). For this reason, in dialogic pedagogy, individuals are expected to be exposed to an inter-thinking atmosphere through interaction or to make sense of information (Dawes, 2012; Mercer, 2000). The concept of inter-thinking underlines the strategy that students will use in a collaborative learning environment by using language as a tool (Cui & Teo, 2021; Emir & Yangin-Ekşi, 2024). The feature corresponds to the characteristics of the constructivist perspective.

Constructivism in dialogic teaching is both the interpersonal concrete constructing of the language (or talk) in the classroom and the constructing of thoughts by using the language as a tool. The inter-thinking concept, which is underlined in dialogic teaching, is also based on the construction of thoughts via language (Palmgren-Neuvonen et al., 2021). In social constructivism, interactive classroom environment, awareness of the zone of proximal development, and scaffolding concept integration are stated to contribute to the actualization of learning (Chaiklin, 2003; Vygotsky & Cole, 1978). In radical constructivism, knowledge must be constructed actively by people and needs multiple perspectives of individuals (Laroche, 2000). Similarly, a common idea is not always tried to be reached in speech types of dialogic teaching (Alexander, 2005), also different views are important.

The main reason for the paper is the fundamental problems of teaching language in Turkey and the world. Some of the problems are challenges in the education of foreign language teachers (Kırkgöz, 2008), challenges in the curricula (Altan, 2017), teacher attitudes and roles (Vitthal, 2010; Zou, 2013), motivation and worries of students (Chen & Lee, 2011; Cook, 2001; İliç & Arıkan, 2016; Llurda, 2005; Stroud & Wee, 2006; Woodrow, 2006). Moreover, critical pedagogy in language learning criticizes the hegemony of one culture on other cultures because of political and economic reasons. Lin (2012) claims that dialogic pedagogy enables minorities to speak in the classroom and allows for the subjectification of the content.

Khan (2020) claimed that dialogic teaching has no direct effect on language learning. The reason of it, the flexible nature of dialogic teaching and the difficulty of controlling the variables in the classroom environment diversify the results of dialogic teaching studies. On the contrary, Chow et al. (2023) concluded that vocabulary teaching based on dialogic teaching intervention program facilitated expressing vocabulary knowledge of learners with low and high vocabulary while gaining awareness of learners with high vocabulary. Also, Lee (2016) stated that by moving away from predictable answers in the classroom, providing more opportunities for students to talk, and creating a questioning environment where reciprocity was employed, thinking skills were developed in the classroom where ideas are examined, and alternative answers emerge. Dialogic teaching studies investigate the thinking skills development with language learning instead of teaching a language. However, the more students are involved in dialogic interaction, the more learning is maximized (Sedova et al. 2014).

Dialogic teaching is both a classroom method to teach and a classroom interaction style that foster to gain autonomy for students in learning. Focusing only on enhancing learning with dialogic teaching can be limited. It can also be observed that the dialogic structure is reflected in the students' work, writings, and thinking systems (Chmarkh, 2021). Similarly, Rapanta (2021) highlighted those dialogic practices in classrooms enhanced students' writing skills in essays. Therefore, there is a need for the studies that design dialogic intervention environments in language teaching, especially in the development of skills.

While interactions are vital to use the language by nature in language classrooms, it can be unclear whether the interactions are dialogic or monologic. It is important both language teaching and the transformation of interaction in the classroom. Dialogic teaching and classroom-talk approaches can prioritize equity of opportunities. Ferrada (2020) stated that dialogic classrooms prioritize classroom interaction transformation and construction of collective objectives. Wu (2001) also states the existence of difficulties due to a lack of materials despite the importance of foreign language education in China. The result reflects a similar situation in Turkey due to the low socio-economic situation.

Dialogic teaching provides equity of opportunities because it is both cost-free and has a transformative function. For these reasons, it is thought that determining the challenges and advantages of dialogic teaching on the paper will contribute to the field of dialogic practice and frame the language teaching with dialogic teaching. It is argued that future studies are needed to define the frame of dialogic teaching and adapt it to the classroom environment (Rapanta et. al., 2021). Also, Elhassan and Adam (2017) suggest that challenges are defined to frame dialogic teaching as a classroom method used to develop students speaking and thinking skills.

The paper investigated the challenges and advantages of dialogic teaching in English language (as a foreign language) classrooms. Five different (cultural, economic, and socio-cultural differences) schools are defined for the research. The advantages and challenges of dialogic teaching were observed in five different schools. Teachers' views about what these opportunities and challenges could be and why they might occur were obtained. The paper is assumed to be important for the development of dialogic teaching practices.

On the paper, it is based on Alexander's conception of Dialogic pedagogy. The conception includes types of speech based on students' active construction of knowledge. Kim and Wilkinson (2019) highlighted that Alexander's dialogic conception has a big role in education in Europe, the USA, and England. Also, in cultural perspectives Alexander's dialogic conception is culturally sensitive. In foreign language teaching classrooms, it is functional to bridge the gap between target culture and students' own cultures.

1.1. Alexander's Dialogic Teaching

Dialogic teaching is the construction of a learning environment where learners work together to support each other to shape knowledge cumulatively and in an inter-thinking way by organizing the speech purposefully. Alexander has developed dialogic teaching to reach different perspectives in the learning environment (Phillipson & Wegerif, 2016). Alexander (2005) expressed dialogic teaching as a learning atmosphere that includes interaction, question-answer, feedback, exchange, discussion-reconciliation, sufficient professional knowledge on the subject, classroom relations, and organizational knowledge beyond a speech.

The basic framework of dialogic teaching aims to help learners be active and to expand their thinking levels of learners and to improve their understanding-learning levels (Alexander, 2005). As learning makes sense of their lives in daily life dialogues and an argumentation-based process, it also supports active, democratic, and critical participation in the classroom environment. Also, It enables students' autonomy in the learning process with their active participation in the classroom.

1.3. Purpose of study

The paper investigated the challenges and advantages of dialogic teaching in English language (as a foreign language) classrooms. Five (5) different (cultural, economic, and socio-cultural differences) schools are defined for the research. The advantages and challenges of dialogic teaching were observed in five different schools. Teachers' views about what these opportunities and challenges could be and why they might occur were obtained. The paper is assumed to be important for the development of dialogic teaching practices.

2. Methods and materials

To investigate the challenges and advantages of the implementation of dialogic teaching in the 5th-grade English teaching process, a multi-case study was chosen from qualitative research methods. In multiple-case studies, it is aimed to examine the case in different situations comparatively. It is considered that different socioeconomic levels, ethnic diversity, academic achievement levels, and applied time variables are crucial in determining the challenges and advantages in the learning environment. A multiple-case study was preferred to ensure the external validity of the study and to see the distribution of the challenges and advantages in different situations.

In the paper, schools are divided into five groups. The characteristics of the schools are presented below.

- Case A: the school, located in the city center, has a high level of success. Its socio-economic level is in the middle class. In the school, students take 3 hours of English lessons per week. The ethnicity of the school shows similar characteristics to the environment. There are 22 students in the classroom.
- Case B: the school, located in the city center, has a high level of success. Its socio-economic level is in the middle class. In the school, students take 15 hours of English lessons per week. The ethnicity of the school shows similar characteristics to the environment. There are 42 students in the classroom.
- Case C: the school, located in the city center, has a low level of success. Its socio-economic level is in the low class. In the school, students take 3 hours of English lessons per week. The ethnic origin of the school consists of minorities in Turkey. There are 25 students in the classroom.
- Case D: It is a private school in the city center. It has a high level of success. Its socio-economic level is in the high and middle classes. The ethnicity of the school shows similar characteristics to the environment. In the school, students take 15 hours of English lessons per week. There are 15 students in the classroom.
- Case E: The school is in a village close to the city center. It has a low level of success. Its socio-economic level is in the low class. In the school, students take 3 hours of English lessons per week. The ethnicity of the school shows similar characteristics to the environment. There are 17 students in the classroom.

2.3. Participants

Group A- Teacher A: He has a bachelor's degree and 27 years of work experience. Also, he has a low level of interest in scientific studies.

Group B- Teacher B: She has studied for a master's degree. She has also 15 years of work experience and is a follower of scientific studies.

Group C- Teacher C: she has a master's degree and 19 years of work experience. She is also a follower of scientific studies.

Group D- Teacher D: She has studied for a master's degree and has 12 years of work experience. Also, she is a follower of scientific studies.

Group E- Teacher E: She has a master's degree and 18 years of work experience. She is also a follower of scientific studies.

2.4. Data collection tool

A structured observation form was used in the research. Suggestions were obtained from the field expert for the measurement tool. For the reliability of the observation form, a pilot application occurred in an online course. A semi-structured interview form was used to interview teachers. For the validity of the measurement tool, opinions were obtained from the field experts. Themes and codes of measurement tools are given in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Themes and codes of the research

	Themes	Codes
Dialogic Teaching	Collective	Classroom activity selection Determining his/her role in group work
	Reciprocal	Listening to each other Sharing ideas/Brainstorming Trying to understand others' points of view
	Supportive	Feel free for self-expression Not to worry about doing wrong Helping each other Getting a common idea together
	Cumulative	Building knowledge of each other's opinion To contribute by producing a thesis or anti-thesis
	Purposeful	Constructing knowledge on experiences Creating opportunities for students' communication Using questions to guide the conversation Encouraging students to ask questions
Monologic Teaching	Monology	Authoritarian facts -program as an authority -book as an authority -teacher as an authority -peers as an authority Traditional teaching approaches Reaching the only correct information Outcome-oriented lessons

2.5. Data analysis techniques

Analysis of data obtained from observations and interviews has been systematized under four themes. These themes are dialogy, monology, opportunities, and challenges. The observation was

collected with a structured observation measurement tool and themes were formed. The interview data were analyzed with the MAXQDA 2018 program.

2.6. Ethics

All ethical considerations were made to ensure the voluntary participation and the confidentiality of the participants in the research. All permissions were also sought from the authorities.

3. Results

Table 2

The dialogic level and features of cases

	Case A	Case B	Case C	Case D	Case E
Dialogic Level	Monology Based	Semi-Dialogic Based	Monology Based	Dialogic Based	Monology Based
Dialogic features	-Dialogic teaching features couldn't be observed.	-Students' attitudes to support each other in speaking -Students were able to express themselves freely in the environment	- Dialogic teaching features couldn't be observed.	-Supportive attitude of students and teachers - Teacher's purposeful arrangement of dialogues - Students' effort to reach different thoughts (Cumulative feature) - Semi-structured teaching environment - The use of different variations in speech types (Repoitere of talk)	-Dialogic teaching features couldn't be observed.
Monology Features	-Traditional teaching approaches - Reaching the only correct knowledge - Book as an authority -only teacher-student interaction -Teacher as an authority -Competitive learning environment	-Traditional teaching approaches and techniques - Reaching the only correct information -Teacher as an authority	- Traditional teaching approaches and techniques. -Teacher as an authority - Only teacher-student interaction -Competitive learning environment - Reaching the only correct information	-limited classroom environment for student-student interaction - Teacher guidance in discussions -Outcome-oriented lesson	-Traditional teaching approaches -Structured learning environment activities - Reaching the only correct knowledge - only teacher-student interaction
Opportunities	-Supportive Teacher -Motivated students	-Supportive teacher -Motivated students	-Motivated students	-Supportive teacher -Motivated students - Students use the target language freely - Students are eager to get other's opinions -Enhanced supportive attitude	-Motivated students
Challenges	-lack of sufficient interaction environment	-Dominant teacher-student interaction	- Dominant teacher-student interaction	- Lesson time anxiety (time is limited) - Limitation of deep inquiries	-Insufficient use of target language

-insufficient use of target language	- Structured individual activities	- lack of sufficient interaction environment	-Whole-classroom teaching method.	- the students' level of inquiry/discussion is deficient.
-the students' level of inquiry/discussion is deficient.	-whole classroom teaching approach	- Insufficient use of target language		- Dominant teacher-student interaction

3.3. Case A

In case A, the dialogic features are not encountered directly. The teacher's attitude was found to be positive for the dialogic structure. It was observed that students are allowed to speak and participate in activities directly. At the same time, it was observed that the students were motivated to participate in the conversations. On the contrary, in the interviews, the teacher has negative views about the students working together. In addition, the teacher expresses that the students also want to work individually.

"Some of the students may feel sorry for others to express their opinions. Why are you getting involved? He says why are you getting mixed up and I can do it." (Teacher A)

From the expressions in the observations and interviews, it was found that the teacher did not favor constructivism and the students' working together, therefore the learning environment was not designed for dialogy.

"Constructivist activities are generally preferred in primary school." (Teacher A)

During the observations, it was found that the mother tongue was preferred more. In addition, it was observed that there is a traditional classroom seating arrangement and lessons occur based on the structured activities in the book. Considering these findings, it was observed that although the teacher allowed the students to express themselves, the lessons were designed according to monologic principles.

3.4. Case B

In two of the three lessons observed, semi-dialogic features were observed, while monology was observed in one. It was observed that the students in the classroom expressed themselves freely and supported each other even if a little. On the contrary, it was observed that the teacher uses traditional methods, teacher-student interaction, and aims to reach the knowledge in the curriculum. The teacher also supported these observations during the interviews.

"Lessons are mostly focused on the interaction of students and teachers. I think it is related to culture. We usually focus on listening and acquiring. We are stuck on allowing others to speak or asking questions" (Teacher B)

The questions asked by the teacher to the students during the observation coincide with the principles of reciprocity, purposeful, and supportive in dialogic teaching. It was observed that the teacher tries to apply the dialogic principles but remains at a limited level since in-depth discussions cannot be applied and organized.

"Think about what might happen in the future and make a sentence." (Teacher B)

"We and real people will be in a war." (Student 1)

"Aren't we real people?" (Teacher B)

"I don't think so." (Student 1)

"Okay." (Teacher B)

In general, it was seen that the teacher was aware of the importance of the dialogic structure in the observations and the interview. In practice, although they were limited, some initiatives were observed. It was observed that the main reason for this challenge stems from the whole-classroom teaching approach, structured activities, and student-teacher interaction.

3.5. Case C

In case C, monologic features are observed predominantly. Traditional teaching approaches, teacher-student approach, and reaching only correct knowledge are the main characteristics observed. The characteristics of the teacher as an authority can be seen below.

Why didn't you write the activities in the book? (Teacher C)

Silence...(Student1)

I will put sad faces on friends who do not write like that. I will put a smiley face on those who do the activities. Let your mothers see too. (Teacher C)

Although the students were motivated to talk, it was observed that they could not do it in a supportive way. Also, it was observed that a competitive environment was predominant.

The student tries to do the activity in front of the board (Student

You write very slowly. There is a lot more to do. (Student 2)

I agree. You must be a little bit faster. (Student 3)

Okay. (Student 1)

Although the students were motivated to participate in the activities, the use of their mother tongue was intensive, and limited student-student interaction was observed. The teacher also stated that the learning environment is monologic.

The teacher asks a question and gets an answer. After the task is done, a general speech is made. As a result, the teacher finishes the activity (Teacher C).

3.6. Case D

It was observed Dialogic features in two of the three lessons, and semi-dialogic features were observed in one. The supportive attitude of students and teachers, the teacher's purposeful arrangement of dialogues, students' effort to reach different thoughts (Cumulative feature), the semi-structured teaching environment, and the use of different variations in speech types (Repetition of talk) were observed in the learning environment.

The strength of student-student communication and their use of speaking repertoire were observed. It is seen below that the cumulative and reciprocity principles are actively used by the students.

What is the hourglass used for? (Teacher D)

Hourglass measures time (Student 1)

We can also use it while cooking eggs as it helps to measure time. (Student 2).

During the interviews, the teacher stated that she supports student-student interaction. In addition, he added that interaction decreases when there are structured activities.

If there is controlled activity, they do it individually first. Then I allow them to check with their partner. (Teacher D).

The limited duration of the lesson and the anxiety of achieving the goals during this period were observed as obstacles to dialogic teaching. The seating arrangement and the whole classroom approach are also considered obstacles to dialogic teaching.

3.7. Case E

In case E, monologic features were observed predominantly. Traditional teaching approaches, structured learning environment activities, reaching the only correct knowledge, and only teacher-student interaction were observed.

Do you think a goat can be a sheep? (Teacher E asked in a mother tongue)

Yes, maybe... (Student 1 answered in a mother tongue)

It means sheep. (Student 2 answered in a mother tongue)

No, it means goat/doe. (Student 3 answered in a mother tongue)

Insufficient use of target language and deficiency of the students' level of inquiry/discussion were also observed. During the interview, the teacher stated that she encouraged the students and allowed them to take part in the education process.

"I believe that the student should also be involved in carrying out the learning process.... In student-student interaction, I seriously care about the involvement of the student in the process, in sharing the idea, creating the knowledge pattern, and bringing resources to the classroom." (Teacher E).

In practice, contrary to what the teacher stated, it was not observed that the students were encouraged. The teacher stated that the basis of students' communication was based on manners, in other words, culture. The teacher also states that students have difficulty accessing education due to the difficult economic conditions of the students. Namely, it can be deduced that economic and cultural conditions directly affect access to education and when the time is shortened, the dialogic structure is a compelling factor to gain for students.

"In the classroom, in terms of manners, they have their own opinion accepted."

"Our students come from different villages by shuttle. Therefore, some students want to come to the courses on the weekend, but they cannot."

4. Discussion

In the data collected from observations and interviews, it was concluded that three of the five cases were monologic, one was semi-dialogic, and one was dialogic. In these cases, the most important opportunity is that students are eager to talk in classrooms and teachers encourage students to speak. Similarly, in practice, Juuti et al. (2020) concluded that dialogic talk took place very rarely in classrooms. However, Chow et. al. (2023) stated that in vocabulary teaching, when teachers were encouraged to use vocabulary more in the classroom, students experienced more interactional opportunities in the foreign language.

Although the attitude of teachers encouraging students to speak cannot be practically occurred in all cases, it was stated in the interviews that the teachers are aware of the importance of students' talk. In the dialogic pedagogy literature, Alexander (2005) stated that teachers' awareness of their students' needs is an important trigger for dialogic teaching. Similarly, Meissner and Timmers (2020) emphasize that teachers' questions and awareness are some important aids in directing students to dialogic teaching. Also, it was stated that one of the barriers to language-based learning approaches stems from problems related to teacher readiness and training (Alsoraihi, 2019). Although teachers' awareness of speaking is

important, using conversations and dialogues purposefully is the first step in transforming the learning environment into dialogic teaching. The monologic characteristics of teachers were observed predominantly in 3 monologic cases. It was observed that they could not transform the learning environment into dialogic teaching, could not use speeches for purposes, and could not create opportunities for student-student interaction. Similarly, Gupta and Lee (2015) found that teachers need to provide dialogic strategies to use the target language in the classroom. Sedova et al. (2014) observed that changing teacher interaction style changed students' interaction patterns. Therefore, renewing the teacher role will enable interactions to be dialogic.

In empirical studies, it has been emphasized that the effective use of talk by the teacher is important to increase the students' awareness and organize their thinking (Meissner & Timmers, 2020; Mercer & Howe, 2012). Also, Anton (1999) and Sewell (2003) observed that teachers' creation of student-based speaking environments made students responsible for their own learning. In language classrooms, it has been concluded that students with weak abstract associations benefit more from interactive learning. (Li & Jeong, 2020). Conversely, Khan (2020) claimed that dialogic teaching has no direct effect on language learning. Considering the studies are limited, there is a need for empirical studies on the productivity of language teaching using dialogic teaching in foreign language learning environments.

It was observed that teachers need to learn the repertoires of dialogic teaching. It was determined that teachers need to organize questions that lead students to deep discussions in dialogic and semi-dialogic cases. Although Applebee et al. (2003) suggested that teachers should use authentic questions to get students' opinions, it was observed that when using authentic questions, teachers strayed from learning outcomes and had difficulties organizing dialogues. In this context, it has been concluded that it is important for teachers to use their dialogic learning repertoire effectively. In particular, the support of the teacher is an important force in the development of language skills (Zou, 2013). Also, teaching teachers to use collaborative and open-ended questions can create an opportunity to put teachers' awareness into practice and to make the learning environment more dialogic. Similarly, Lehesvuori (2013) claims that teachers should learn to practice and choose dialogues in practice.

Language teachers need to effectively adapt the use of dialogic teaching techniques to language teaching. Sedova (2014) suggest that teacher education which based on Alexander's principles enables to learn interaction varieties. Lee (2016) observed that when exploratory talk was used in language classroom, students had more opportunities to construct their own learning together. Also, Chmarkh (2021) stated that teachers need to learn how to design dialogic environment in language classroom. In language classrooms, dialogic teaching methods, language teaching nature and interaction varieties should be intertwined.

Teacher-student interaction and the use of the whole classroom approach are observed in all cases. The situation may be due to the seating arrangement of the classroom, as well as not organizing the classroom interaction for the student-student chain. Lee (2016) observed that exploratory talk enables to share and build different ideas although whole classroom approach was used in language classroom. One of the main purposes of the dialogic learning environment is for the student to realize different ideas, reach a common idea or experience exchanging ideas (Phillipson & Wegerif, 2016). In the whole classroom approach, students can reach the ideas of others indirectly, namely, through the teacher. Chmarkh (2021) stated that at macro level, whole classroom approach enables to discuss the ideas however at micro level, peer or group discussion allows to expand their learning together in language classroom.

On the other hand, Mercer (2000) emphasizes that the basic structure for dialogic teaching is possible by creating an environment where they decide together and experience various conversations. Van Del Pol et al. (2017) found that while correct or wrong answers are sought in lessons with rule-based disciplines, more teacher-based approaches are used, while student-based approaches are used in lessons with social

disciplines. Similarly, in the research, although language teaching is a social discipline, it is recognized as a rule-based discipline in research. The main reason is that it still focuses on teaching grammar in language classrooms.

Although dialogic teaching characteristics appear in cases B and D (semi-dialogic and dialogic cases), there are no deep dialogues to evaluate an idea. Similarly, Lee (2016) found that although teachers encouraged speaking in the classroom, students did not have dialogues in the classroom that would create their own meanings. Also, Van Del Pol et al. (2017) claimed that high dialogic levels of the students were not sufficient for the dialogic environment because of their high participation in their research. However, dialogy is not a talk, it requires a structure in which there is question-answer, feedback, change, and discussion-reconciliation that they directly experience (Alexander, 2005).

Collaborative reasoning is possible, especially in classrooms where direct communication is predominant. Dialogy encourages learners to make sense of information through collaborative reasoning (Waggoner et al., 1995). Collaborative reasoning, which should also be the base of social constructivism, occurs when students encounter different claims and ideas (Waggoner et al., 1995). Similarly, Maine and Čermáková (2021) recommend that students should be taught to evaluate different viewpoints and ideas, not just accept, and reject other ideas in interaction.

In monologic cases, reaching the only correct knowledge, a competitive classroom environment, and a book as an authority was observed. These monologic characteristics negatively affect the ability of dialogue to construct its own interpretations for learners (Kinchin, 2004). The effort to reach objective knowledge directly creates authority. Similarly, Muhonen et al. (2016) observed that teacher directed discussions, contents and curriculum caused authoritative science classrooms. Also, when the classrooms in China are examined, it was found that the basis of monologic interaction stems from transmitting culture in education and that teacher is at the center of classroom interaction (Yang & Wang, 2022). Dialogy directly focuses on the changing of authority roles and equal distribution of roles (Lyle, 2008). Teachers' focus on achieving goals in their rigid curriculum and use of compulsory books naturally create an authoritative classroom environment.

In foreign language classrooms, the main goal is for students to use the language productively. The criterion of knowing a foreign language is expressed as the productive use of language in the classroom and outside the classroom environment (Preece & Bularafa, 2015). In foreign language teaching studies, it has been argued that interaction-based teaching improves the use of language (Yang-Frank et al., 2021). In the findings, it was observed that in cases B and D (semi-dialogic and dialogic cases), teachers and students tried to focus on the use of foreign languages. The main natural rule that makes language a living phenomenon is that people use it, personalize it, and their personalization is based on the choice of words and the unique use of grammar by those who use the language.

In the interviews with the teacher in case E, it was stated that the socio-economic and socio-cultural background caused challenges in the use of the language and the learning environment. In dialogic teaching, learners are expected to develop individual thinking and learning skills in their own culture and nature. Maine (2024) highlighted that cultural competence, interaction and self-expression are key words to build a bridge between past and present in changing society. It is thought that considering the chosen pedagogy (Hardman & Abd-Kadir, 2010) and culture is important in foreign language teaching. In the context of dialogic teaching, rather than focusing on a competitive environment, the focus is on teaching in which students will take the initiative and experience different experiences in the process (Shea, 2018). Further studies on the socio-economic and socio-cultural perspectives of dialogic teaching are also needed.

5. Conclusion

The paper investigated the challenges and advantages of dialogic teaching in English language (as a foreign language) classrooms. It was designed to reveal what monologic and dialogic characteristics consist of. Finally, the paper can contribute knowledge about how to implement dialogic teaching in language classrooms.

Based on the results reported above, teachers have a key role to enable interactions dialogic. Although teachers had awareness that interactions are vital in language classrooms, teachers were not well-equipped to share classroom roles with students. Therefore, teachers should be given in-service training on dialogic teaching and student-centered methods. It is thought that the curriculum, which will be prepared by considering foreign language education and the dialogic characteristics of groups, can provide an opportunity for the development of language skills. In addition, it is recommended to move the books and curriculum away from their authoritarian attitude in the classroom and to bring them into a more flexible form. Considering challenges and advantages presented, empirical studies should be conducted on the functionality of dialogic teaching and the use of dialogic teaching strategies in foreign language teaching.

Limitations of the study include the following:

- No video recording in observations was taken to prevent the natural environment from being affected by the researcher. An observation report was kept.
- The study is limited only to the examination of the learning environment for English language teaching as a foreign language.
- Observations are limited to course time. Extra-curricular hours are not included in the research.
- Interviews are limited to the teachers of the observed classes. Other teachers in the school are not included in the research.

Acknowledgement: The paper was created from thesis "Investigation of opportunities and challenges for the implementation of dialogical pedagogy in English language teaching process

References

- Alexander, R. J. (2005). Teaching through dialogue: The first year. *London: London Borough of Barking and Dagenham*. <http://robinaalexander.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Bardaglea-eval-report-05.pdf>
- Alsoraihi, M. H. (2019). Bridging the Gap between Discourse Analysis and Language Classroom Practice. *English Language Teaching*, 12(8), 79-88. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1222308>
- Altan, M. Z. (2017). Globalization, English Language Teaching, and Turkey. *International Journal of Languages Education and Teaching*, 5(4), 764-776. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ijlet/issue/82539/1426461>
- Antón, M. (1999). The discourse of a learner-centered classroom: Sociocultural perspectives on teacher-learner interaction in the second-language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(3), 303-318. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/0026-7902.00024>
- Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (2003). Discussion-based approaches to developing understanding: Classroom instruction and student performance in middle and high school English. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 685-730. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.3102/00028312040003685>
- Chaiklin, S. (2003). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction. *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*, 1(2), 39-64. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/1F8B412CF2A358988F0E7C2ABBCECBA3>
- Chen, C. M., & Lee, T. H. (2011). Emotion recognition and communication for reducing second-language speaking anxiety in a web-based one-to-one synchronous learning environment. *British Journal of Educational*

Beyazbal, S. & Kartal, O.Y. (2024). Is it possible to have a dialogical English language classroom? Challenges and advantages. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 19(1), 17-31. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v19i1.9286>

- Technology*, 42(3), 417-440. <https://bera-journals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.01035.x>
- Chow, B. W., Hui, A. N., Li, Z., & Dong, Y. (2023). Dialogic teaching in English as a second language classroom: Its effects on first graders with different levels of vocabulary knowledge. *Language teaching research*, 27(6), 1408-1430. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820981399>
- Chmarkh, M. (2021). A dialogic teaching approach to undergraduate ESL instruction. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(3), 1-13. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3879879
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423. <https://www.utpjournals.press/doi/abs/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>
- Cui, R., & Teo, P. (2021). Dialogic education for classroom teaching: a critical review. *Language and Education*, 35(3), 187-203. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09500782.2020.1837859>
- Dawes, L. (2012). Speaking, listening, and thinking with computers. In *Teaching Speaking and Listening in the Primary School*, David Fulton Publishers, 103-120. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780203963265-7/speaking-listening-thinking-computers-lyn-dawes>
- 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. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no4.4>
- Ferrada, D. (2020). Dialogic pedagogy linking worlds: Participatory community classrooms. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 28(1), 131-146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2019.1615534>
- Gupta, A., & Lee, G. L. (2015). Dialogic teaching approach with English language learners to enhance oral language skills in the content areas. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(5), 10-17. https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1029&context=teachinglearning_fac_pubs
- Emir, G., & Yangın-Ekşi, G. (2024). The role of telecollaboration in English language teacher education: a systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(1), 3. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40561-024-00290-0>
- Grossen, M., & Muller Mirza, N. (2020). Talking about cultural diversity at school: Dialogical tensions and obstacles to secondarisation. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 35(2), 243-264. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10212-019-00442-8>
- Gupta, A., & Lee, G. L. (2015). Dialogic teaching approach with English language learners to enhance oral language skills in the content areas. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(5). https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/teachinglearning_fac_pubs/19/
- Hardman, F., & Jan, A. K. (2010). Classroom discourse: towards a dialogic pedagogy. In *The Routledge international handbook of English, language and literacy teaching*, Routledge, 254-263. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780203863091-25/classroom-discourse-frank-hardman-abd-kadir-jan>
- İliç, U., & Arıkan, Y. D. (2016). Analysis of student views on foreign language learning in Second Life environment. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(4), 364-395. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/tojq/issue/24763/261748>
- Juuti, K., Loukomies, A., & Lavonen, J. (2020). Interest in dialogic and non-dialogic teacher talk situations in middle school science classroom. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 18(8), 1531-1546. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10763-019-10031-2>
- Khan, I. U. (2020). Exploring the role of dialogic teaching in improving learners' spoken English at intermediate level in district Bannu. *sjesr*, 3(3), 90-95. <https://ojs.sjesr.org.pk/index.php/ojs/article/view/259>
- 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. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210656118301764>
- Kinchin, I. (2010). Investigating students' beliefs about their preferred role as learners. *Educational research*, 46(3), 301-312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/001318804200277359>
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2008). A case study of teachers' implementation of curriculum innovation in English language teaching in Turkish primary education. *Teaching and teacher education*, 24(7), 1859-1875. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X08000280>

- Beyazbal, S. & Kartal, O.Y. (2024). Is it possible to have a dialogical English language classroom? Challenges and advantages. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 19(1), 17-31. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v19i1.9286>
- Larochelle, M. (2000). Radical Constructivism: Notes on viability, ethics, and other educational issues. In L. P. Steffe & P. W. Thompson (Eds.), *Radical Constructivism in action: Building on the pioneering work of Ernst von Glasersfeld*, Routledge Falmer, 55-68.
- Lee, R. (2016). Implementing dialogic teaching in a Singapore English language classroom. *RELC Journal*, 47(3), 279-293. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0033688216631171>
- Lehesvuori, S. (2013). *Towards dialogic teaching in science: Challenging classroom realities through teacher education* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Jyväskylä). https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/41268/1/978-951-39-5152-8_vaitos10052013.pdf
- Li, P., & Jeong, H. (2020). The social brain of language: grounding second language learning in social interaction. *npj Science of Learning*, 5(1), 8. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41539-020-0068-7>
- Lin, C. C. (2012). *Centering English language learners in the praxis of dialogic pedagogy*. Montclair State University. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/186314449a175c3247ad88d3b16c7b6e/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750>
- Llurda, E. (2005). *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (Vol. 5). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Lyle, S. (2008). Dialogic teaching: Discussing theoretical contexts and reviewing evidence from classroom practice. *Language and education*, 22(3), 222-240. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09500780802152499>
- Maine, F. (2024). The role of oral language in the dialogic primary classroom. *Education 3-13*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2024.2357894>
- Maine, F., & Čermáková, A. (2021). Using linguistic ethnography as a tool to analyse dialogic teaching in upper primary classrooms. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 29, 100500. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210656121000118>
- Meissner, H., & Timmers, R. (2020, February). Young musicians' learning of expressive performance: the importance of dialogic teaching and modeling. In *Frontiers in Education* 5, 11. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2020.00011/full>
- Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and minds: How we use language to think together*. New York: Routledge. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(02\)00044-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00044-1)
- 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. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210656112000049>
- Muhonen, H., Rasku-Puttonen, H., Pakarinen, E., Poikkeus, A. M. & Lerkkanen, M. K. (2016). Scaffolding through dialogic teaching in early school classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 55, 143-154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.01.007>
- Palmgren-Neuvonen, L., Littleton, K., & Hirvonen, N. (2021). Dialogic spaces in divergent and convergent collaborative learning tasks. *Information and Learning Sciences*, 122(5/6), 409-431. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/ILS-02-2020-0043/full/html>
- Phillipson, N., & Wegerif, R. (2016). *Dialogic education: Mastering core concepts through thinking together*. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315621869/dialogic-education-neil-phillipson-rupert-wegerif>
- Preece, D., S., A. & Bularafa, W., M. (2015). Community of inquiry method and language skills acquisition: Empirical evidence. *Journal of education and practice*, 6(27), 89-93.
- Rana, K., & Rana, K. (2022). English teachers' awareness of collaborative learning: a case study in Nepal. *SN Social Sciences*, 2(7), 107. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s43545-022-00405-9>
- Rapanta, C. (2021). Can teachers implement a student-centered dialogical argumentation method across the curriculum? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 105, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103404>
- Rapanta, C., Garcia-Mila, M., Ortiz, A. R., & Gonçalves, C. (2021). El reto de la enseñanza dialógica inclusiva en la escuela pública secundaria. *Comunicar: Revista Científica de Comunicación y Educación*, (66), 21-31. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=7696989>
- Renshaw, P. D. (2004). Dialogic learning teaching and instruction: Theoretical roots and analytical frameworks. In *Dialogic learning: Shifting perspectives to learning, instruction, and teaching*, Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 1-15. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/1-4020-1931-9_1

- Beyazbal, S. & Kartal, O.Y. (2024). Is it possible to have a dialogical English language classroom? Challenges and advantages. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*, 19(1), 17-31. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v19i1.9286>
- Sedova, K., Svaricek, R., Sedlacek, M., & Salamounava, Z. (2014). On the way to dialogic teaching: Action research as a means to change classroom discourse. *Studia Paedagogica*, 19(4), 9-43. <https://doi.org/10.5817/SP2014-4-2>
- Sewell, H. D. (2003). *The good language learner: Second language acquisition*. Retrieved from https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college_artslaw/cels/essays/secondlanguage/SewellSLA.pdf
- Sewell, A. (2011). Developing dialogue in the classroom: A cultural tool for learning together. *Classroom Discourse*, 2(2), 268-281. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19463014.2011.614063>
- Shea, D. P. (2019). Trying to teach dialogically: The good, the bad, and the misguided. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(6), 787-804. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1362168818768982>
- Stroud, C., & Wee, L. (2006). Anxiety and identity in the language classroom. *Relc Journal*, 37(3), 299-307. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0033688206071311>
- Van De Pol, J., Brindley, S., & Higham, R. J. E. (2017). Two secondary teachers' understanding and classroom practice of dialogic teaching: A case study. *Educational Studies*, 43(5), 497-515. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03055698.2017.1293508>
- Vitthal, G. (2010). Techniques for Developing Speaking Skills and Fluency. *IUP Journal of Soft Skills*, 4. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1610013c>
- Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Waggoner, M., Chinn, C., Yi, H., & Anderson, R. C. (1995). Collaborative reasoning about stories. *Language Arts*, 72(8), 582-589. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41482243>
- Woodrow, L. (2006). Academic success of international postgraduate education students and the role of English proficiency. *University of Sydney papers in TESOL*, 1(1), 51-70. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=249e28eec24b27c9c9ceefbbe655f81c46bca82f>
- Wu, Y. A. (2001). English language teaching in China: Trends and challenges. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 191-194.
- Yang, G., Quanjian, G., Michael, L., Chun, L., & Chuang, W. (2021). Developing literacy or focusing on interaction: New Zealand students' strategic efforts related to Chinese language learning during study abroad in China. *System*, 98, 102462. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X21000166>
- Yang, Z., & Wang, S. (2022). Dialogic teaching in secondary classrooms in China: Features, commonalities, and distinctiveness. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 34, 100619. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210656122000204>
- Zhang, L. J., & Zhang, D. (2020). Dialogic discussion as a platform for constructing knowledge: student-teachers interaction patterns and strategies in learning to teach English. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1), 22. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40862-020-00101-2>
- Zou, B. (2013). Teachers' support in using computers for developing students' listening and speaking skills in pre-sessional English courses. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 26(1), 83-99. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09588221.2011.631143>