

The Dialogic Education: Models, Approaches, and Its Implementation

Elok Putri Nimasari¹, Slamet Setiawan², Ahmad Munir³, Suhartono⁴

Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Corresponding email: elok.21016@mhs.unesa.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Dialogic education refers to the interaction occurred in a group work dialogue between teacher and students. It is not limited to written and verbal discourse; it also encompasses the broader notion that the interaction of diverse ideas can result in mutual insights. The concept of dialogic education involves how teachers elicit students' 'common sense' perspectives through classroom dialogue, interact with their emerging ideas, and assist students in overcoming misunderstandings during the learning process. By analyzing and creating dialogic interactions principals in the classroom, dialogic education not only stimulates broader and more comprehensive thinking and learning among students, but it also transforms classroom relationships, realigning the conventional power structure between teachers and students. This paper reviews the importance of the dialogic education by giving discussion on the models of the dialogic education, the approaches to study the dialogic education, and its implementation across countries. This paper also concludes the review by adding some future research direction according to the novelty and gaps from the earlier literature.

Keywords: conversation analysis, corpus linguistics, dialogic education, sociocultural discourse analysis, thematic content analysis

First Receive:

08 November 2022

Revised:

03 January 2023

Accepted:

18 March 2023

Final Proof Received:

29 April 2023

Published:

01 June 2023

How to cite (in APA style):

Nimasari, E.P., Setiawan, Slamet., Munir, Ahmad., & Suhartono. (2023) The Dialogic Education: Models, Approaches, and Its Implementation, *ELITE Journal*. 5 (2), 389-402

INTRODUCTION

Mercer, Wegerif, et al. (2019) have introduced the approach of teaching and learning known as dialogic education which purposes to involve students in classroom conversations about accountability, reciprocity, equality, and collectivity. In this dialogue context, students are able to deliver their own perspectives and responses those of others, therefore they can develop their cognitive abilities. The teacher and students' language used, both verbal and written forms in the classroom context for the purpose of communication can be analyzed to examine the teaching and learning practices, the language acquisition, the teaching evaluation, and the teacher professional development. In the classrooms that promote the value of this language used, known as the classroom discourse, students' comprehension can be engaged since they are actively involved to discuss a problem or a topic during learning process. The purposeful dialogue in the classroom facilitates students to develop their critical

Available online at <https://www.elitejournal.org/index.php/ELITE>

concepts and ideas through explanation, question and answer session, reflection, and synthetization. The dialogue technique encourages reflection and provides a content analysis for evaluative purposes. Dialogs are an excellent method for fostering inclusive classroom practices. It can interactively be utilized to explore classroom beliefs, cognition and behaviors and to promote processes for reflective evaluation of teaching and learning practice (Pilkington, 2013). Moreover, dialogue and reflection stimulate new methods of conceptualizing and examining practice-based knowledge (Peel, 2021). By analyzing the classroom discussion, we can determine what stimulates the acquisition of a language, referring to the subconscious activities rather than the explicit instruction-based learning. However, the 'dialogue' concept implemented in the 'dialogic education' practice, particularly in the classroom context, is never simple. Although the function of dialogic education in the development of students' thinking and knowledge has been conceived, this topic has not been extensively researched in many classrooms (Haneda, 2017; Howe et al., 2019; Howe & Abedin, 2013; Mercer, Hennessy, et al., 2019; Teo, 2016). We need to investigate how the classroom dialogue works and what aspects that may involve to have a more insights in the implication.

Having a well-known concept and purpose of the dialogue needs a comprehensive and accurate interpretation of the information created through conversation. The learning process in the classroom is contextual because the cultural aspects that emerge to occupy the individual rely on the space and social background from which the people interact with other people in praxis. This makes the classroom learning process contextual (Alexander, 2018; Cui & Teo, 2021; Howe & Abedin, 2013). One of an important aspect of classroom dialogue study is classroom participation (Song, 2015). In the field of education, the concept of participation is not uncommon; yet, it is rarely defined, and there is not much discussion over whether or not a specific behavior is considered to be active involvement or participation. In Indonesian pedagogical context, it is common to have a teacher talks more dominant compared to the students. The Indonesian curriculum development during the last 10 years has shown the determined effort to engage students actively in the classroom. The findings of classroom dialogue can reveal in which educational dimension it can help students think critically and comprehend content more thoroughly.

Research on dialogic education has been increasingly popular in the last decades due to the acknowledged benefits of discourse in academic achievement, professional development and knowledge (Alexander, 2018; Chien, 2021; Fisher, 2007; Hill & Vaughan, 2018; Howe & Abedin, 2013; Mercer et al., 2009; Molinari & Mameli, 2010; Peel, 2021; Peled-Elhanan & Blum-Kulka, 2006; Pilkington, 2013; Simoncini et al., 2014)(Howe & Abedin, 2013). The lack of alignment in the dialectical education discipline, how it should be conducted, and the effects it has on students acquiring the aforementioned benefits has contributed to dialogic education research development. The following discussion reviews the results of the research focusing on the models of dialogic education, the approaches to study the classroom dialogue and the implementation. Thus, this paper will give a brief conclusion by giving the future directions based on the gaps of the earlier literature discussed.

METHOD

This paper is classified into a literature review paper. We challenge current thinking and practice and propose new approaches through reviewing 54 web of science (WoS) indexed journals. We briefly outline the key aspects of a study in the field of dialogic education before undertaking the study. It is meant to provide a review of related literature idea of the study focusing dialogic education in relation to its models, approaches, and implementation. Thus, in the following discussion, we propose the models of dialogic education from its historical review, approaches that can be used to study dialogic education theory, and implementation that is applied under dialogic education theoretical framework.

DISCUSSION

The models of dialogic education

A critical review undertaken by (Cui & Teo, 2021) identifies four dialogic education models as having stimulated the broad acceptance of dialogic education in classrooms, relative to older research on the dialogic educational concept. These four reviewed models are 'Dialogically organized instruction', 'Thinking Together', 'Accountable Talk' and 'Dialogic teaching'. The first model, 'Dialogically organized instruction' is based on extracted and encoded indication of effective instruction in the classrooms. It focuses on altering students' understanding through appreciating and allowing students' voices to be heard in class, as opposed to giving them teacher-centered instruction. (Nystrand et al., 2003). Further, the instruction of uptake, authentic questions, and high-level evaluation are highlighted in this model. Students' responses are incorporated into subsequent questions therefore they can extend their contribution. While authentic questions are designed to assess learners' views and insights rather than their knowledge, high-level evaluation improves teachers' capacity to "dialogically open the door to student ideas. The second model, the 'Thinking Together' approach, emphasizes students' dialogue by motivating students to utilize language as a tool for collective reasoning in order to collectively overcome the problems (Cui & Teo, 2021). This model is under the umbrella of sociocultural discourse analysis (Mercer, 2019b). The sociocultural discourse analysis proposes three types of classroom dialogue: disputational dialogue, cumulative dialogue, and exploratory dialogue. Thinking together is mostly developed by 'exploratory dialogue', which allows students to explore their ideas and think together in the ways of reasoning and metacognition. Similar to the second model, the third model, 'accountable dialogue' highlights the social interaction role in the improvement of an individual's thinking capacity (Cui & Teo, 2021). The discourse between the teacher and students in the classroom should represent the learning community, the principles of critical thinking, and knowledge (Michaels et al., 2008). In addition, it is clarified that accountability to the learning community requires participants in the dialogue to pay close attention to one another, construct one another's ideas, and ask each other questions that are meant to clarify or expand on those ideas. The accountability to norms of reasoning relates to discussion which emphasizes interconnections and the development of acceptable conclusions, whereas

Available online at <https://www.elitejournal.org/index.php/ELITE>

the accountability to knowledge indicates that discourse is explicitly according to facts, written discourse, or other publicly accessible information sources. In this model, Chapin et al. (2003) proposed five productive talk moves as the effective tools in classroom dialogue. Those are revoicing, repeating, reasoning, adding on, and using wait time. When compared to the third model, the fourth model, which is called dialogic teaching, tends to be more user-friendly and practical for teachers. This is partially owing to the fact that dialogic teaching was developed as a result of significant studies on classroom dialogue (Cui & Teo, 2021). The principles of dialogic education are as follows: reciprocal (sharing ideas and exploring alternative viewpoints), cumulative (developing on their own and one another's ideas), collective (the class involved in addressing learning tasks), supportive (encouraging and assisting each other to openly express ideas), and purposeful (involving in classroom dialogue with particular educational purposes).

The four types of dialogic education discussed in the preceding section describe several essential characteristics. First, they are all intended to improve young learner's learning and critical thinking through interaction, and are therefore mainly focused on and tailored for them as compared to adolescent or adult learners. The basic foundation is that it is more significant and easier to create and cultivate a positive dialogic environment in younger students than in older ones. Second, these models are primarily derived from American or British contexts, despite the fact that empirical evidence has been found in other European, North American, and Australian contexts. Research on dialogic education has rarely conducted in Asian context. To the best of knowledge in this book section, there is one research in the Asian context investigating classroom dialogue participation in mainland China (Song, 2015). However, the developed models based on cultural and geographical factors have not been found. Further research may explore more and develop the existing models in the Asian context.

The approaches

In a classroom dialogue, it includes a dynamic interaction in which the teacher and the students are engaged facing several problems to understand one another. The fact is that no one never really knows what anyone else is thinking (Hill & Vaughan, 2018; Larkin, 2017; Thomson & Trigwell, 2018). It therefore influences how the discussion and negotiation flow to reach a common understanding of certain information. It can be analyzed that the academic achievement may depend on how well the participants do the ability of thinking collectively. Thus, it is significant to find the approach that focus on the analysis of the discourse occurred among the participants to try to solve problems, the argumentation about different perspectives, and the language used to overcome differences and create shared knowledge and understanding. The notion of interthinking draws attention to the shared, coordinated intellectual activity that people normally engage in through the use of language has been introduced by (Mercer, 2019a) to study the language used by the people in dialogues to strive to reach joint understanding. According to the literature of the dialogic education, there are four approaches to study the classroom dialogue: conversation analysis, thematic

content analysis, corpus linguistics, and sociocultural discourse analysis (Johnson & Mercer, 2019; Mercer, Wegerif, et al., 2019; Ritella & Ligorio, 2019).

Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis is a method to the social interaction research that incorporates both verbal and nonverbal behaviors in everyday situations. It is a well-known method for studying discourse, including classroom dialogue (Church & Bateman, 2020). It is a technique of considering and studying the pragmatics of everyday discourse, with an emphasis on the participatory, pragmatic production of everyday exchanges. Conversation analysis seeks to determine how individuals in a real conversation think and behave when it is their turn to talk. The focus is on the formation of these action scenes. Conversation-analysts employ specific transcription tools to portray dialogue, focusing on the turn-taking behavior of discourse participants (Deppermann & Pekarek Doehler, 2021; Meredith, 2019; Schaeffer, 2021), which enables them to acquire information into how individuals create their understandings apparent at various moments in an encounter. There is accumulating evidence that the characteristics of email communication such as informality of language and paired-unit structures are sufficiently 'talk-like' to make it susceptible to a conversation analysis' style. The research that has utilized conversation analysis to track change over time can be classified into three categories: identifying changes in terms of speakers' learning or development, being as a component of sociohistorical/cultural change, and being as the interactional narrative of a community. These disciplines share a fundamental basis for the ranking of single instances — their chronological structure — as well as a number of methodological issues linked with considerations regarding consistency over time. Conversation analysis focuses on the interactional turns that happened in the classroom discourse because they demonstrate how social class and power are communicated and perpetuated. This affords the chance to analyze how the interpersonal features of examiners' professional relationships shall be performed through the classroom interaction. However, this approach relies on the interactional features of speech at the word level, but provides less overall picture of the interaction at a certain dimension (Johnson & Mercer, 2019). This fine-grained approach also makes it difficult for conversation analysis to accommodate the study of interaction over time.

Thematic Content Analysis

Thematic content analysis is the approach to identify themes according to the classification or themes of the content of interaction. Through the interpretative involvement of an analyst with the interaction text, the content is segmented into general and specific parts of discourse. This results in the generation of codes that allow to characterize the form and nature of the discourse (Anderson, 2007; Finkelstein et al., 2021). This approach includes the analyst imposing their own meaning on the conversation, which entails a set of assumptions regarding how the participants themselves interpret their speech. However, the notion of thematic content analysis might be challenging because a sociocultural research must be

predicated on the assumption that externalized discourse influences internalized thought (Johnson & Mercer, 2019). Thematic analysis permits the researcher to appreciate the characteristics of a phenomenon that participants discuss frequently or extensively, as well as the relationships between these characteristics. Although it provides some benefits, the use of thematic content analysis in the classroom dialogue context has a number of limitations. This method provides an objective overview of dialogue (Sibomana, 2022; Vaismoradi et al., 2013). This means that it may place less emphasis on word-level features in order to generate a perspective of the discourse based on large categories of codes and themes.

Corpus Linguistics

Similar to the two preceding methods, corpus linguistics accommodates the identification to word use and scale. It is an approach that identifies text properties using computer software. It examines text features and employs statistical measurements to assess the consistency of its results while working with huge data sets. A benefit of the corpus linguistic technique is that it uses software to scan big corpora, so limiting the possibility of human coding error while constructing a discourse data overview (Hennessy et al., 2021; López-García & Rodríguez-Inés, 2019). The major benefit of the corpus-linguistic method is that it eliminates the need for language researchers to rely on their own or other native speakers' intuition or even on fabricated cases. It enables an analyst to inductively locate words and collocations that are typical of the conversation (relative to others) or inductively determine whether specific terms of theoretical relevance are prominent in the discourse. These latter terms may include those discovered to be associated with the development of reasoning among conversation participants. However, one limitation that makes corpus linguistics inappropriate for analyzing human interaction is that the software's intervention of language can cause a distance between the analyst and the text, which hinders the analyst's ability to incorporate a human perspective into the study. This is one of the reasons why corpus linguistics is not ideal for studying human interaction. In addition, there are concerns that centering attention on specific words and the contexts in which they are used may mask the more nuanced, developing, and sequential relationship that exists between word usage and the passage of time. The reason for this is because the meaning of a single word must always be interpreted in relation to its surrounding context (Cui & Teo, 2021; Johnson & Mercer, 2019) in which it is the focus of the last approach to study interaction phenomenon, sociocultural discourse analysis.

Sociocultural Discourse Analysis

Sociocultural discourse analysis is an approach to study classroom dialogue as it focuses on four aspects: the lexical content and the cohesive structures of classroom dialogue, the joint intellectual action between participants in classroom, the shared understanding developed in the classroom dialogue, and the participants' cognition, behavior (Johnson & Mercer, 2019; Kheradmand Saadi, 2016; Mercer, 2013, 2019b; Twiner et al., 2021). Sociocultural discourse

analysis, unlike prior methodologies that were unable to identify the ways in which words can acquire shared meanings over time for participants in an extended dialogue, focuses on the shared understanding between the classroom dialogue's participants. It focuses on the handover points between the discourse participants. Shared understanding is described as the process negotiation of some persons to have common bodies of causal information to achieve common or shared objectives (Mercer, 2013, 2019b; Mercer, Wegerif, et al., 2019). It is the ability of each individual such as coordination and collaboration in a group or between peers to reach an agreement of a particular topic of discussion. Since the focus of is shared understanding in the context of classroom dialogue, it concerns on how participants, the teacher and the students, use the language to think together, to have a shared common knowledge. It is related to the researchers' efforts to explain how relationships affect the accuracy of interaction data and answers our interest in how participants may manage relationships in the presence of unsuccessful communication patterns. This analysis provides insight into Joint Intellectual Action because it reveals how participants tailor the content and structure of their communication to the receiver's perceived needs, indicating that they have an image of the recipient in mind when drafting the communication. Moreover, the techniques impacted by conversation analysis can provide insight into the impact of the encounter "as experienced" by the participants.

As defined in the previous section, shared understanding has a significant role in a process of intellectual activity having a knowledge understanding. Without a shared understanding, vital information and moments of clarity may be disregarded or neglected, erroneous judgments may be taken, and opportunities may be wasted, which can have disastrous consequences when the stakes are high. However, in order to understand the process of collective thinking, we need to take a look at a different notion of 'context'. As (Mercer, 2019a) argued that it is because the focus is on textual characteristics rather than cognitive processes, so the concept of context does not capture the fundamentally dynamic, temporal aspect of the human mental activity of contextualizing. Sociocultural discourse analysis integrates the use of conversation analysis, thematic content analysis, and corpus linguistics (Johnson & Mercer, 2019; Mercer, 2013, 2019b, 2019a; Mercer, Wegerif, et al., 2019). This involves a focus on language in its social context and, accordingly, on the joint activity, content, and structure of discourse amongst interactants – or, to put it another way, on how knowledge is collaboratively produced, negotiated, or questioned. The following are some of the components that make up sociocultural discourse analysis in general: a corpus linguistic analysis of whole lesson transcripts, including the identification of keywords or collocates within a set of lessons, as well as the highlighting of patterns or shifts in teachers and students speaking over the course of time; and a qualitative analysis of lesson excerpts, such as outlining the discussion and interactions surrounding the contextualized usage of certain resources or activities as they occur over the course of a series of classes; and a quantitative analysis of lesson excerpts, such as outlining the discussion and interactions surrounding the Because of these characteristics, this approach is possible to enable the attention to explore the links or the relationship between the pedagogical processes and

learning results in which becomes the most appropriate method to study the dialogic education.

The implementation of dialogic education across countries

The implementation of dialogic education in the European, North American and Australian context has been examined the classroom dialogue in the level of primary school (Twiner et al., 2021)(Mercer et al., 2009), teacher professional development (Huang et al., 2020; Mantei & Kervin, 2011; Simoncini et al., 2014), research-teacher collaboration (Peel, 2021; Peled-Elhanan & Blum-Kulka, 2006), academic fellowship (Asghar & Pilkington, 2018), professional discourse (Johnson & Mercer, 2019) and academic practices (Guzmán & Larrain, 2021; Mercer et al., 2009; Pilkington, 2019; Simoncini et al., 2014; Kheradmand Saadi, 2016; Howe et al., 2019). When the interaction is mediated by communicative signs and interactions occurred in a variety of modes in the context of primary school, it is reported that the approach to study dialogic education, sociocultural discourse and multimodal analysis have proposed an innovative method that utilizes a variety of research approaches to investigate the complex aspects, development, and diverse characteristics of dialogic education (Twiner et al., 2021). In addition, the implications are raised for evaluating the discourse practices of teachers in primary school and for professional development. An example of an exercise that has been found to assist primary school teachers in implementing dialogic education is offered, illustrating how such an approach requires structuring the structural diversity of conversation. Meanwhile, the results of dialogic education on professional development reported that institutions of teacher education should promote student teachers' knowledge of the significance of professional dialogue and the dialogic space it provides, which has the ability to enrich and alter teacher professional learning opportunities. Additionally, in the field of researcher-teacher collaboration, the dialogic education identified the potential to influence future pedagogical policy and practice as evidence-based teaching practices for the best possible student learning. The approach that was suggested, known as the appreciative inquiry approach, provides a professional learning culture within a setting that is both secure and authentic. This context values the knowledge and experience of the teachers (Peel, 2021). The influence of professional reflection and learning on student learning outcomes is proportional to its effectiveness. Within academic fellowship scope, a carefully managed professional dialogic can provide personal practices and develop real self-esteem. It is proven to be more successfully than written applications. Regarding the practice of teaching, it is suggested that conversation is what stimulates the social side of professional learning as well as a more communal way of being, both of which are things that the academic world is said to have lost (Asghar & Pilkington, 2018). Howe et al. (2019) conducted practical implication research focusing on the quantitative study of dialogic education, particularly measuring how teacher-student interaction in the classroom correlated with students' outcome, which jointly covered curriculum mastery, reasoning, and educationally relevant attitudes. When students actively participated, it was discovered that

elaboration and questioning of earlier contributions were favorably associated with curriculum comprehension, while elaboration was also positively correlated with attitudes.

According to the results of previous studies of dialogic education including the critical review and its implementation, it is important to have classroom dialogue for both the professional development of teachers and the outcomes of their students. Optimal patterns of classroom dialogue are commonly thought to require some or all of the following: open questions; elaboration of previous contributions; reasoned discussion of competing viewpoints; linkage and coordination across significant contribution; metacognitive engagement with dialogue; and high participation of the individuals in the dialogue. On the other hand, there is a paucity of information regarding the positive psychological variables that enable educators to translate the theoretical concepts of dialogic education into practical applications in the classroom (Brubacher et al., 2014; Cui & Teo, 2021). There is also a little attention to investigate what mental wellbeing elements in the classroom dialogue that encourage students to perform maximum learning outcomes (Mahatmya et al., 2018; Singh & Bandyopadhyay, 2021). Having a consideration of those gaps, I believe that classroom dialogue is closely associated with positive psychology aspects, particularly for mental wellbeing of the participants. It is expected that the better students' wellbeing is, a better learning outcome will be.

CONCLUSION

To date, the relevance of wellbeing implication remains underexplored although dialogic education practice has been quietly related to students' psychological features such as cognition and behaviors (Asanjarani & Asgari, 2021; Mahatmya et al., 2018; Milatz et al., 2015; Singh & Bandyopadhyay, 2021). Little is known about the implication between shared understanding in the classroom dialogue and students' wellbeing. Future research direction on dialogic education may convincingly examine wellbeing aspects as the partial impact of student outcomes.

Wellbeing is defined as the sense of positive emotions, such as happiness and purpose of the individual potential (Seligman, 2011; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Wellbeing is significant to an individual's overall health, allowing them to solve problems and accomplish their goals. In relation to academic achievement context, a student's wellbeing can impact academic performance, behaviors, social integration, and motivation. Those students who are high in well-being, are proved to exhibit greater productivity in the classroom, to perform effective learning, to have more creativity, more prosocial behaviors, and positive relationships.

The construction of wellbeing instruments has been developed and validated by Longo et al. (2017). Thus, the 65-items of wellbeing aspects is continually examined in the 2018 and shorten to 14-item version (Longo et al., 2018). The 14-aspects of wellbeing are involvement, vitality, happiness, optimism, calmness, self-worth, competence, development, self-acceptance, purpose, self-awareness, significance, self-congruence and connection. The instrument of scales of general wellbeing is considered as a comprehensive scope and

practical instrument to assess any of the fourteen scales individually, or an overall score for general well-being. On the basis of a novel and all-encompassing operational definition, quantitative research can be carried out to evaluate different aspects of wellbeing in a short amount of time; this research has the potential to be of practical benefit to both researchers and clinicians (Longo et al., 2018). In the quantitative method, the results will be objective, fast, focused and acceptable. However, longitudinal research can also be implemented to identify the students' mental wellbeing that may changes over time, and provide insight into cause-and-effect relationships within other variables occurred in the classroom dialogue.

The brief overview of the dialogic education research in the classroom dialogue practice has been discussed in its models, approaches, and the implementation across various contexts, and the gaps from previous studies. The results of earlier literature have implied that more research in the eyes of positive psychological features need to assess to find more findings on the differential effect from the classroom dialogue. Based on the weaknesses of the previous studies and the potential theoretical relation, the present book section offers a framework of the dialogic education for future direction research, specifically interrelating classroom dialogue and wellbeing construction in the implication for students' learning outcomes. As with any other teaching method, teachers play a significant role in the successful implementation of dialogic education; hence, the discourse employed in classroom conversation is important for students' learning results.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, R. (2018). Developing dialogic teaching: Genesis, process, trial. *Research Papers in Education*, 33(5), 561–598. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2018.1481140>
- Anderson, R. (2007). Thematic Content Analysis (TCA) 1 Descriptive Presentation of Qualitative Data. *Online*, 15, 1–4.
- Asanjarani, F., & Asgari, M. (2021). Effects of a school-based program on Iranian students' well-being. *International Journal of School and Educational Psychology*, 9(sup1), S103–S112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21683603.2020.1758858>
- Asghar, M., & Pilkington, R. (2018). The relational value of professional dialogue for academics pursuing HEA fellowship. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 23(2), 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2017.1386566>
- Brubacher, S. P., Powell, M., Skouteris, H., & Guadagno, B. (2014). An investigation of the question-types teachers use to elicit information from children. *Australian Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, 31(2), 125–140. <https://doi.org/10.1017/edp.2014.5>
- Chapin, S. H., O'Connor, C., & Anderson, N. C. (2003). *Classroom Discussions: Using Math to Help Students Learn* (T. Gordon, Ed.). Math Solutions Publications.
- Chien, C. W. (2021). Taiwanese elementary school english teachers' practice of teacher leadership in professional dialogue. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 00(00), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2021.1953611>
- Church, A., & Bateman, A. (2020). Conversation analytic role-play method (CARM) for early childhood teacher education. *Teacher Development*, 24(5), 652–668. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2020.1820371>

- Cui, R., & Teo, P. (2021). Dialogic education for classroom teaching: A critical review. *Language and Education*, 35(3), 187–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1837859>
- Deppermann, A., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2021). Longitudinal Conversation Analysis—Introduction to the Special Issue. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 54(2), 127–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2021.1899707>
- Finkelstein, S., Sharma, U., & Furlonger, B. (2021). The inclusive practices of classroom teachers: A scoping review and thematic analysis. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(6), 735–762. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1572232>
- Fisher, R. (2007). Dialogic teaching: Developing thinking and metacognition through philosophical discussion. *Early Child Development and Care*, 177(6–7), 615–631. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430701378985>
- Guzmán, V., & Larrain, A. (2021). The transformation of pedagogical practices into dialogic teaching: Towards a dialogic notion of teacher learning. *Professional Development in Education*, 00(00), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2021.1902837>
- Haneda, M. (2017). Dialogic learning and teaching across diverse contexts: Promises and challenges. *Language and Education*, 31(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2016.1230128>
- Hennessy, S., Calcagni, E., Leung, A., & Mercer, N. (2021). An analysis of the forms of teacher-student dialogue that are most productive for learning. *Language and Education*, 0(0), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2021.1956943>
- Hill, G., & Vaughan, S. (2018). Conversations about research supervision—Enabling and accrediting a community of practice model for research degree supervisor development. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55(2), 153–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2017.1406388>
- Howe, C., & Abedin, M. (2013). Classroom dialogue: A systematic review across four decades of research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 43(3), 325–356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2013.786024>
- Howe, C., Hennessy, S., Mercer, N., Vrikki, M., & Wheatley, L. (2019). Teacher–student dialogue during classroom teaching: Does it really impact on student outcomes? *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 28(4–5), 462–512. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2019.1573730>
- Huang, A., Klein, M., & Beck, A. (2020). An exploration of teacher learning through reflection from a sociocultural and dialogical perspective: Professional dialogue or professional monologue? *Professional Development in Education*, 00(00), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2020.1787192>
- Johnson, M., & Mercer, N. (2019). Using sociocultural discourse analysis to analyse professional discourse. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 21(October 2018), 267–277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2019.04.003>
- Kheradmand Saadi, Z. (2016). Meaning making, agency, and languaging in dialogic interactions on academic writing tasks: A sociocultural discourse analysis. *Online Submission*, January.
- Larkin, D. (2017). Planning for the elicitation of students’ ideas: A lesson study approach with preservice science teachers. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 28(5), 425–443. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2017.1352410>
- Longo, Y., Coyne, I., & Joseph, S. (2017). The scales of general well-being (SGWB). *Personality and Individual Differences*, 109, 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.01.005>

Available online at <https://www.elitejournal.org/index.php/ELITE>

- Longo, Y., Coyne, I., & Joseph, S. (2018). Development of the short version of the scales of general well-Being: The 14-item SGWB. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 124(November 2017), 31–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.11.042>
- López-García, V., & Rodríguez-Inés, P. (2019). Learning corpus linguistics tools and techniques to cope with the current challenges of audiovisual translation. *Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 13(3), 307–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2019.1656409>
- Mahatmya, D., Thurston, M., & Lynch, M. E. (2018). Developing students' well-being through integrative, experiential learning courses. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 55(3), 295–307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2018.1474756>
- Mantei, J., & Kervin, L. (2011). Turning into teachers before our eyes: The development of professional identity through professional dialogue. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2011v36n9.1>
- Mercer, N. (2013). The social brain, language, and goal-directed collective thinking: A social conception of cognition and its implications for understanding how we think, teach, and learn. *Educational Psychologist*, 48(3), 148–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2013.804394>
- Mercer, N. (2019a). Language and the joint creation of knowledge: The selected works of Neil Mercer. In *Language and the Joint Creation of Knowledge: The Selected Works of Neil Mercer*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429400759>
- Mercer, N. (2019b). Sociocultural discourse analysis. *Language and the Joint Creation of Knowledge*, 1, 156–186. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429400759-9>
- Mercer, N., Dawes, L., & Staarman, J. K. (2009). Dialogic teaching in the primary science classroom. *Language and Education*, 23(4), 353–369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780902954273>
- Mercer, N., Hennessy, S., & Warwick, P. (2019). Dialogue, thinking together and digital technology in the classroom: Some educational implications of a continuing line of inquiry. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 97(March), 187–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.08.007>
- Mercer, N., Wegerif, R., & Major, L. (2019). The routledge international handbook of research on dialogic education. In *The Routledge International Handbook of Research on Dialogic Education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429441677>
- Meredith, J. (2019). Conversation Analysis and Online Interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(3), 241–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2019.1631040>
- Michaels, S., O'Connor, C., & Resnick, L. B. (2008). Deliberative discourse idealized and realized: Accountable talk in the classroom and in civic life. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 27(4), 283–297. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-007-9071-1>
- Milatz, A., Lüftenegger, M., & Schober, B. (2015). Teachers' relationship closeness with students as a resource for teacher wellbeing: A response surface analytical approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6(DEC), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01949>
- Molinari, L., & Mameli, C. (2010). Classroom dialogic discourse: An observational study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 3857–3860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.604>
- Nystrand, M., Wu, L. L., Gamoran, A., Zeiser, S., & Long, D. A. (2003). Questions in Time: Investigating the Structure and Dynamics of Unfolding Classroom Discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 35(2), 135–198. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326950dp3502_3

- Peel, K. L. (2021). Professional dialogue in researcher-teacher collaborations: Exploring practices for effective student learning. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 47(2), 201–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1855061>
- Peled-Elhanan, N., & Blum-Kulka, S. (2006). Dialogue in the Israeli classroom: Types of teacher-student talk. *Language and Education*, 20(2), 110–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780608668716>
- Pilkington, R. (2013). Professional dialogues: Exploring an alternative means of assessing the professional learning of experienced HE academics. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 18(3), 251–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2012.717225>
- Pilkington, R. (2019). Investigating the use of ‘professional dialogues’ when assessing academic practice: Revealing learning, managing process, and enabling judgements. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 24(1), 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2018.1512496>
- Ritella, G., & Ligorio, B. (2019). Dialogical approaches to learning: From theory to practice and back. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 20, 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2019.02.001>
- Schaeffer, N. C. (2021). Interaction before and during the survey interview: Insights from conversation analysis. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 24(2), 181–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2020.1824626>
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. Free Press.
- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology. An introduction. *The American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5>
- Sibomana, E. (2022). Transitioning from a local language to English as a medium of instruction: Rwandan teachers’ and classroom-based perspectives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(4), 1259–1274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1749554>
- Simoncini, K. M., Lasen, M., & Rocco, S. (2014). Professional dialogue, reflective practice and teacher research: Engaging early childhood pre-service teachers in collegial dialogue about curriculum innovation. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n1.3>
- Singh, K., & Bandyopadhyay, S. (2021). Enhancing college students well-being: The psycho-spiritual well-being intervention. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 31(7), 867–888. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2020.1823294>
- Song, Y. (2015). An investigation into participation in classroom dialogue in mainland China. *Cogent Education*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2015.1065571>
- Teo, P. (2016). Exploring the dialogic space in teaching: A study of teacher talk in the pre-university classroom in Singapore. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 56, 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.01.019>
- Thomson, K. E., & Trigwell, K. R. (2018). The role of informal conversations in developing university teaching? *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(9), 1536–1547. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1265498>
- Twiner, A., Littleton, K., Whitelock, D., & Coffin, C. (2021). Combining sociocultural discourse analysis and multimodal analysis to explore teachers’ and pupils’ meaning making. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 30(PA), 100520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2021.100520>

Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing and Health Sciences*, 15(3), 398–405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12048>