
Stepping into Dialogical Interaction in the Classroom for More Revolutionized Instruction

Bushra Fatima
Shia PG College, Lucknow

ABSTRACT

With the recent introduction of interactive techniques to English language teaching (ELT), scholars' attention has been drawn more than ever to the many tactics for modernising instruction, particularly that connected to the teaching and learning of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) (EFL). These tactics incorporate interactive elements that are fueled by the notion of dialogy, which serves as a primary driver for teacher-student and student-student interactions in the classroom (CIs). The purpose of this paper is to underline the urgent necessity for a move to more revolutionary instruction in the classroom by encouraging dialogical engagement.

ELT, EFL, strategies, interactive, dialogy, CIs, revolutionized, instruction.

Keywords: ELT, EFL, strategies, interactive, dialogy, CIs, revolutionized, instruction.

INTRODUCTION

Today's educators, linguists, and applied linguists are pursuing the goal of encouraging students to be 21st century learners (Crouse, 2013). This quest is constrained by a number of conditions that both the instructor and the learner should be aware of, such as adhering to particular instructive tactics that improve both the teaching and learning processes. These tactics are based on student involvement in the classroom. It could comprise dialogy-based tactics that place both the teacher and the learner on an equal footing once used in the classroom. Brown's (1998) principle of empathy backs this up. This principle proposes that interactive tactics promote a dynamic and unique relationship between

Received: 05.06.2022

Accepted: 24.07.2022

Published: 25.07.2022



This work is licensed and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

classroom participants, one that extends beyond classroom interaction to dialogical instruction.

I. What is the definition of classroom interaction (CI)?

1.1. CI as the pinnacle of contemporary education

CI has become the quintessence of classroom communication and one of its main pillars and catalysts, thanks to the new interactive approach to English language instruction and learning. It has long been fundamental to the educational process, whether it be primary, secondary, or postsecondary (Choudhury, 2005; Bonavetti, 2015). It's about getting kids to participate in vibrant talks with their teachers, lively discussions with their peers, and fruitful interrogations with the entire class. Interactions between teachers and students, as well as student-student and student-teacher interactions, all contribute to the overall teaching and learning experience. Furthermore, for controlling language learning, CI is "a productive teaching strategy" (Yu, 2008, p. 49). Furthermore, Yu (2008) emphasises that CI is founded on the critical concept of collaborative discussion. It demonstrates that it is based on a combination of verbal, nonverbal, and social cues.

1.2. Interactions verbal, nonverbal, and social

1.2.1 Verbal interaction

Verbal contact, often known as verbal communication, is one of the fundamental pillars of classroom communication (Bonavetti, 2015). The latter entails the message being delivered over a verbal channel. It is a method of expressing one's sentiments, thoughts, and opinions through speeches, talks, presentations, and conversations. In the classroom, teachers and students' patterns and exchanges during the course and while executing activities are shaped by verbal contact (Csomay, 2007). Furthermore, teachers in the twenty-first century tend to employ verbal interaction as a significant approach for empowering their instruction and ensuring improved student accomplishment. Indeed,

verbal engagement patterns can excite students and encourage them to build a variety of skills that they will need in the near and long term (Ben-Noun, 2015).

1.2.2. Non-verbal Interaction

Nonverbal engagement is complementary to verbal contact in that it supports it through the use of nonverbal clues.

This sort of interaction, according to Hong-li (2011), is a system that incorporates both verbal and non-verbal clues to reflect the emotional and attitudinal behaviour of CI participants.

In the classroom, sharing these signs is just as important as speaking. Eye contact, gestures, posture, and voice pitch can all be used to illustrate them, thus the use of both visible and audible phenomena (Birjandi&Nushi, 2010). Nonverbal interaction is shaped by three core functions, according to Birjandi&Nushi (2010): cognitive, emotional, and organisational. The first function illustrates how communication and TL acquisition are intertwined. For better instruction, the second function translates the combination of both verbal and nonverbal instructions. In terms of the third function, it emphasises the importance of nonverbal communication in classroom management.

1.2.3. Social Interaction

Without anchoring verbal and nonverbal exchanges in their social environment, they cannot take place or take shape. The latter includes a combination of both components, as well as social engagement, which occurs concurrently with both learning and development, and hence learning and achievement (Vygotsky, 1978). As a result, the proximal development zone is encompassed (ZPD). According to Vygotsky (1978), the understanding of what is learnt with and without the help of the teacher is necessary for obtaining ZPD. As a result, ZPD narrows the gap between dependent and autonomous learning, which can both reflect the level of social engagement in a classroom context.

Received: 05.06.2022

Accepted: 24.07.2022

Published: 25.07.2022



This includes the amount of talk exchanged between teachers and students as well as among students themselves, the scope of collaboration and interaction occurring between these participants (Yu, 2008), and the extent of student empowerment for more autonomous learning and dialogical teaching.

II. WHAT IS DIALOGICAL INSTRUCTION AND HOW DOES IT WORK?

2.1. Dialogism, interactionism, contextualism, and constructionism are all examples of constructivism.

The theory of dialogism is based on the premise that human communication is a two-way exchange between participants (Linell, 2003). It's a collection of "theoretical and epistemological assumptions regarding human behaviour, communication, and cognition" (Linell, 2003, p. 2). Linell (2003), on the other hand, underlines the intimate relationship between dialogism and interactionism. In the interactive discourse that is mutually exchanged between two or more parties, the latter term invokes the interdependence between the self and the other. Interactions are, without a doubt, an important aspect of conversation. Interactions blur the line between interactionism and contextualism because they are both context-dependent (Ibid). "Context is widely dealt with as a social background for discourse," since discourse is bound by the situation in which it occurs (Van Dijk, 2008, p. vi). From this perspective, the importance of context in interpreting various types of discourse, and hence in knowledge formation and meaning negotiation, cannot be overstated. This ties dialogism and constructionism together. Furthermore, "communication" is not the transfer of pre-fabricated ideas. "Knowledge is mostly constructed through communication" (Linell, 2003, p. 3).

2.2. Dialogism and conversation

Meaning negotiation and production with a dialogical dimension based on the use of

Received: 05.06.2022

Accepted: 24.07.2022

Published: 25.07.2022



dialogue are provided by dialogism. "Meaning is dialogically constructed, made in dialogue (cognition and communication), with reference to and against the backdrop of the world, which is then dialogically appropriated and dialogically recognised" (Linell, 2003, p. 3). One of the essential requirements for channelling classroom spoken discourse and funnelling it through face-to-face (F-t-F) practise of the target language is the use of conversation in the classroom (TL). In dialogism applied to the classroom context, and thus in dialogical instruction, the F-t-F mode is the lead mode. As a result, dialogical instruction is an F-t-F operation. So far, the latter has been linked to traditional classroom instruction rather than online course delivery (Simon et al, 2013). Furthermore, traditional classroom teaching emphasises a number of components in which students learn in a synchronous context. To gain inspiration and instruction from the teacher as well as the other students, the instructor and the students must be in the same place at the same time. (Simon and colleagues, 2013, p. 108)

Following the same lines of reasoning, Simon et al (2013) argue that it is the conventional learning environment that forces teachers to "identify students' needs and inspire them on an individual basis." However, there are several approaches that may be taken to make the phrase "traditional" more favourable. When a result, the dialogical perspective emerges as these paths converge towards the interactive.

III. GETTING STARTED WITH DIALOGICAL INSTRUCTION The learning environment

3.1. The learning environment

The learning environment in which dialectical instruction can take place is constrained. Kataoka (2010) claims that the faster the shift to sociopetal setting occurs, the more CIs are guaranteed. The physical arrangement of the classroom allows students and teachers to F-t-F each other in a sociopetal setting. It is recommended as a more effective

Received: 05.06.2022

Accepted: 24.07.2022

Published: 25.07.2022



alternative to the sociofugal arrangement, in which students sit in rows facing the teacher's desk. Unlike sociopetal setting, sociofugal setting indicates a typical teacher-centered approach of learning. Additionally, the more calm students are in their classrooms, the more their emotions are discharged, and thus the more their interactional patterns are moulded. Cordall (2014) supports this viewpoint, claiming that the proliferation of a happy learning environment is linked to students' success. This type of setting is both physically and emotionally conducive to the emergence of learner-centered instruction.

3.2. Instruction depending on the needs of the students

Humanistic approaches to ELT have received a lot of interest recently in educational circles. Since the 1950s, Humanist Psychology has been on the rise. Abraham Maslow, who founded the field in 1970, and Carl Rogers, who founded it in 1964, were the forerunners. It converges on prioritising human well-being attributes as a means of ensuring better self-development. These beneficial attributes, according to Prabhavathy&Mahalakshmi (2016) and Derobertis& Bland (2017), can pave the path for human creativity and the development of human potential. "Humanistic learning approaches stress the important role of the 'whole person' in the learning process," according to Wikipedia. (2016, Prabhavathy&Mahalakshmi, p. 5). The concepts of self-direction, self-regulation, and self-help have been steadily expanding alongside the expansion of the notion of counselling in ELT since the advent of the humanistic perspective. The emotive and social aspects of teaching and learning have grown increasingly important. They are the only way to ensure that learners are engaged. Meanwhile, more than ever, creative pedagogical and methodological techniques have been linked to the use of humanism in education (Prabhavathy&Mahalakshmi, 2016; Derobertis& Bland, 2017).

The learner's empowerment is promoted through humanism. In other words, it empowers the student in the classroom. "Since the early 1980s, the phrase empowerment has been used in educational literature" (Sullivan, 2002, p.1). Empowerment necessitates participation and engagement. It also implies that students are in charge of their own decisions and academic performance. In order for students to be empowered, they must first form a partnership. To put it another way, teachers and students are equal partners in the classroom. Teachers can provide students the freedom to act, react, and experiment on their own with new learning processes, strategies, and techniques. Without a doubt, student-led education, which is built on the critical principle of student empowerment, is one of the most current visions of the 21st century learner (Sullivan, 2002; Crouse, 2013).

IV. INSTRUCTION REVOLUTIONIZATION

4.1. The necessity for dialogical interaction analysis

Dialogical analysis is founded on intersubjectivity, which is defined as the psychological bond that exists between two people in a specific situation (Gillespie & Cornish, 2010). It is intended to diagnose the utterances, patterns, and behaviours produced by classroom partners, particularly those with interactive and communicative value, from a methodological standpoint. This dialogical view of interaction considers not just the relationship between partners, but also the relationship between partners and the environment in which they work (Grossen, 2010). As a result, dialogical interaction analysis can be deduced to be about involving the self and the other, who can ask a variety of questions aimed at eliciting reflection on what each partner thinks about themselves, the roles they play, the register and discourse type they use, the communicative acts they engage in, and the alternatives for what they could say. As a result, before rethinking the practises of others, dialogical analysis urges both the teacher and the learner to reconsider their own practises. It recognises the importance of the voice

and participates in its direction. As a result, dialogical analysis combines discourse and conversation analysis by focusing on what partners say and achieve through their conversations. It even goes beyond that by attempting to gain a greater understanding of communication beyond the self's boundaries, resulting in the inculcation of intersocial, interrelational, and intersubjective components (Gillespie & Cornish, 2010). Simply put, it's about recognising not only the voice but also the multivoicedness of that voice.

4.2. The necessity of rethinking instruction

Revolutionizing education necessitates rethinking it. To this end, efforts should be made to expand the use of creative pedagogies that are more humanist in nature (Prabhavathy & Mahalakshmi, 2016; Derobertis & Bland, 2017). The journey begins in the classroom, where learning should become a more enjoyable experience for both the student and the teacher (Cordall, 2014). It's a space where, via meaningful dialogism and permitted multivoicedness, positions can be switched. The latter is the result of discursive interactions that take place in the classroom between teachers and students, as well as among students themselves (Mortimer, 1998). Thinking and rethinking classroom-based approaches that include more dichotomies such as the teacher-student, the researcher-educator, and the thinker-practitioner are all part of reconceptualizing education. Such dichotomies, of course, necessitate the positive presence of the self and the other, necessitating the remaking of power relations in favour of greater acknowledgement of student empowerment (Reeves, 2008). The latter can be achieved by giving up teacher control in order to develop more responsible students who can take charge of their classes. In summary, empowerment is founded on the recognition of plurality, which is required in the process of revolutionising education.

CONCLUSION

Dialogical interaction must be instilled before moving on to dialogic training. The latter

Received: 05.06.2022

Accepted: 24.07.2022

Published: 25.07.2022



is founded on the expansion of humanistic approaches to language teaching and learning, as well as humanistic classroom practises. Human factors should be prioritised in such plans. Turns, teacher-student and student-student roles, power relations, interactive patterns, and conversational exchanges all work together to paint a clear picture of the dialogic classroom, where reshaping practises and rethinking methodologies are critical for revolutionising instruction and exporting more original ideas for improved achievement.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Birjandi, P., & Nushi, M. (2010). Non-verbal communication in models of communicative competence and L2 teachers' rating. *Journal of English Studies*, 1(1), 3-22.
- [2]. Bonavetti, M. C. (2015). Oral interaction in the classroom: An up-close view at the English as a Foreign Language Teaching Program at Universidad Adventista del Plata. *Enfoques XXVII*, 1, 51-77.
- [3]. Brown, H. D. (1998). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8, 117-123. [4]. Choudhury, S. (2005). Interaction in Second Language classrooms. BRAC University
- [5]. *Journal*, 2(1), 77-82. Retrieved from <http://dspace.bracu.ac.bd/bitstream/handle/10361/530/Vol.2%20No.1.7.pdf?sequence=1>
- [6]. Cordall, I. (2014). Positive Learning Environment as a key to Students' Success. [PowerPoint slides]. Tunisia TESOL Second National Conference on Reflective English language Teaching: Exploring our own Classroom Practice. AMIDEAST.
- [7]. Crouse, D. (2013). Making the connection: 21st century skills and languages. *The Language Educator*, 8(3), 21-25.

Received: 05.06.2022

Accepted: 24.07.2022

Published: 25.07.2022



- [8]. Csomay, E. (2007). A corpus-based look at linguistic variation in classroom interaction: Teacher talk versus student talk in American university classes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6, 336–355. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/owner/Downloads/A_corpus-based_look_at_linguistic_variat.pdf
- [9]. Derobertis, E. M. & Bland, A. M. (2017). The humanistic perspective in psychology. In Springer International Publishing, 1-19.
- [10]. Gillespie, A., & Cornish, F. (2010). Intersubjectivity: Towards a dialogical analysis. *Journal for the theory of social behaviour*, 40(1), 19-46.
- [11]. Grossen, M. (2010). Interaction analysis and psychology: A dialogical perspective. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 44(1), 1-22.
- [12]. Hong-li, P. (2011). Effects of non-verbal communication on college English classroom teaching. *US-China Foreign Language*, 9(8), 505-516.
- [13]. Kataoka, S. M. (2010). Using proxemic indicators and instruments to analyze classroom interaction, curriculum planning, and curriculum implementation. *EDRA*, 1, 241-248. Los Angeles: University of California.
- [14]. Linell, P. (2003). What is dialogism? Aspects and elements of a dialogical approach to language, communication and cognition. (1- 23).
- [15]. Mortimer, E. F. (1998). Multivoicedness and univocality in classroom discourse: an example from theory of matter. *International journal of science education*, 20(1), 67-82.
- [16]. Prabhavathy, P. & Mahalakshmi, S. N. (June, 2016). The development of humanistic approach in English language. In *An International Journal in English*, 2 (3), 1-


Received: 05.06.2022


Accepted: 24.07.2022

Published: 25.07.2022





9.

[18]. Reeves, D. B. (2008). The learning leader/Leadership for student empowerment. *Learning*, 66(3), 84-85. 

[19]. Sullivan, A. M. (January, 2002). The nature of student empowerment. In *Self-Concept Research: Driving International Research Agendas*, 1-11. 

[20]. Simon, D.S. Jackson, K. and Maxwell, K. (2013). Traditional versus online instruction: Faculty Resources Impacts Strategies for Course Delivery. *Business Education and Accreditation*, 5(1), 107-116.

[21]. Van Dijk, T.A. (2008). *Discourse and Context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 

[22]. Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In Gauvain & Cole (Eds.), *Readings on the development of children* (pp. 34-40). 

[23]. Yu, W. (2008). Interaction in EFL Classes. *Asian Social Science*, 4(4), 48-50. 