Understanding the Cognitive and Socio-Emotional Dimensions of Dialogic Teaching and Learning Approach

Serkan Ucan, İstanbul Medeniyet University, serkan.ucan@medeniyet.edu.tr, 0000-0002-3639-3171

Zehra Kılıç Özmen, İstanbul Medeniyet University, zehrakilic.ozmen@medeniyet.edu.tr, 0000-0001-7825-0016

Merve Taşkın Serbest, İstanbul Medeniyet University, taskinmerve@windowslive.com, 0000-0002-5760-867X

Introduction

Dialogic teaching and learning is a pedagogical approach that utilises the power of classroom dialogue to help students achieve meaningful learning, advance their thinking and problem–solving skills, and develop more positive attitudes to schooling (Alexander, 2008; Kershner et al., 2020). In contrast to the traditional teacher–centred approach, in dialogic teaching and learning, students show active engagement in their learning process, having opportunities to share and explore diverse and contrasting ideas, critique others' opinions in an open–minded and respectful way, inquire open–ended questions, engage in collective reasoning and thinking, and co–construct knowledge and understanding (Alexander, 2008; Chow et al., 2021; Hennessy et al., 2018; Hennessy, Kershner et al. 2021; Lefstein & Snell, 2014; Mercer & Littleton, 2007).

In the current literature, dialogic teaching and learning is considered to support cognitive, social and emotional aspect of learning as well as the development of 21st-century skills, such as critical, reflective, and creative thinking and problem–solving (Alexander, 2020; Hennessy et al., 2018). Dialogic teaching and learning practices can increase student motivation and academic achievement, and contribute to students' social development and positive peer relationships (Alexander, 2020). It can also help students develop democratic attitude and awareness for active citizenship and hence enhance the quality of their lives in society (Alexander, 2020; Hennessy et al., 2016; Lefstein & Snell, 2014).

The number of research studies on dialogic teaching and learning has substantially increased internationally over the last decade. While these studies link dialogic teaching and learning to higher student academic achievement (Howe et al., 2019; Mercer & Sams, 2006), it is also revealed that despite the advancements in the field of education, teaching practices have not changed yet, and monologic teaching is still maintained as teachers usually prefer the authoritarian and monologic teaching approach and hence rarely utilise dialogic discourse in their classroom practices (Alexander, 2018; Howe & Abedin, 2013; Kutnick et al., 2002; Mercer et al., 2019; Muhonen et al., 2020; Reznitskaya & Gregory, 2013; Sedova et al., 2014).

The reasons why dialogic teaching and learning pedagogy is not widely observed in classrooms can be stated as teachers' inclination of using monologic approach in classroom communication (Hennessy et al., 2011; Teo, 2016), being pressured for keeping up with the curriculum requirements (Hennessy & Davies, 2019), crowded classrooms (Lefstein & Snell, 2014), and underestimating students' contributions to lessons (Boyd & Rubin, 2006). In addition to those reasons, uncertainty in the literature about what dialogic pedagogy is, how it should be applied, and the confusion arising from the existence of many similar but different models is also seen to be another crucial factor for the slow adoption of dialogic teaching and learning approach (Cui & Teo, 2021; Hennessy & Davies, 2019; Kim & Wilkinson, 2019). The dialogic teaching and learning models, such as 'dialogic teaching' (Alexander, 2008), 'dialogically organized instruction' (Nystrand, 1997), 'dialogic space' (Wegerif, 2007), 'accountable talk' (Michaels et al., 2008), 'collaborative reasoning' (Reznitskaya et al., 2009), 'thinking together' (Mercer, 2000), have all their own terminology and emphasise different aspects of classroom talk reflecting their own perspectives (Calcagni & Lago, 2018). As the review by Hennessy and Davies (2019) indicates, mostly due to this diversity and conceptual confusions across models, most teachers find it a cognitively demanding task to implement

dialogic teaching and learning pedagogy in practice, as they often lack understanding of its practices and principles, do not have sufficient knowledge and skills in applying productive classroom dialogue, and are not be able to build and maintain a socio–emotional climate supporting a dialogic classroom environment.

In this paper, we also argue that the tendency of approaching to classroom dialogue mostly from a cognitive perspective (i.e., conceptualising dialogue as specific forms of interactions and moves) and ignoring its socio–emotional dimensions (i.e., relational and affective aspects, such as interpersonal relations, classroom climate, values, attitudes, emotions) in research studies and intervention programs constitutes another reason for the low occurrence of dialogic teaching and learning in classrooms. As a number of researchers point out (Alexander, 2020; Cui & Teo, 2021; Hennessy, Calcagni et al. 2021; Kim & Wilkinson, 2019; Lefstein & Snell, 2014; Resnick et al., 2018), classroom dialogue has both cognitive and socio–emotional dimensions that interact and reinforce one another and mutually contribute to the adoption of a dialogic pedagogy in classrooms. Hence considering classroom dialogue solely as an interactional form without reference to its socio–emotional dimension appears inadequate and obstructs full understanding of dialogic pedagogy.

To contribute to a better understanding of the dialogic teaching and learning approach, this article presents a conceptual review study (Kennedy, 2007) that critically looks into several well–known models and relevant literature to uncover the features of cognitive and socio–emotional dimensions of dialogic pedagogy. For this purpose, in the following sections, five prominent dialogic teaching and learning models, 'dialogic teaching' (Alexander, 2020), 'dialogic teaching' (Burbules, 1993), 'dialogically organized instruction' (Nystrand, 1997), 'accountable talk' (Resnick & Hall, 1998) and 'thinking together' (Mercer, 2000), will be critically scrutinised and discussed along with other relevant literature. It is hoped that this review study will be helpful for researchers and educators who wish to study and implement dialogic teaching and learning approach in classrooms.

Dialogic Teaching and Learning Approach

As a pedagogical approach that views learning as social, interactive and dialogic (Mercer et al., 2020), dialogic teaching and learning is mainly rooted in Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory, Bakhtin's (1981) theory of dialogism and Freire's (1970) dialogue–based educational approach. In his sociocultural theory, Vygotsky (1978) considers the interactive and effective use of language as playing an important role in the learning process, shaping the development of individual and collective thinking. Focusing on the interplay among language, interaction and cognitive development along with the influence of social and cultural context, he describes language both as a cultural tool, which facilitates social interactions and collective thinking and as a psychological tool, through which individuals internalise knowledge, skills and understanding emerging in social interaction and discourse. This perspective suggests that via language and social interaction, individuals think together, co–create meaning, and reach higher mental functions (Mercer et al., 2020).

In his theory of dialogism, Bakhtin (1981) views language as essentially dialogic, as he considers every utterance produced by each speaker in conversations to represent a link in the chain of dialogic interactions, since each utterance responds to a previous utterance(s) and anticipates a response from a subsequent utterance(s). In this perspective, a dialogic utterance always involves the interaction of at least two speakers, who position themselves in relation to

one another and recognise the diversity of voices, perspectives, values and beliefs in a dialogue that leads to the creation of new meaning and insights (Bakhtin, 1981; Hennessy et al., 2020). According to dialogism, classroom discourse becomes more dialogic when participants actively listen to each other, share and engage with each other's ideas, and mutually create new meanings via extended sequences of utterances (Bakhtin, 1981).

In his dialogue–based educational approach, Freire (1970) considers dialogue as vital for true learning to take place, as it creates a space in which individuals are able to understand the perspectives of others, critically reflect on their own perspective, and co–construct new knowledge and understanding. He views dialogue as a horizontal relationship between two or more individuals, involving reciprocal and constant communication, empathy, and mutual recognition (Vaughan, 2011). According to Freire (1970), while the process of dialogue is central to the development of critical thinking and critical consciousness of students, achieving dialogue is no simple process, as it requires each individual to be equal and have the right to speak, involves a collaborative activity in which individuals work with each other without imposing one's own ideas on another, and respectful and critical discussion of ideas rather than making simple exchanges or engaging in a hostile, polemical argument. Moreover, Freire (2018) describes five ideas (i.e., humility, hope, faith, love, and critical thinking) that he believes to be important for the occurrence of true dialogue among teachers and students. He contends that only when teachers employ these ideas in dialogue, a climate of mutual trust and positive connections with students can be established, and meaningful learning can occur and be fostered (Freire, 1970).

Mostly influenced by these theoretical perspectives, several researchers put forward different models of dialogic teaching and learning. Five of these models are explained and critically scrutinised below in terms of the cognitive and socio–emotional features of dialogic pedagogy they emphasise.

Alexander's Dialogic Teaching Model

Alexander (2017) defines his model of 'dialogic teaching' as a general pedagogical approach that encourages students to think, learn and understand by utilising the power of talk. Focusing on both teacher–student and student–student talk, he describes dialogic teaching as involving "a particular kind of interactive experience… to engage children, stimulate and extend their thinking, and advance their learning and understanding" (Alexander, 2006, p. 37).

In his comparative research conducted in the US, England, France, India, and Russia, Alexander (2006) studied classroom discourse practices in primary schools, and his analysis of observed and video–recorded lessons revealed the features of the quality of classroom dialogue that enhance student learning, and pointed out the influence of curricular and cultural context on its occurrence. Through the research, Alexander (2020) identified a set of justifications, principles, repertoires, and indicators that form the basis of his dialogic teaching model, touching both the cognitive and socio–emotional features of dialogic pedagogy.

In terms of justifications, Alexander (2020) propounds eight reasons why classroom dialogue is important. Among them, 'talk for thinking' ("talking and thinking are intimately related"), 'talk for learning' ("learning is a social process, and talk helps to scaffold thinking from the given to the new"), 'talk for mastery' ("through talk, students deepen their understanding within each curriculum domain, subject or area of learning"), 'talk for communicating' ("we use language

of all kinds to exchange and negotiate meaning and engage in everyday transactions") and 'talk for teaching' ("well-structured talk gives teachers access to students' thinking") refer to the cognitive benefits of dialogic teaching, while the remaining three justifications, 'talk for relating' ("talk builds and consolidates social relationships and gives us the confidence and competence to handle them"), 'talk for acculturation' ("talk expresses and helps us to engage with what we have in common with others in our community and culture") and 'talk for democratic engagement' ("talk is vital for civic participation and engagement"), concerns more about socio–emotional benefits of classroom dialogue (Alexander, 2020, p. 130).

Alexander (2020) also identifies six principles that help characterising dialogic teaching in the classroom. These principles are as follows:

- Collective: The classroom is a site of joint learning and enquiry, and, whether in groups or as a class, students and teachers are willing and able to address learning tasks together.
- Reciprocal: Participants listen to each other, share ideas, ask questions, and consider alternative viewpoints; and teachers ensure that they have ample opportunities to do so.
- Supportive: Students feel able to express ideas freely, without risk of embarrassment over contributions that are hesitant or tentative, or that might be judged 'wrong', and they help each other to reach common understandings.
- Cumulative: Participants build on their own and each other's contributions and chain them into coherent lines of thinking and understanding.
- Deliberative: Participants discuss and seek to resolve different points of view, they present and evaluate arguments and they work towards reasoned positions and outcomes.
- Purposeful: Classroom talk, though sometimes open-ended, is nevertheless structured with specific learning goals in view. (p. 130).

As Alexander (2020) clarifies, the first three of these principles (collective, reciprocal, and supportive) are more related to the socio–emotional features of dialogic teaching, namely "the classroom culture within which dialogue is most likely to prosper, its learning potential has the best chance of being realised, and students will be most at ease in venturing and discussing ideas" (p. 131). These principles clearly attach importance to active student participation in classroom talk, as well as the positive classroom climate which includes optimal mood, attitudes, behaviours and tone of teachers and students that are essential to maximise the potential of dialogue in the process of teaching and learning. On the other hand, the second (reciprocal) and the last three principles (cumulative, purposeful, and deliberative) appear to be associated with the cognitive features, namely the dialogic interaction forms and moves, which characterise the applications of dialogic pedagogy in classrooms.

In line with these principles, Alexander (2020) also introduced eight repertoires in his model that aim to help teachers organise interactions and effective classroom dialogue, and support students' agency in engaging talk and in constructing their knowledge and understanding of a learning topic. These repertoires are named (1) interactive culture, (2) interactive settings, (3) learning talk, (4) teaching talk, (5) questioning, (6) extending, (7) discussing, and (8) arguing. Among these, the first repertoire, interactive culture, includes some elements of socio–emotional dimension, as it portrays the "norms for the management of talk form part of the

wider framework of routines, rules, and rituals that shape and maintain the culture of the classroom" (Alexander, 2020, p. 136). The second repertoire, interactive settings, describes the classroom organisation in terms of activity types (e.g., whole class, group, individual), grouping (e.g., size, friendship, gender), time, and classroom space. The remaining repertoires characterise the specific forms of dialogic interactions and moves teachers and students are expected to utilise in the classroom.

Lastly, Alexander (2020) lists 15 indicators through which he describes both the cultural context and conditions (e.g., "agreed and respected norms for speaking, listening and discussion", "respect for the situation, needs, and rights of every student") as well as the characteristics of dialogic interactions and moves (e.g., "questions which invite more than simple recall", "exchanges which chain together into coherent and deepening lines of enquiry") needed for the successful implementation of dialogic teaching pedagogy (p. 163).

Burbules' Dialogic Teaching

In his dialogic teaching model, Nicholas Burbules (1993) describes dialogue as "a relation that we enter into — we can be caught up in it and carried away by it" rather than being something used or done (p. xii). He also views dialogue as an ongoing and evolving pedagogical process that is "directed toward the discovery and new understanding, which stands to improve the knowledge, insight, or sensitivity of its participants" (Burbules, 1993, p. 8). Considering the differences between individuals as central to dialogue, Burbules (1993) argues that "we need to be similar enough for communication to happen, but different enough to make it worthwhile" (p. 31). In this respect, he compares dialogue to playing a game in which participants experience tension, enjoyment, and creativity, as well as follow ground rules and use particular moves (Burbules, 1993).

Burbules (1993) contends that as a communicative relationship, dialogue includes cognitive and socio–emotional elements for learning. From a cognitive perspective, he argues that dialogue should include utterances, such as exchanging views, questioning, responding, and explaining, which lead to the development of new knowledge, understanding and insights. Moreover, Burbules (1993) suggests that "cognitive interest is not all that attracts us to the dialogical encounter, or keeps us in it when it becomes difficult or contentious", but the dialogue is also relational, conveying emotions, such as "concern, trust, respect, appreciation, affection, and hope – [which] are crucial to the bond that sustains a dialogical relation over time" (p. 41). Burbules (1993) also posits three rules, namely (1) participation (i.e., active involvement of all participants), (2) commitment (i.e., having intersubjective understanding, openness about one's positions, willingness to reach some meaningful outcome, respect for differences), and (3) reciprocity (i.e., showing mutual respect and concern, not taking for granted roles of expertise or privilege, assuming a dynamic reversible and reflexive stance). Similar to Alexander's (2020) first three principles (collective, reciprocal, supportive), these rules clearly emphasise the importance of creating a classroom culture that supports active participation of all individuals involved in the dialogue process and facilitate the emergence of a positive climate in which open–mindedness, mutual trust, respect for differences prevail.

Nystrand's Dialogically Organized Instruction

Mostly influenced by Bakhtin's (1981) theory of dialogism, Nystrand (1997) used the term 'dialogically organized instruction' to emphasise the role of instructional context and the ways

it is organised by teachers in unveiling the potential of language and dialogue. Nystrand and colleagues observed English lessons in over a hundred US secondary schools and identified the aspects of his model based on the pedagogic characteristics of the successful lessons observed. The lessons aimed at transmitting knowledge to students via an initiation–response–feedback (IRF) sequence was defined as 'monologically organized instruction', while 'dialogically organized instruction' was characterised as involving lessons aimed at enhancing students' understanding by valuing and providing a "space for student responses, accommodating and frequently intermingling teacher–student voices representing differing values, beliefs, and perspectives" (Nystrand, 1997, p. 18).

Nystrand's model involves both the cognitive and socio–emotional elements of dialogic pedagogy. In terms of cognitive dimension, Nystrand et al. (1997) characterises dialogic instruction via three teacher discourse moves, namely (1) posing authentic questions (which seek multiple and thoughtful answers, exploring students' views and ideas, rather than pre–specified answers), (2) uptake (incorporating students' previous responses into subsequent questions), and (3) high–level evaluation (instead of offering a simple evaluation or praise, acknowledging a student's contribution and incorporating their responses into "the discourse of the class, usually in the form of either an elaboration (or commentary) or a follow–up question") (p. 21). In addition to teacher questions, Nystrand et al. (2003) also point out the importance of encouraging students to freely voice their own ideas and ask engaged questions (e.g., eliciting and/or clarifying questions). In terms of socio–emotional dimension, the abovementioned teacher and student discourse moves are suggested to help cultivate a positive classroom culture in which teachers actively welcome and solicit students' ideas, make students feel that their questions and ideas are important and taken into consideration, allow students to take control of the flow of classroom dialogue showing active participation, and afford more agency in shaping their understanding and learning.

Resnick's Accountable Talk

This dialogic approach was introduced by Lauren Resnick and her colleagues from the US (Michaels et al., 2008; Resnick, 1999) as the most 'academically productive classroom talk'. Its authors suggest that for promoting thinking and learning, teacher and student talk should be accountable to the learning community, standards of reasoning, and knowledge (Michaels et al., 2008). Accountability to the learning community refers to the talk in which participants respect and listen to one another, build on each other's contributions, and ask each other clarifying or elaboration questions. Accountability to standards of reasoning requires participants to make logical connections and draw reasonable conclusions via explanations and self–corrections. Accountability to knowledge implies the talk that "based explicitly on facts, written texts or other publicly accessible information", and involves participants making "an effort to get their facts right and make explicit the evidence behind their claims or explanations" (Michaels et al., 2008, p. 289). As Michaels et al. (2008) assert, all three aspects of accountability are "inextricably intertwined, interdependent, and must co-occur if discourse is to promote academic learning" (p. 292).

In ensuring that classroom talk is accountable in terms of the three aspects, from a cognitive perspective, Resnick and her colleagues (Chapin et al., 2009; Resnick et al., 2007) list a variety of talk moves to help students to articulate and share their thinking, build on each other's thinking and deepen their understanding of concepts. Suggested teacher talk moves include:

- Revoicing (restating a student's contribution),
- Repeating (asking students to restate someone else's contribution),
- reasoning (asking students to apply their own reasoning to another reasoning shared),
- Adding on (prompting students for further participation),
- And waiting (giving students time to think) (Chapin et al., 2009, p. 13).

Resnick et al. (2015) also describe the moves of productive classroom talk from students' perspectives:

> This kind of talk begins with students thinking out loud about a domain concept: noticing something about a problem, puzzling through a surprising finding, or articulating, explaining, and reflecting upon their own reasoning. Students do not simply report facts they already know for the teacher to evaluate. Instead, with teacher guidance, they make public their half-formed ideas, questions, and nascent explanations. Other students take up their classmates' statements: challenging or clarifying a claim, adding their own questions, reasoning about a proposed solution, or offering a counterclaim or an alternate explanation (pp. 3-4).

In terms of socio–emotional dimension, akin to the collective, reciprocal and supportive principles posited by Alexander (2020), this approach also points out the importance of creating a positive classroom climate and promoting active student participation. As Michaels et al. (2010) state, accountable talk in the classroom requires a "climate of respect, trust, and risk–taking, with challenges, criticism, or disagreements directed at ideas, not at individuals" (p. 3). In addition, it is seen as important to encourage equitable, inclusive, and active student participation in classroom talk in which students feel comfortable presenting diverse ideas, listen and respond carefully to each other with interest, and respect and value each other's point of view (Michaels & O'Connor, 2015).

Mercer's Thinking Together Approach

In Thinking Together approach, in line with Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural perspective, Neil Mercer and his colleagues view the use of language as a tool for collective thinking to solve problems collaboratively and co–create new meanings, knowledge, and understanding (Mercer 1995, 2000; Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Mercer & Dawes, 2008; Mercer et al., 2019). Specifically focusing on student–student group interactions, this approach is characterised by an educationally effective type of talk named 'exploratory talk' which "represents a distinctive social mode of thinking "based on principles of accountability, clarity, constructive criticism and receptiveness to well–argued proposals (Mercer & Littleton, 2007, p. 57). In contrast to the less effective talk types, such as disputational talk (e.g., involves disagreements, individualised decision making, and no attempts to make constructive contributions) or cumulative talk (e.g., involves up taking each other's opinions without any critique), as Littleton and Mercer (2013) describe, in the exploratory talk:

- Everyone engages critically but constructively with each other's ideas;
- Everyone offers the relevant information they have;
- Everyone's ideas are treated as worthy of consideration;
- Partners ask each other questions and answer them, ask for reasons and give them;
- Members of the group try to reach an agreement at each stage before progressing;
- To an observer of the group, the reasoning is 'visible' in the talk (p.16).

From a cognitive perspective, exploratory talk prevails when students think together (or interthink) while utilising a number of talk moves, such as exploring ideas, reasoning, asking questions, challenging, justifying, and elaborating upon ideas, acknowledging, 'revoicing' and building on each other's ideas, and working towards agreement (Mercer & Dawes, 2008).

In terms of socio–emotional perspective, 'thinking together' approach points out the importance of creating a dialogic culture via setting ground rules for talk based on mutual trust and respect and helping students achieve a 'meta–awareness' of the importance of exploratory talk (Mercer et al., 2019). As Mercer and Dawes (2008) state, exploratory talk is likely to emerge and be fostered when "a sense of trust and common endeavour" and "a shared understanding of how to engage in a productive discussion" exist among students (p. 66). The authors suggest that the ground rules which can facilitate such should include, such as the following:

- Everyone actively participates.
- Tentative ideas are treated with respect.
- Ideas offered for joint consideration may be challenged.
- Challenges are justified and alternative ideas or understandings are offered.
- Opinions are sought and considered before decisions are jointly made (Mercer & Dawes, 2008, p. 66)

Discussion

While emphasising different aspects of classroom talk (e.g., teacher–student and/or student–student talk) within a range of instructional contexts (e.g., whole class, small group), all the models explicated above suggest a number of dialogic interactions and moves that are considered to represent the productive classroom dialogue. Furthermore, while differing in the level of importance attached, they also recognise the socio–emotional aspects of classroom dynamics in creating and cultivating a dialogic environment that fosters and facilitates the use of dialogic interactions and moves by students and teachers. The following sections present a summary of the cognitive and socio–emotional features of dialogic teaching and learning by taking into account the abovementioned models as well as other relevant literature.

Cognitive Dimension

From a cognitive perspective, dialogic teaching and learning is conceptualised as specific forms of verbal interactions and moves (see Cui & Teo, 2021; Hennessy, Calcagni et al. 2021; Khong et al., 2019). As this review shows, dialogic teaching and learning models propose a number of dialogic interactions and moves that are thought to be productive for student learning. Taking into account also the recent literature that lists the shared features of dialogic interactions (e.g., Hardman, 2020; Hennessy et al., 2016; Howe et al., 2019; Vrikki et al., 2019), this review identifies the following categories of dialogic interactions and moves commonly observable across the dialogic teaching and learning models:

- *Invitations:* Emphasised in all the reviewed models and other review studies, this move involves asking open–ended ('how' and 'why'), thought–provoking, and/or genuine questions that invite for reasoning, clarifications, explanations, elaboration, coordination, comparison or evaluation of ideas, arguments or opinions shared previously (e.g., Alexander, 2020; Burbules, 1993; Hennessy et al., 2016; Howe et al., 2019; Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Nystrand et al., 2003; O'Connor et al., 2015; Vrikki et al.,

2019). This move can help with making students' ideas, understanding, and reasoning explicit to others, and have the function of evoking multiple and thoughtful responses and stimulating collective thinking.

- *Extended and reciprocal contributions:* Also included in all the reviewed models and other review studies, this dialogic move involves multiple participants (both students and teachers) reciprocally making extended contributions by building on, clarifying, justifying, elaborating, or evaluating own or others' contributions (e.g., Alexander, 2020; Burbules, 1993; Hennessy, Kershner et al., 2021; Howe et al., 2019; Mercer & Dawes, 2008; Nystrand et al., 2003; O'Connor et al., 2015; Vrikki et al., 2019).

- *Critical engagement with ideas:* Emphasised in four of the models and other review studies, this move involves students engaging critically and constructively with ideas shared, such as via challenging, counter–challenging, critiquing, and/or evaluating each other's viewpoints and reasons (e.g., Alexander, 2017; Howe et al., 2019; Maine & Čermáková, 2021; Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Michaels et al., 2008; Nystrand, 1997; Vrikki et al., 2019). As this move goes beyond simple idea expression, evaluation, or praise, teachers can find an opportunity to think together with their students and utilise their ideas and perspectives during the lesson, while students can explore different perspectives, reason and support their ideas, as well as resolve different points of view (Hennessy et al., 2020).

- *Links and connections:* Clearly evident in four of the reviewed models and other review studies, in this move, participants are expected to make links and identify connections amongst questions and contributions (e.g., ideas, arguments, perspectives) as well as with previous knowledge, experiences or a wider context (e.g., Alexander, 2020; Hennessy et al., 2016; Howe et al., 2019; Mercer & Dawes, 2008; Michaels et al., 2008; Nystrand, 1997; Vrikki et al., 2019).

- *Joint construction of knowledge:* Emphasised by all the reviewed models and other review studies, this move involves multiple students actively engaging in a continuous joint knowledge-building process through exploring, transforming, elaborating, critiquing, coordinating, and/or negotiating different ideas and viewpoints via cumulative exchanges (e.g., Alexander, 2008; Burbules, 1993; Hennessy et al., 2016; Mercer & Dawes, 2008; Michaels et al., 2008; Nystrand, 1997).

- *Consensus:* Acknowledged by the three of the reviewed models and other review studies, in this move, participants attempt to reach a consensus, to resolve inconsistencies among ideas shared (e.g., Alexander, 2020; Howe et al., 2019; Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Michaels et al., 2008; Vrikki et al. 2019). Even though achieving a consensus is not absolutely necessary, they are expected to demonstrate at least some commitment to work towards reaching a solution via indicating agreement/disagreement, supporting their positions with reasons, justifying, clarifying and/ or evaluating arguments (Hennessy et al., 2016).

- *Metacognitive reflection on dialogue:* Specifically emphasised by Mercer and Dawes (2008), Hennessy et al. (2020), and Howe et al. (2019), this move suggests both teachers and students to adopt a metacognitive perspective on their verbal interactions in terms of becoming aware of the value of dialogue and reflecting on its quality and productiveness in achieving learning objectives.

Socio–Emotional Dimension

As explained previously, the socio–emotional dimension of dialogic pedagogy typically refers to the relational and affective aspects of classroom dynamics, such as classroom climate and ethos, interpersonal relations, values, attitudes, and emotions. As this review shows, dialogic teaching and learning models point out the importance of creating and cultivating a classroom climate and ethos that promote active student participation and agency for facilitating the emergence of dialogic interactions and moves.

As Hennessy et al. (2016) state, dialogic pedagogy views students as "active rather than passive participants in the process of dialogic interactions" (p. 18). In line with this view, all the reviewed models and other studies highlight the importance of providing students with equal opportunities for active and inclusive involvement in classroom talk (e.g., Alexander, 2020; Burbules, 1993 Cui & Teo, 2021; Hennessy, Calcagni, et al., 2021; Howe et al., 2019; Kim & Wilkinson, 2019; Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Nystrand et al., 2003; O'Connor et al., 2015; Vrikki et al., 2019). In order to ensure an equitable participation of all students, it is considered important for teachers to act as co–learners with their students and make their classroom "a site of joint learning and enquiry" (Alexander, 2020, p. 130).

Furthermore, across the reviewed models, a positive classroom climate, characterised by mutual trust and respect, positive interpersonal relationships, being open–minded to new ideas, feeling valued, and feeling comfortable to speak, is also seen as a precondition for productive classroom dialogue and active student participation (Alexander, 2020; Burbules, 1993; Mercer et al., 2019; Michaels et al. 2010; Nystrand, 1997). As the recent reviews highlight, a dialogically safe classroom atmosphere can only be cultivated if teachers and students respect, trust and actively listen to each other, share their opinions freely without any fear, are open–minded to new, multiple and diverse ideas, remain open to criticism and negotiation of their own ideas, and show a willingness to change their minds (e.g., Hennessy et al., 2016; Hennessy, Calcagni, et al., 2021; Howe et al., 2019; Kershner et al., 2020; Khong et al., 2019).

Conclusion

With the purpose of better understanding of dialogic teaching and learning approach, this study looked into several prominent models and relevant literature to uncover the key features of cognitive and socio–emotional dimensions of dialogic pedagogy. As explained in detail above, from a cognitive perspective, the dialogic teaching and learning models primarily treat classroom dialogue as an interactional form, emphasising the significance of using specific types of dialogic interactions and discourse moves that help students to think and learn. From a socio–emotional perspective, they also point out the importance of the existence of a supportive classroom climate and ethos in enabling teachers and students to take part in an effective classroom dialogue process. In line with this result, similar to Kim and Wilkinson's (2019) stance, this review highlights the importance of viewing dialogic teaching and learning as a pedagogical framework that comprises both cognitive and socio–emotional dimensions.

Only recently, several researchers have started to look into socio–emotional dimension of classroom dialogue (e.g., Hennessy, Calcagni et al., 2021). Hence to have a better understanding of socio–emotional dimension of dialogic pedagogy, this study urges future research studies to explore further the role of relational and affective aspects of classroom

dynamics in supporting classroom dialogue across a wide variety of instructional settings, subject areas, and socio–cultural contexts. In particular, future research studies are suggested to focus on investigating the factors that can impede or facilitate the cultivation of a supportive classroom climate for active student participation in classroom dialogue. Moreover, it appears important for intervention programs to include socio–emotional dimension of a dialogic pedagogy in their design process, and explicitly highlight the best strategies and tools for helping teachers with the creation and cultivation of a dialogic classroom climate and ethos.

Author Contributions

All three authors conceived of the presented idea of the manuscript, carried out the literature review, developed the main arguments and wrote and edited the manuscript.

References

Alexander, R. J. (2006). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (3rd ed.). Dialogos.

Alexander, R. J. (2008). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (4th ed.). Dialogos.

Alexander, R. J. (2017). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (5th ed.). Dialogos.

Alexander, R. J. (2018) Developing dialogic teaching: Genesis, process, trial. *Research Papers in Education*, *33*(5), 561–598. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2018.1481140

Alexander, R. (2020). *A dialogic teaching companion*. Routledge.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. University of Texas Press.

Boyd, M., & Rubin, D. (2006). How contingent questioning promotes extended student talk: A function of display questions. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *38*(2), 141–169. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15548430jlr380

Burbules, N. C. (1993). *Dialogue in teaching: Theory and practice*. Teachers College Press.

Calcagni, E., & Lago, L. (2018). The three domains for dialogue: A framework for analysing dialogic approaches to teaching and learning. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, *18*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2018.03.001

Chapin, S. H., O'Connor, M. C., & Anderson, N. C. (2009). *Classroom discussions: Using math talk to help students learn, Grades K-6*. Math Solutions.

Chow, B. W. Y., Hui, A. N. N., Li, Z., & Dong, Y. (2021). Dialogic teaching in English as a second language classroom: Its effects on first graders with different levels of vocabulary knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688209813

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

Freire, P. (1970). *In pedagogy of the oppressed. The Continuum International Publishing Group.* Retrieved from http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon2/pedagogy/pedagogychapter3.html

Freire, P. (2018). *Pedagogy of the oppressed: 50th anniversary edition* (4th ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Hardman, F. (2020). Embedding a dialogic pedagogy in the teaching of English. In J. Davison, & C. Daly (Eds.), *Debates in English teaching* (pp. 131–144). Routledge.

Hennessy, S., Mercer, N., & Warwick, P. (2011). A dialogic inquiry approach to working with teachers in developing classroom dialogue. *Teachers College Record*, *113*(9), 1906–1959. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811111300902

Hennessy, S., Rojas–Drummond, S., Higham, R., Márquez, A. M., Maine, F., Ríos, R. M., Garcia–Carrion, R., Torreblanca, O. & Barrera, M. J. (2016). Developing a coding scheme for analysing classroom dialogue across educational contexts. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 9*, 6–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2015.12.001

Hennessy, S., Dragovic, T., & Warwick, P. (2018). A research–informed, school–based professional development workshop programme to promote dialogic teaching with interactive technologies. *Professional Development in Education*, *44*(2), 145–168. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2016.1258653

Hennessy, S., & Davies, M. (2019). Teacher professional development to support classroom dialogue. In N. Mercer, R. Wegerif, & L. Major (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of research on dialogic education* (pp. 238–253). Routledge.

Hennessy, S., Howe, C., Mercer, N., & Vrikki, M. (2020). Coding classroom dialogue: Methodological considerations for researchers. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, *25*, 100–404. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2020.100404

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*, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2021.1956943

Hennessy, S., Kershner, R., Calcagni, E., & Ahmed, F. (2021). Supporting practitioner-led inquiry into classroom dialogue with a research-informed professional learning resource: A design-based approach. *Review of Education*, *9*(3), e3269. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3269

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

Kennedy, M. M. (2007). Defining a literature. *Educational Researcher*, *36*(3), 139–147. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X07299197

Kershner, R., Hennessy, S., Wegerif, R., & Ahmed, A. (2020). *Research methods for educational dialogue*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Khong, T. D. H., Saito, E., & Gillies, R. M. (2019). Key issues in productive classroom talk and interventions. *Educational Review*, *71*(3), 334–349. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2017.1410105

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://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2019.02.003

Kutnick, P., Blatchford, P., & Baines, E. (2002). Pupil groupings in primary school classrooms: Sites for learning and social pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal*, *28*(2), 187–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920120122149

Lefstein, A., & Snell, J. (2014). *Better than best practice: Developing teaching and learning through dialogue*. Routledge.

Littleton, K., & Mercer, N. (2013). *Interthinking: Putting talk to work*. Routledge.

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*, 100-500. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2021.100500

Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and learners.* Multilingual Matters.

Mercer, N. (2000). *Words & minds: How we use language to think together.* Routledge.

Mercer, N., & Sams, C. (2006). Teaching children how to use language to solve maths problems. *Language and Education, 20*(6), 507–528. https://doi.org/10.2167/le678.0

Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach*. Routledge.

Mercer, N., & Dawes, L. (2008). The value of exploratory talk. In N. Mercer & S. Hodgkinson, *Exploring talk in school* (pp. 55–72). Sage.

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*, 187–199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.08.007

Mercer, N., Wegerif R., & Major L. (2020). *The Routledge international handbook of research on dialogic education*. Routledge.

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

Michaels, S., O'Connor, M. C., Hall, M. W., & Resnick, L. B. (2010). *Accountable talk sourcebook: For classroom conversation that works.* University of Pittsburgh Institute for Learning.

Michaels, S., & O'Connor, C. (2015). Conceptualizing talk moves as tools: Professional development approaches for academically productive discussion. In L. B. Resnick, C. Asterhan, & S. N. Clarke (Eds.), *Socializing intelligence through talk* (pp. 347–362). AERA.

Muhonen, H., Pakarinen, E., Lerkkanen, M. K., Barza, L., & von Suchodoletz, A. (2020). Patterns of dialogic teaching in kindergarten classrooms of Finland and the United Arab Emirates. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, *25*, 100264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2018.11.011

Nystrand, M. (1997). Dialogic instruction: When recitation becomes conversation. In M. Nystrand, A. Gamoran, R. Kachur, & C. Prendergast (Eds.), *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom* (pp. 1-29). Teachers College Press.

Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., Kachur, R., & Prendergast, C. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*. Teachers College Press.

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

O'Connor, C., Michaels, S., & Chapin, S. (2015). 'Scaling down' to explore the role of talk in learning: From district intervention to controlled classroom study. In L. B. Resnick, C. S. C. Asterhan, & S. N. Clarke (Eds.), *Socializing intelligence through academic talk and dialogue* (pp. 111–126). American Educational Research Association.

Resnick, L. B., & Hall, M. W. (1998). Learning organizations for sustainable education reform. *Daedalus, 127*(4), 89–118.

Resnick, L. B. (1999). Making America smarter. *Education Week Century Series, 18*(40). 38–40.

Resnick, L., O'Connor, C., & Michaels, S. (2007). *Classroom discourse, mathematical rigor, and student reasoning: An accountable talk literature review:* LearnLab, Pittsburgh Science of Learning Center.

Resnick, L., Asterhan, C., & Clarke, S. (Eds.). (2015). *Socializing intelligence through academic talk and dialogue*. AERA.

Resnick, L. B., Asterhan, C. S., Clarke, S. N., & Schantz, F. (2018). Next generation research in dialogic learning. *Wiley Handbook of Teaching and Learning*, 323-338.

Reznitskaya, A., Kuo, L. J., Clark, A. M., Miller, B., Jadallah, M., Anderson, R. C., & Nguyen-Jahiel, K. (2009). Collaborative reasoning: A dialogic approach to group discussions. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *39*(1), 29–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640802701952

Reznitskaya, A., & Gregory, M. (2013). Student thought and classroom language: Examining the mechanisms of change in dialogic teaching. *Educational Psychologist, 48*(2), 114–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2013.775898

Sedova, K., Salamounova, Z., & Svaricek, R. (2014). Troubles with dialogic teaching. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 3*(4), 274–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2014.04.001

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

Vaughan, C. (2011). Dialogue, critical consciousness, and praxis. In I. D. Hook, B. Franks, & M. W. Bauer (Eds.), *The social psychology of communication* (pp. 46–66). Palgrave MacMillan.

Vrikki, M., Wheatley, L., Howe, C., Hennessy, S., & Mercer, N. (2019). Dialogic practices in primary school classrooms. *Language and Education*, *33*(1), 85–100. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1509988

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wegerif, R. (2007). *Dialogic education and technology: Expanding the space of learning*. Springer.

TÜRKÇE GENİŞ ÖZET

Diyalojik Öğretim ve Öğrenme Yaklaşımının Bilişsel ve Sosyo-Duygusal Boyutlarını Anlamak

Giriş

Diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenme, sınıftaki konuşmaların gücünden yararlanan pedagojik bir yaklaşımdır. Öğretmen merkezli monolojik yaklaşımın aksine, diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenmede öğrenciler, öğrenme süreçlerine aktif katılım gösterir, başkalarının görüşlerini açık fikirli, saygılı bir şekilde eleştirme, sorgulama fırsatı bulur; açık uçlu sorularla, kolektif akıl yürütmeyle bilgiyi ve anlayışı birlikte yapılandırır (Alexander, 2008; Chow vd., 2021; Hennessy vd., 2018; Hennessy, Kershner, vd., 2021; Mercer & Littleton, 2007). Diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenme yaklaşımının uygulanması öğrencilerin üst düzey düşünme becerilerini (eleştirel düşünme vb.) geliştirir (Alexander, 2020; Hennessy vd., 2018), derse karşı motivasyonlarını ve akademik başarılarını arttırır, sosyal gelişimi ve olumlu akran ilişkilerini destekler (Alexander, 2020).

Öğrencinin gelişimine katkıda bulunan diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenmenin sınıflarda yaygın olarak görülmemesinin nedenleri olarak, öğretmenlerin sınıf iletişiminde monolojik yaklaşımı kullanma eğilimleri (Hennessy vd., 2011; Teo, 2016), öğretim programı gerekliliklerine uyma konusunda baskı hissetmeleri (Hennessy & Davies, 2019), kalabalık sınıflar (Lefstein & Snell, 2014), öğrencilerin derslere katkısının önemsenmemesi (Boyd & Rubin, 2006) sayılabilir. Diyalojik pedagojinin ne olduğu, nasıl uygulanması gerektiği konusunda literatürdeki belirsizlikler, benzer ancak farklı birçok modelin varlığından kaynaklanan kafa karışıklığı da diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenmenin yavaş benimsenmesinde etkilidir. Ayrıca bu makalede, araştırma ve müdahale çalışmalarında sınıf diyaloğuna çoğunlukla bilişsel bakış açısıyla yaklaşıldığı belirlenmiştir. Sosyo-duygusal boyutun göz ardı edilmesinde sınıflarda diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenme yaklaşımının az görülmesinin de etkili olduğu düşünülmektedir. Çok sayıda araştırmacının vurguladığı üzere (Alexander, 2020; Cui & Teo, 2020; Hennessy, Calcagni, vd., 2021; Kim & Wilkinson, 2019; Resnick vd., 2018), sınıf diyaloğunun birbirleriyle etkileşen, sınıflarda diyalojik pedagojinin benimsenmesine katkıda bulunan, hem bilişsel hem de sosyo-duygusal boyutları vardır. Bundan dolayı, sınıf diyaloğunun sosyo-duygusal boyutunu ihmal ederek yalnızca bilişsel süreçler açısından değerlendirmek yetersizdir, diyalojik pedagojinin tam olarak anlaşılmasını engellemektedir.

Diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenme yaklaşımının daha iyi anlaşılmasına katkıda bulunmayı amaçlayan bu makale, diyalojik pedagojinin bilişsel ve sosyo-duygusal boyutlarının özelliklerini ortaya çıkarmak için literatürde iyi bilinen modelleri ve diğer ilgili literatürü eleştirel bir şekilde inceleyen kavramsal inceleme çalışması (Kennedy, 2007) sunmaktadır. Bu amaçla, 'diyalojik öğretim' (Alexander, 2020), 'diyalojik olarak düzenlenmiş öğretim' (Nystrand, 1997) 'diyalojik

öğretim' (Burbules, 1993), 'sorumlu konuşma ' (Resnick & Hall, 1998) ve 'keşfedici konuşma' (Mercer, 2000) modelleri diğer ilgili literatürle birlikte eleştirel bir şekilde incelenerek tartışılmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın, sınıflarda diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenme yaklaşımını incelemek ve uygulamak isteyen araştırmacılara, eğitimcilere yardımcı olacağı umulmaktadır.

Tartışma, Sonuç ve Öneriler

Diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenmenin temelleri Vygotsky'nin (1978) sosyokültürel, Bakhtin'in (1981) diyalogculuk teorisine ve Freire'nin (1970) diyaloğuna dayanır. Bu teorik bakış açılarından etkilenen bazı araştırmacılar, farklı diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenme modelleri öne sürmüşlerdir. Alexander (2020) diyalojik öğretim modelini, öğrencileri konuşmanın gücünden yararlanarak düşünmeye, öğrenmeye ve anlamaya teşvik eden genel bir pedagojik yaklaşım olarak tanımlamaktadır. Sınıftaki diyalojik öğretimi karakterize etmeye yardımcı olan kolektif, karşılıklı, destekleyici, kümülatif, müzakereci, amaçlı olmak üzere altı ilke tanımlar. Burbules (1993) diyalojik öğretimi kuralları gereği bir oyuna benzetmekte, bilişsel ve duyuşsal ilişkileri geliştiren iletişimsel bir ilişki olarak görmektedir. Michaels ve diğerleri (2008) diyalojik öğretim tanımlarında, öğrenmenin sorumlu konuşmalarla daha iyi gerçekleşebileceğini belirtmektedir. Nystrand (1997) diyalojik olarak düzenlenmiş öğretim terimini kullanır. Öğretmenin dersi organize ettiğini, öğretmen-öğrenci sorularının önemli olduğunu vurgular. Mercer (1995, 2000) birlikte düşünme yaklaşımı ile katılımcıların sorunlarını iş birliği içinde çözdüklerini, keşfedici konuşmalarla öğrencilerin kendi anlayışlarını oluşturabildiklerini belirtmektedir.

Yukarıda açıklanan tüm modeller üretken sınıf diyaloğunun temsil ettiği düşünülen bir dizi diyalojik etkileşim ve hareket önermektedir. Bu modeller, öğrenciler ve öğretmen tarafından diyalojik etkileşimlerin kullanımını teşvik eden, kolaylaştıran diyalojik bir ortam yaratma ve geliştirmede sınıf dinamiklerinin sosyo-duygusal yönlerini de tanımlar. Bu da modellerin bilişsel ve sosyo-duygusal boyutu beraber ele aldığını yani sınıf içi konuşmalar kadar pozitif sınıf katılımının oluşturulacağı sınıf ortamının da önemli olduğunu göstermektedir.

Bilişsel bakış açısına göre diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenme, sözel etkileşimlerin belirli biçimleri olarak tasarlanmaktadır (bkz. Cui & Teo, 2020; Hennessy, Calcagni, vd., 2021; Khong vd., 2019). Yukarıda bahsedilen modeller ve diyalojik etkileşimlerin ortak özelliklerini listeleyen güncel literatür (Hardman, 2020; Hennessy vd., 2016; Howe vd., 2019; Vrikki vd., 2019) dikkate alındığında yaygın olarak gözlemlenen diyalojik etkileşimler; açık uçlu sorular sormak (ör. özgün sorular sorarak açıklamalar isteme), verilen cevapların gerekçelerini istemek, sunulan fikirlere eleştirel bir şekilde yaklaşmak, onları sorgulamak ve üzerine yeni bilgi inşa etmek, konuyla ilgili bağlamı ve ilişkileri tanımlamak, tutarsızlıkları çözerek fikir birliğine varmaya çalışmak ve sınıfta gerçekleşen konuşmalar üzerine üstbilişsel yansıtmalar yapmak, şeklinde sıralanabilir.

Sosyo-duygusal boyut ise; sınıf iklimi, kişilerarası ilişkiler, değerler, tutumlar ve duygular gibi sınıf dinamiklerinin ilişkisel ve duygusal yönlerini kapsamaktadır. Bu makalenin ortaya koyduğu diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenme modelleri, diyalojik etkileşimlerin ortaya çıkmasını kolaylaştırmak için olumlu bir sınıf ikliminin yanı sıra aktif öğrenci katılımının teşvik edilmesinin önemini de vurgular. Diyalojik olarak güvenli bir sınıf ortamı ancak öğretmenler ve öğrenciler birbirlerine saygı ve güven duyar, birbirlerini dinler, fikirlerini özgürce paylaşır, yeni ve farklı fikirlere açık olur, kendi fikirlerini eleştirmeye, değiştirmeye istekli olduklarını gösterirlerse geliştirilebilir (ör. Hennessy vd., 2016; Howe vd., 2019; Kershner vd., 2020; Khong vd., 2019). Gözden geçirilen

modellerde, karşılıklı güven ve saygı, olumlu kişilerarası ilişkiler, yeni fikirlere açık olma, değer verildiğini hissetme, rahat konuşma ile karakterize edilen olumlu bir sınıf iklimi, üretken sınıf diyaloğu için bir ön koşul olarak görülmektedir (Alexander, 2020; Burbules, 1993; Mercer vd., 2019; Nystrand, 1997).

Diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenme yaklaşımının daha iyi anlaşılması amacıyla yapılan bu çalışmada, diyalojik pedagojinin bilişsel ve sosyo-duygusal boyutlarının temel özelliklerini ortaya çıkarmak için öne çıkan bazı modeller ve ilgili literatür incelenmiştir. Yukarıda ayrıntılı olarak açıklandığı üzere, bilişsel bir bakış açısından, diyalojik öğretim ve öğrenme modelleri, sınıf diyaloğunu öncelikle etkileşimli bir biçim olarak ele alır, öğrencilerin düşünmesine ve öğrenmesine yardımcı olan belirli diyalojik etkileşim türlerinin, söylem hareketlerinin kullanılmasının önemini vurgular. Sosyo-duygusal bakış açısıyla, öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin etkili bir sınıf içi diyalog sürecinde bulunmalarını sağlamada destekleyici bir sınıf ikliminin varlığı önemli görülmektedir.

Son yıllarda, araştırmacıların sınıf diyaloğunun sosyo-duygusal boyutunu incelemeye başladığı (ör. Hennessy, Calcagni, vd., 2021) görülmektedir. Bu çalışmanın, gelecekteki araştırmalara; çeşitli öğretim ortamlarında, konu alanlarında, sınıf diyaloğunu desteklemede sınıf dinamiklerinin ilişkisel ve sosyo-duygusal yönlerinin rolünü daha fazla keşfetmede yol göstereceği umulmaktadır. Sınıf diyaloğunda, aktif öğrenci katılımını destekleyici sınıf ikliminin geliştirilmesini etkileyen faktörlerin de araştırılmasına odaklanılabilir. Ayrıca, müdahale programlarının, diyalojik pedagojinin sosyo-duygusal boyutunu tasarım süreçlerine dâhil etmesi, öğretmenlere yardımcı olacak en iyi stratejileri, araçları açıkça vurgulaması da önemli görünmektedir.