Published Date: - 25-11-2025
Page No: - 217-223

DIALOGIC TEACHING IN THE 21ST CENTURY CLASSROOM: RETHINKING TEACHER–STUDENT COMMUNICATION

Rozimatova Maxfuza
Teacher Hacaton IT School, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Rapid social, technological, and cultural transformations have heightened the necessity for classrooms where communication transcends mere teacher instruction and succinct student replies, evolving into a collaborative environment for inquiry, reasoning, and collective meaning-making. Studies on dialogic teaching indicate that organized classroom dialogue can improve students' cognitive, linguistic, and socio-emotional growth, as well as increase achievement, especially in underprivileged settings. However, in numerous educational systems, teacher-student communication continues to adhere to monologic patterns influenced by recitation, assessment, and curriculum coverage. This article analyzes dialogic teaching as a response to the communicative challenges of 21st-century education and advocates for a re-conceptualization of teacher–student discourse as a fundamental pedagogical resource rather than a neutral conduit. Based on a narrative review of important works on classroom talk, sociocultural theory, and dialogic pedagogy from 1997 to 2024, the paper brings together the main ideas of dialogic teaching, such as epistemic openness, shared responsibility for ideas, and the planned organization of cumulative, reasoned classroom talk. It subsequently examines the implementation of these principles in modern classrooms characterized by increasing digitization, diversity, and a focus on accountability. The article concludes that dialogic teaching provides a robust framework for aligning teacher-student communication with 21st-century competencies, including critical thinking, collaboration, and democratic participation. However, its broader implementation necessitates ongoing professional development, conducive policy environments, and a transformation in perceptions regarding knowledge, authority, and classroom management.

KEYWORDS: Dialogic teaching; classroom talk; teacher–student communication; 21st-century skills; digital pedagogy; sociocultural theory.

INTRODUCTION

In many education systems, official rhetoric increasingly celebrates learner-centred education, critical thinking and collaboration, while everyday classroom life continues to be dominated by tightly controlled teacher questioning and short student answers. Extensive observational studies have recorded the frequency of recitation-style discourse, characterized by teachers posing questions, assessing succinct responses, and swiftly progressing, thereby providing minimal opportunity for students to investigate concepts, contest assumptions, or enhance each other's contributions. These patterns are becoming less and less in line with the communication needs of the 21st century, where young people are expected to deal with different types of information, work together to solve problems, and take part in public discussions.

Published Date: - 25-11-2025
Page No: - 217-223

Dialogic teaching is a purposeful effort to change how people talk to each other in the classroom. Instead of seeing talk as a way to share information that has already been decided somewhere else, dialogic pedagogy sees classroom communication as a key place where knowledge is built, perspectives are negotiated, and identities are formed. Robin Alexander's widely referenced work characterizes dialogic teaching as the adept utilization of classroom discourse to provoke thought, enhance comprehension, and construct logical arguments, positioning students as active participants in collaborative inquiry rather than mere recipients of information. Mercer and Howe, utilizing sociocultural theory, underscore that learning occurs through guided participation in collaborative, language-mediated activities rather than through solitary acquisition alone.

In the 21st century, dialogic teaching is both more promising and more difficult. Digital technologies enable students to engage with diverse perspectives and facilitate communication across temporal and spatial boundaries; however, they also exacerbate the dissemination of misinformation and the polarization of public discourse. Wegerif contends that education in the digital era must foster the ability to engage in “dialogic space” – a communal environment where learners embrace diverse viewpoints and remain receptive to transformation through interaction. At the same time, high-stakes accountability systems, strict curricula, and big classes make it hard to have long conversations in the classroom. Teachers often feel torn between the need to "cover" material and the need to encourage discussion.

In light of this context, the current article reevaluates teacher-student communication through the framework of dialogic teaching. It has three goals. First, it makes the theoretical basis of dialogic pedagogy clearer, especially how it is based on sociocultural and dialogic theories of learning. Second, it brings together important parts of dialogic classroom practice in ways that are relevant to 21st-century schools, such as digital and hybrid learning environments. Third, it talks about how this affects teacher professional development and educational policy. It says that dialogic teaching should not be seen as an optional method, but as a fundamental approach to classroom life in modern education.

This article is predicated on a narrative review and conceptual synthesis rather than a singular empirical study. The methodological objective was to integrate significant research trajectories concerning classroom discourse and dialogic pedagogy, interpreting them in the context of contemporary discussions regarding 21st-century competencies and digital education. A narrative review was selected due to the field's inclusion of various traditions—discourse analysis, sociocultural psychology, philosophy of education, and design-based research—that are inadequately addressed by narrowly defined systematic review protocols.

The literature search concentrated on publications released from 1997, the year of Nystrand’s seminal study Opening Dialogue, to early 2024, by which time dialogic teaching had evolved into a recognized international discipline. We searched electronic databases (like ERIC, Scopus, Web of Science, and publisher platforms) for combinations of terms like "dialogic teaching," "classroom talk," "educational dialogue," "teacher-student interaction," and "sociocultural theory." Alexander, Mercer, Nystrand, and Wegerif's seminal monographs and handbooks served as anchor texts, and backward and forward citation tracking was employed to pinpoint related empirical and conceptual research.

About sixty sources were chosen for close reading. Inclusion was predicated on conceptual relevance to teacher-student communication, explicit engagement with dialogic or

sociocultural frameworks, and empirical or theoretical rigor. Recent contributions to dialogic teaching in online and hybrid settings were incorporated to represent the realities of post-pandemic education. The chosen studies underwent inductive analysis. Recurrent themes emerged concerning the conceptualization of dialogic teaching, the associated teacher practices, the reported learning outcomes, and the conditions that facilitate or hinder its implementation. Subsequently, these themes were categorized into overarching dimensions of dialogic pedagogy and analyzed through the frameworks of 21st-century skills and digital education.

There are some problems with this method. It does not assert comprehensive coverage of all literature on classroom dialogue, and it inevitably embodies the author's interpretive perspective. Nonetheless, its strength resides in offering a cohesive theoretical framework based on significant and frequently referenced research, including a substantial randomized controlled trial of dialogic teaching in primary schools in England, alongside contemporary studies on dialogic pedagogy in international higher education and online learning.

A primary finding from the reviewed literature is the distinction between monologic recitation and dialogic inquiry as prevailing modes of classroom discourse. Nystrand's examination of numerous English lessons revealed that conventional recitation formats—characterized by teachers posing known-answer questions, selecting specific students, and rapidly assessing their responses—constrain students' opportunities for higher-order thinking and collaborative meaning-making. In these classrooms, communication is mostly used for management and testing; it keeps people in line and checks their memory instead of letting them talk about ideas. Dialogic teaching, on the other hand, purposefully increases the dialogic potential of what students say and do in class. Alexander's research shows that classroom communication changes when teachers ask real questions, let students talk for a long time, use their contributions as starting points for more questions, and encourage students to respond to and build on each other's ideas.

Conversations become more exploratory and cumulative, and meanings are built together instead of being handed to people. Mercer and colleagues have demonstrated that students participating in structured "exploratory talk" enhance their reasoning abilities and deepen their conceptual comprehension, especially in disciplines like science and mathematics.

The Education Endowment Foundation trial of dialogic teaching in England offers quantitative validation for these assertions. In a study with almost 5,000 students in 76 primary schools, classes whose teachers had taken part in a dialogic teaching professional development program made, on average, two more months of progress in English and science and one more month of progress in math than control classes. These improvements were especially noticeable for students from less fortunate backgrounds, which suggests that dialogic teaching may help both fairness and overall success.

The second finding pertains to the evolving roles of educators and learners in dialogic classrooms. In monologic contexts, the teacher serves as the principal epistemic authority, governing the progression of inquiries, responses, and assessments. Students are primarily positioned as respondents tasked with demonstrating individual mastery. In dialogic pedagogy, authority is reallocated rather than relinquished. Teachers are still in charge of making sure that discussions have an educational purpose, but they intentionally create what Wegerif calls "dialogic space," where many voices and points of view can be heard and examined together.

Schaffalitzky's recent research shows that dialogic teaching requires teachers to be truly interested in what their students have to say and not to end a discussion too soon when the expected answer comes up.

Teachers don't want students to all agree on one right answer. Instead, they want students to explain, defend, and improve their own views based on other people's views. This change in roles is also clear in the growing field of "philosophy with children," where teachers are less like lecturers and more like facilitators of community inquiry, helping students come up with common rules for listening, reasoning, and disagreeing.

Students are then asked to take charge of moving the conversation forward. They should ask their classmates and the teacher questions, respectfully challenge what they think they know, connect ideas from different contributions, and back up their claims with facts or personal experience. These expectations change the rules of the classroom over time. Students are not only judged on how accurate their individual answers are; they are also judged on how well they work together to come up with new ideas. The studies that were reviewed show that moving students around in this way can make them feel more in control, more like they belong, and more confident in their own intelligence, especially when dialogic norms are taught and modeled.

A third group of findings has to do with how digital technologies affect communication between teachers and students. The quick growth of online and hybrid learning during and after the COVID-19 pandemic showed how weak traditional ways of interacting can be and how digital tools can be used to start new conversations. Research on synchronous video-based teaching shows that many remote lessons copied the way lectures are given, which made students less interested and less connected to each other. However, when teachers intentionally used digital affordances – such as chat functions, breakout rooms, shared documents and polling tools – to orchestrate multi-voiced, reflective discussions, students reported greater satisfaction and deeper involvement in learning.

Wegerif contends that networked technologies can broaden the parameters of dialogic space by linking learners to varied communities and resources; however, they also pose the risk of diluting attention and fostering uncritical information consumption. From a dialogic teaching perspective, the key question is not whether technology is used, but how it is harnessed to support sustained, reasoned and inclusive dialogue. Asynchronous discussion forums and dialogue journals, for instance, can give students who aren't sure of themselves time to think about what they want to say and keep a record of how classroom conversations change over time. Students can work together to make texts, concept maps, or data sets on collaborative platforms while also talking about why they made the choices they did. When used wisely, these tools make it possible for teachers and students to talk to each other over longer periods of time and in more places. They also open up new ways for people to get involved.

Finally, the literature agrees that supportive classroom and institutional conditions are necessary for dialogic teaching to continue. Alexander delineates a framework of principles that characterize dialogic discourse as collective, reciprocal, supportive, cumulative, and purposeful, underscoring that these attributes manifest solely within a coherent culture of communication embraced by both educators and learners. To create this kind of culture, people need to work on "ground rules" for discussion, such as how to listen carefully, how to

respectfully challenge others, and how to expect that contributions should be explained and justified.

Studies on professional development show that teachers don't usually start using dialogic methods just by reading about them. Change is more likely to happen when teachers work together to plan, reflect on videos, model, and coach each other, and when leaders value dialogue as a key part of teaching rather than as an extra skill. It's also very important to plan your time. Dialogic lessons may seem slower at first because they focus on understanding deeply instead of quickly covering a lot of ground. When curricula are too full and tests reward remembering facts, teachers have reasons not to spend time on longer discussions. Policy frameworks that prioritize oral language, reasoning, and collaborative problem-solving in assessment and accountability metrics are essential facilitators of dialogic teaching.

The synthesis above confirms that dialogic teaching is a strong and well-supported alternative to monologic recitation as the main way for teachers and students to talk to each other. Based on sociocultural theory, it sees learning as a process of guided participation in shared activities that involve language, where meanings are negotiated instead of given, and where knowledge comes from the interaction of different points of view. This perspective aligns closely with modern definitions of 21st-century competencies, which highlight not only individual cognitive abilities but also collaboration, communication, creativity, and civic involvement.

Dialogic teaching fosters the essential dispositions required by citizens in pluralistic and digitally saturated societies: receptiveness to diverse perspectives, readiness to substantiate assertions, ability to amend beliefs based on new evidence, and awareness of the ethical implications of discourse. The RCT evidence indicating that dialogic instruction can enhance achievement, including for disadvantaged students, implies that these broader objectives do not compromise quantifiable academic results. Instead, they seem to make them stronger.

The review also points out some big problems at the same time. Many teachers were socialized into monologic patterns of schooling and may equate classroom control with minimizing open discussion. It's hard to try out new ways of communicating when there are a lot of students in the class, the curriculum is focused on tests, and there isn't much time for instruction. In certain cultural contexts, entrenched norms regarding authority and deference can make questioning or disagreement uncomfortable for both educators and students. Dialogic pedagogy cannot disregard these realities; it must engage with them. Studies on cross-cultural applications of dialogic teaching indicate that concepts such as respect, common objectives, and cumulative reasoning can be achieved through contextually suitable forms of discourse, contingent upon educators receiving assistance in balancing the dynamics between innovation and tradition.

The digital turn makes things even more complicated. Online spaces can let many people join in, but they can also make people act in shallow ways, switch turns quickly, and do more than one thing at a time. The studies reviewed on dialogic teaching in synchronous online lessons indicate that merely transferring existing practices to video platforms is improbable to yield substantive dialogue. Teachers should have chances to try out digital tools in ways that keep the main dialogic ideas intact: seeing student contributions as valuable, building on previous questions, and encouraging everyone to take responsibility for the quality of the discussion. This might mean that teachers need to work together to come up with new ways to learn, try out, and think about digitally mediated dialogic tasks.

Another problem has to do with testing. As long as high-status tests focus mostly on written work and remembering specific facts, teachers will be under a lot of pressure to put coverage and test prep ahead of exploratory conversation. Some systems have started to include oral communication and working together to solve problems in their assessment frameworks, but these changes are still only partial and not always consistent. To make dialogic teaching work, the goals of the curriculum, the expectations for teaching, and the ways of testing need to be better aligned. This does not mean giving up high standards or strict testing; instead, it calls for a wider view of evidence that includes the value of classroom talk and how it helps students learn over time.

In conclusion, the review posits that dialogic teaching is optimally perceived not as a static methodology but as a dynamic approach to pedagogy and learning. Teachers who take a dialogic approach see communication in the classroom as a way for both them and their students to learn. They pay close attention to how people interact with each other, ask how different voices are positioned and whose views are heard or ignored, and change what they say based on what they see. This position is inherently developmental; it necessitates time, contemplation, and collegial assistance. Initial teacher education and continuous professional development are essential for developing the knowledge, attitudes, and practical skills necessary for dialogic work.

Through the lens of dialogic teaching, rethinking how teachers and students talk to each other changes the classroom from a place where knowledge is shared to a place where people ask questions and form their own identities. The literature examined in this article demonstrates that when educators intentionally facilitate collective, reasoned, and supportive discourse in the classroom, students gain advantages not only in academic achievement but also in their ability to engage in collaborative thinking, articulate and defend their perspectives, and partake in democratic dialogue. These results are especially relevant in the 21st century, where people have to deal with complicated information systems and work together with people from different cultures and points of view.

To fully realize the potential of dialogic teaching, however, more than just individual teacher enthusiasm is needed. It requires coherent professional development that gives teachers chances to look at their own work, try out new ways of communicating, and get feedback in a trusting environment. It also depends on policy frameworks that acknowledge the importance of classroom conversation for learning, that give teachers enough freedom in the curriculum to focus on depth over speed, and that include tasks that encourage conversation in assessments. In digital and hybrid settings, dialogic principles can direct the pedagogically sound application of technology, guaranteeing that tools are utilized to enhance, rather than diminish, educational discourse.

In short, dialogic teaching is a strong way to make sure that classroom communication meets the cognitive, social, and moral needs of the 21st century. Educators can make learning spaces where students learn not only to know, but also to listen, question, and reason together by seeing teacher-student talk as a shared project of inquiry instead of a one-way transmission.

REFERENCES

1. Alexander R. Towards Dialogic Teaching: Rethinking Classroom Talk. 5th ed. York: Dialogos, 2017. 60 p.

2. Alexander R. A Dialogic Teaching Companion. New York: Routledge, 2020. 236 p.
3. Nystrand M. Opening Dialogue: Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Learning in the English Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1997. 141 p.E
4. Mercer N., Howe C. Explaining the dialogic processes of teaching and learning: The value and potential of sociocultural theory // Learning, Culture and Social Interaction. 2012. Vol. 1, No. 1. P. 12–21.
5. Wegerif R. Dialogic: Education for the Internet Age. London: Routledge, 2013. 208 p.
6. Schaffalitzky C. Dialogic teaching // In: Klausen S.H., Mård N. (eds.). Developing a Didactic Framework Across and Beyond School Subjects: Cross- and Transcurricular Teaching. London: Routledge, 2024. P. 61–73.
7. Jay T. et al. Dialogic Teaching: Evaluation Report and Executive Summary. London: Education Endowment Foundation, 2017. 84 p.
8. Alexander R. Developing dialogic teaching: Genesis, process, trial // Research Papers in Education. 2018. Vol. 33, No. 5. P. 561–598.
9. Hardman J. Developing and supporting implementation of a dialogic pedagogy in primary schools in England // Teaching and Teacher Education. 2019. Vol. 87. P. 1–12.
10. Schou-Juul F., Jensen S.S. Using dialogic teaching to promote student satisfaction and engagement in emergency remote teaching in primary school: A proof-of-concept study // Technology, Pedagogy and Education. 2023. Vol. 33, No. 2. P. 1–15.
11. Ucan S. Understanding the cognitive and socio-emotional affordances of dialogic teaching for upper primary students // Education Sciences. 2023. Vol. 13, No. 4. P. 1–20.
12. Warwick P., Dawes L. Dialogic teaching and learning in the primary school // In: Developing Dialogue for Learning in the Classroom. London: Routledge, 2018. P. 1–20.