

Understanding Pedagogical Dialogue: Indian context

Garima Aggarwal

Abstract

This paper presents a part of a qualitative study conducted in three Indian classrooms (Delhi) — state-run, private and private-progressive schools. The study aims to understand the varying degree of meaningful engagement that the teachers of the three selected schools are able to provide during the pedagogical dialogue. The objective is to understand the discursive ethos of the selected classrooms. For the purpose of analysis, theoretical ideas and constructs proposed by Bakhtin (1981, 1984) have been used. The analysis helps in determining the conditions in which dialogue, from a Bakhtinian perspective, is most likely to occur and what is and can be the role of the teacher in promoting and sustaining dialogue. It helps in the systematic exploration of the following specific questions like, how ‘monologue’ plays a pivotal role in the reproduction of ‘hierarchical’ relationships between the teacher and the students; how classroom processes manifest themselves in a dialogic environment; how active ‘dialogic’ orientations develop in students during classroom discussions, further helping in the construction of ‘democratic’ and ‘egalitarian’ classroom cultures; how the nature of ‘multiple discourses’ work together in classroom communication and the discursive space that it provides to students.

Keywords: Classroom culture, discourse, monologue, dialogue, authoritative discourse, voice.

INTRODUCTION

Exploring the pedagogical interactions in the classroom is crucial for understanding the diverse levels of meaningful engagement that teachers can offer to students. There are many leading theorists (Vygotsky, 1962, 1978; Bruner, 1996), whose work is considered influential and have been extensively used by many researchers (Barnes, 1993; Wells, 2000; Applebee et al, 2003) in understanding pedagogical interactions in the field of education. However, a strong case remains for initiating greater efforts in understanding the various nuances of teacher-student pedagogical interaction with empirical depth and clarity in the Indian context that explains how pedagogical interactions impact students’ learning. This article presents a part

of the study conducted in three secondary schools in Indian context (Delhi)— state run, private and private-progressive schools. The study attempts to understand the nature of the selected classrooms’ pedagogical interactions and their varying degrees of meaningful engagement. This article uses evidence gathered from the study examining classroom interactions and the researcher’s critical reflections upon the process to understand several common and distinct patterns of select classrooms’ discursive ethos during pedagogical interaction. This further helps in gauging the conditions in which dialogue, from the Bakhtinian perspective, is most likely to occur and what is and can be the role of the teacher in promoting and sustaining dialogue?

*Assistant Professor, Department of Elementary Education, Mata Sundri College, University of Delhi

Interaction in an educative process is studied by researchers using the socio-cultural lens which foregrounds and explicates upon the significant role of 'social interaction' during learning (Vygotsky, 1962, 1978; Barnes, 1993; Rogoff, 1994; Bruner, 1996; Wells, 2000). However, a strong case remains for initiating greater efforts at understanding various nuances of 'dialogue' in the classroom. Bakhtin's philosophy of language (1981, 1984, 1986) has been considered rigorous and robust to be applied in the field of education for illuminating various aspects related to dialogue and its meaningful engagements (Cooper et al., 2012). For the purpose of this research, a detailed and systematic framework has been drawn using the following key constructs of Bakhtin's (1981, 1984) metalinguistic theory of communication: 'monologue', 'dialogue' and 'authoritative discourse'. Each of these have been used as frames and reference points to make meaning of the field data and experiences.

Dialogue and Bakhtinian Thought

Bakhtin writes extensively on the 'social nature of language' and discards its singular and objective view. He advocates that language impacts and gets impacted by the complex and historically developed dimensions of a society (Holquist, 1983). Bakhtinian elucidations make it considerably essential to include multi perspective and simultaneous existence of all meanings. The simultaneity of meaning can be explained with the help of Bakhtinian (1981) construct—'dialogue', which can be explained as the 'relative presence of ideas' i.e., one perspective or idea has to be positioned relatively with their ideological opponents, conflicts and dissimilarities to be understood in coherence (Holquist, 2002). 'Difference' for Bakhtin is essential for the presence of informed understanding of the participants. The same is not possible with 'monologue' (Bakhtin, 1984) where a singular 'voice' (perspective) is dominant resulting in the elimination of other voices

(perspectives). Discussion which endorses such coercion of meanings gets developed into an 'authoritative discourse'. 'Discourse' is the ideational plane of a community which affects its participants and gets affected in turn, by its participants. Dialogue flourishes on the ideational plane of a discourse. An authoritative discourse eradicates dialogue and perpetuates only the voice of the powerful. On the other hand, a discourse becomes 'internally persuasive', when its participants are informed, self-assured and are allowed to develop critical minds. This consciousness helps in the 'ideological becoming' of an individual, which basically refers to how we develop our way of thinking and believing.

There has been growing interest in applying these ideas of Bakhtin in education amongst several scholars (Moraes 1996; Coulter 1999; Skidmore 2000; Miller 2003; Freedman and Ball 2004; Matusov and von Duyke, 2010; Barekat and Mohammadi, 2014). Research reveals how the Bakhtinian construct 'dialogue' presents a promising 'pedagogical tool' to create effective teaching-learning environments. A strong case remains for initiating greater effort to undertake classroom-based research from Bakhtin's metalinguistic perspective to enable a more nuanced understanding of classroom culture in Indian context and discourse.

Design of the Study

The study undertaken is qualitative research within the 'interpretivist paradigm' that attempts to produce contextual real-world understanding about the meaningfulness in learning and the discursive ethos in select classrooms. For the purpose of the research, three schools in the Indian setup from different administrative environments (to retain heterogeneity in classroom profiles) are chosen through 'purposive sampling strategy' — one of each—state-run school, private school, private-progressive school. Grade 8 classes of Social and Political Life (NCERT, 2006), are observed and the lesson transactions are recorded and

transcribed for one entire academic session by the researcher. The attempt is made to understand the entire data in terms of utterances instead of individual sentences. The researcher created a code for each utterance that further helped in creating 'critical links' between data collection and their explanation of meaning. The codes used explore thematic, pedagogical, instructional and responsive aspects of the data. All the utterances which could be assigned similar codes are then combined to construct 'episodes' under a particular theme for the purpose of writing.

Content analysis of the qualitative data obtained from the three classrooms highlight specific themes, including the everyday rituals of a classroom and the pedagogic approaches followed. These have been observed in the context of school type as well, however, without attempting any comparisons. One episode from each of the classroom is presented for the purpose of reference in the following section.

It can be summarised that a clear distinction was observed in the socio-cultural background of the students and teachers of the select classrooms.

Analysis

Classroom One: Authoritative Communication

Socio- cultural Background	Students	Teacher
State-run School	families of street vendors (17 students), hawkers (9 students), vegetable sellers (8 students) and site constructors (6 students). Hindus (16 students), Muslims (23 students), Sikh (1 student). Majorly talking in Hindi.	middle class Hindu family background, pursued a degree in education along with her graduation, 18 years of teaching from her first posting in government job. Teaches in Hindi
Private school	families of civil servants and corporate managers—total 24 students, families having their own teaching staff and administrative staff (8 students) Hindus (30 students), Sikhs (2 students) Majorly talking in English	wife of high paying civil servant and has been teaching in this school from past 7 years. She has a total experience of 22 years of teaching in several elite schools of Delhi. Hindu Teaches in English.
Progressive school	families having professional background. Hindus (16 students), Sikhs (7 students), Muslims (5 students), Christians (3 students) Using both Hindi and English.	pursued her master's degree both in education and political science and having teaching experience of 7 years. Teaching is bilingual.

Socio-cultural background of the participants

Box 1: Teaching for reproduction in exams

Context- The teacher starts the class by asking students to give a quick recap of the previous class in which she has already discussed about ‘sansad’.

T: han bachcho... pichli class me mene bataya tha ki ... ki... sansad ki avshyakta kyo hai. Koi batayega is baare me. Kaun bolega ... Neha ... Neha tum bolo (Tr: Ok children...I told in the previous class that...that...why is Parliament required. Can anyone tell about this? Who will speak...Neha..Neha, you speak)

Neha: (Silence)

T: Rajni tum bolo (Tr: Rajni, you speak)

Rajni: Madam, sansad rajye ko samprabhu banana ke liye avshyak hai. (Madam, Parliament is necessary to make the country sovereign)

T: Bahut badiya... aur kisiliye sansad ki avshyakta hai ... (Tr: Very good...and why else is Parliament required?)

Anita: maam aapne ye bhi bataya tha ki pehle angrezo ne hum pe shasan kiya, jiski vajah se hum apne decisions nai le paate the. Jaise hume apni kaksha me apne liye decision lene ka adhikar hai vaise hi rajye ko bhi apne decisions khud lene ka adhikar hona chahiye. (Maam, you also told that earlier British ruled over us, because of which we were not able to take our own decisions. Just like we have the right to take decisions in our class for ourselves, a state should also enjoy the right to take decisions for itself)

T: vo theek hai. Mene ye bataya tha ki ek rajye ko samprabhu banne ke liye yeh avshyak hai ki use apne nirnay lene ka adhikar ho. Vo baat rajni bol chukii hai. Paper mein vo sab hi likhna jo mene abhi bataya. Baki sab to me tumhe samjhane ke liye bol deti hun. (Tr: that is alright...I had told that in order to become sovereign, it is necessary that a state has the right to take decisions for itself. That point has already been spoken by Rajni. You're supposed to write all that I have told in the examination paper. Everything else is spoken by me just to help you understand).

Chapter: Chapter 3: Why do we need a Parliament? Social and Political Life – III, Grade 8, NCERT (2006).

The above episode highlights Anita's attempt to share her understanding of the concept of 'sansad' by talking about the significance of taking decisions for oneself in a democratic country. However, the teacher dismisses Anita's personal understanding and reiterates the need to 'mouth' definitions, given in the textbook. Bakhtin (1981) uses the phrase 'unitary language' for usage (of language) which is centripetal/centralising in its nature. For Bakhtin, such language "is posited at every moment of its linguistic life and is opposed to the realities of heteroglossia (pp- 270)". However, language which is culturally responsive and relevant would also partake in centrifugal forces. The teacher can be observed considering herself and the reference books as the only valid sources of information. Clearly, such pedagogic communication curbs student

initiative, rendering them into a kind of passivity. Bakhtin calls this a monologue – that which rejects experiences and viewpoints not in alignment with the perspective of the powerful participant (teacher in this case). Such teaching results in teaching without mind and the creation of an 'authoritative discourse' (Bakhtin, 1981).

Classroom talk witnessed in the present classroom can be examined through the lens of another theoretical idea proposed by Bakhtin (1981) — the difference between 'novel' and 'epic'. By drawing upon the genres of a novel and the epic, Bakhtin emphasises the significance of inconclusiveness that should remain within a 'discourse' for its further growth as 'dialogue.' The discourse should constitute language which is not unitary and centripetal in nature. Using definitions, emphasising on correct

answers and the primacy of facts over lived experiences tends towards the centripetal force of language, hence resulting in an 'epic'-like genre instead of 'dialogue.' Such characteristics of classroom talk creates a

kind of indispensability for conclusiveness and finality; coercing students into believing that knowledge is a given, is neutral and is therefore correct or incorrect; and has little to do with personal and social meanings.

Classroom Two: Derailed Attempts to Create Extended Conversations and Dialogue

Box 2: Ignoring student responses

Context- The teacher discusses some of the laws of the Indian state, how these are made and enforced.

T: So... law system in our country...ok ... Laws are enforceable on all...first of all...!! Laws ensure... right things happen around us. If somebody is jailed then what do we think about that person?

Yashi: mam that person must have done wrong...

(Couple of words from behind, could not record)

T: yes so it is called Violation of law. Yes or No?

Sts: (Chorus) Yes Mam...

T: Next they have written about ancient India... That all communities had separate set of laws... they were innumerable in number and at times overlapping also...

Natasha: Mam why overlapping...

T: ...Next in British era a number of laws were enforced upon India. These laws were arbitrary in nature. They have talked about Rowlett Act. What is this? Can somebody tell...?

(Silence)

T: What is this...we talked about this before ... come on who will tell ... You? Yes tell

Chandan: Mam they were imprisoned without any crime.

T: no not crime...without due trial in court. Next ...Now our constitution serves as the basis of our legal system... you people following... yes or no

Sts: (Chorus) Yes mam.

Chapter: Chapter 4: Understanding Laws, Social and Political Life – III, Grade 8, NCERT (2006).

In this episode the teacher rushes through the content and does not build on the students' responses. Bakhtin argues that monologue stems from hegemonic control (Holquist, 2002). According to Bakhtin, such talk eliminates plurality and variety in thought which are essential for dialogue. The teacher in the second classroom (from the private school) can be seen 'seeking' students' participation. What becomes quite clear soon enough, is that none of the questions asked by the teacher lead to any extended conversation within the class. Instead, each

of the observed classroom conversations tend to take the shape of a 'monologue'. Even though the teacher initiates discussion by asking a question, she is seen to dismiss students' responses by either turning a deaf ear or by questioning its relevance. The teacher's emphasis on 'correct' answers or on responses strictly from the textbook disallows any conceptual engagement on the matter being discussed. The consequence is the emergence of an authoritarian dominant voice of the teacher and the degeneration of 'apparent conversations' into monologue.

Classroom Three: Dialogical Communication

Box 19: Structuring meaningful classroom discussions

Context- The teacher is discussing the significance of Judiciary and is observed quoting examples of court judgements that have directly impacted students' lives.

T: Students what do you think about corporal punishment. ...

(After a few seconds) ... Do you all know that corporal punishment is banned in schools?

Lovely: yes mam. It is justified also...

T: what is it Naveen...?

Naveen: ma'am, it says that it is not allowed to beat the students ...

T: Yes it bans physical punishment to students.

Kritika: Mam it's a court decision. And teachers used to beat students on ...petty issues. Now it is banned.

Shivani: Why teachers would do that?

T: there were many such cases where teachers were found slapping or beating ruthlessly... one way of thinking was to control students by doing this I suppose.

Prateek: it's for all kinds of schools... we have such cases in private schools...?

T: Why not ... why do you think that private school teachers would not be indulged in such practices?

I have heard many such cases ... where teachers believe that students don't learn without physical punishment ...

T: What other cases you have heard about in your neighbourhood, family and friends... or you have read something in newspaper. This will help in understanding the topic better.

Kritika: Mam my family ... we are fighting a case against our tenants. We gave them two rooms upstairs to live. Now my brother is married and we need those two rooms. But they are denying to leave the room now.

Paras: What are they saying ... it's your place you can take it back.

Kritika: yes but they feel that they have lived here for 11 years and now they cannot be asked to leave the place like this.

T: okay ... the court must be looking at all the aspects of the case and will give its decision.

Shivani: Ma'am these days a lot of mention of courts... specially in newspaper ...

T: what did you read ,,,

Shivani: Mam there was a case ... Aarushi hatyakand ... but the case is just on and on ...

T: it takes time to visit and understand all the evidences and all of them do not come up in one time also... a thorough discussion and debate is also needed over each statement and evidence.

Shivani: yes mam, that is important ... but it takes way too much time.

T: yes, that is considered a drawback of Indian Judiciary system. The two cases that we just discussed ... they tell us that Judiciary basically helps in resolving disputes ... can disputes be only amongst individuals?

Prateek: No mam ... My papa is fighting a case against a school and CBSE... actually he and his friends are fighting it together ... My brother is not allowed to sit for 10th examinations ... he is mentally retarded and the school is not allowing him to leave maths... they are saying CBSE has no policy for this ...

T: ok ... so there can be disputes amongst individuals, individuals and institutions,

individuals and state as well ...

Prerna: Mam here they write between two state governments and centre and state government as well...

T: yes ... can we find out a few examples of such cases for tomorrow's class ...

(many answers in yes from the students)

So why do you think it is important to have courts What kind of damage we can have in our democracy if we don't have them ...

Naveen: Ma'am, it protects us and our rights ... if something wrong happens that is against our rights, we can go to the courts ...

Kritika: But ma'am ... we need a lot of improvements ... cases in courts take a lot of time ...

T: let's write what kind of improvements can be made to strengthen our Judiciary system and share that on our article board.

Chapter- Chapter 5: Judiciary, Social and Political Life – III, Grade 8, NCERT (2006).

In this episode the teacher asks students a question which requires them to probe the motives for banning corporal punishment. This example provides a good entry point for students whose life at school is directly impacted by this legal provision. It is evident that the teacher does not ask questions that demand mere reproduction of information. Instead, she encourages students to respond spontaneously and then reflect on their own thinking about the subject. While analysing the dynamics of language in learning during English classes from Bakhtinian perspective, Nystrand (1997) points out that the kind of questions asked by teachers play a major role in enabling dialogue inside classrooms. Teacher-student interaction presented in the Box above, indicates that the teacher encourages students to reflect on situations and then asks them to share examples of court cases from their daily lives. She views herself as a participant who also needs to continually think and re-think about issues. The episode indicates that students do not simply respond to the questions of the teacher. Instead, they themselves contribute conceptually in the ongoing discussion through a sharing of their lived experiences. For example, Shivani mentions the case of '*Aarushi hatyakand*'. Another student shares her experience of her father filing a case against the CBSE. This episode shows students sharing their viewpoints with fellow students and with the teacher. The teacher builds on the student's idea and

designs an assignment for them to write on how and what kind of improvements can be made to strengthen the judicial system. The teacher does not come across as the sole authority of either the ideas discussed or sitting in judgement of students' opinions and thinking. She is nevertheless seen as a responsible figure of authority (not authoritarian), explaining to the students the rationale of discussing a particular issue and for taking certain positions. Students are expected to engage with the several layers that make up an issue through rigorous enquiry using concepts and sub-concepts; and most importantly, without any attempt to categorize student responses as either 'right' or 'wrong.' The pattern of questioning deployed by the teacher, apart from sustaining engagement and dialogue, helps students develop several capacities and dispositions, such as, the ability to explicate their own thoughts and articulate with clarity, the ability to critically analyse a given situation, to refocus on a problem situation and revisit it with new perspectives to gain better insight, to collaborate and learn to listen to one another without necessary intervention by the teacher; to explore possibilities and to express themselves in an uninhibited manner. This, as elucidated by Bakhtin (1981), is 'ideological becoming', where individuals learn to develop ways of understanding the world.

Discussion

The Absence of Dialogue

Analysis reveals that the government school classroom reflects a clear inclination towards the construction of 'monologue', where the teacher's 'voice' dominates and is presented as authority. This occurs through several pedagogic measures, including a concerted emphasis on 'memorization of definitions', mouthing 'textbook' language; encouraging the reproduction of 'correct answers' over conceptual engagement; and rewarding 'primacy of fact' over the lived experiences of students. The primary reason behind such a classroom ethos is identified to be the belief of the teacher in 'transmission of information' as the key mode of instruction.

In the private school classroom, the teacher is seen making several attempts to seek students' participation. Close scrutiny shows that the participation of students is largely sought through the posing of routine questions such as – information-based questions demanding recall or reference to text; questions requiring students to make simple applications of concepts and questions that seek validity of students' responses. Bakhtin (1984) criticises the view of knowledge as independent from individual experiences. For Bakhtin "truth is not born, nor is it found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction" (pp- 110). Most of the questions asked by the teacher can be referred to as 'display questions,' where just a display of knowledge is demanded as against critical application of concepts, as argued by Long and Sato (1983). In the private school classroom, students were observed to respond to such questions because of the obligation to respond to the teacher, not because they are engaged. Meaning making as explained by Bakhtin (1981), happens when a person engages with her immediate surroundings and creates personalized understanding.

Role of Monologue in Reproduction of Hierarchy

The teacher in the government school puts forth a conception of learning that foregrounds memorization and retention as the only way to gain knowledge. The students do not consider it significant to know what they gain from lessons in terms of understanding; they too seem to be interested in knowing how to memorize important facts and information for the purpose of qualifying examinations. Similarly, the 'authoritative discourse' created by the domination of the teacher appears to obstruct other voices and restrict students' thinking in the Private school. It would not be wrong to say that most students are overwhelmed and hence feel disempowered by the prevailing 'authoritative classroom discourse'. It can be inferred through analysis that students were gradually conditioned to this pattern of classroom talk. Students are seen undermining their own responses, each time acknowledging the unquestioned authority of the teacher by singing in chorus 'yes ma'am'. Classroom discourse and culture that gives premium to the overwhelming authority of the teacher and disregards students' thinking and lived experiences amounts to a denial of their 'epistemic selves'.

Ecology of a Dialogic Classroom

Conversations in the progressive school classroom exhibit the generation of meaningful and contextualized dialogue between the teacher and students and among students within the familiar and lived experiences. Students in the progressive school classroom are seen identifying themselves with what is being discussed and are hence involved and engaged.

Observations reveal that the progressive school classroom permits the expression of 'multiple viewpoints' that contributes to the richness of discussions by inviting students to 'dialogue'. These viewpoints were not only

viewpoints of individual students and the teacher, but also of the textbook, references to which were continually made by the teacher and students. While the teacher's viewpoints clearly emerge as the central guiding force within the discourse, students share their life experiences, ask questions, and express doubts and beliefs in a fearless manner. A multi-voiced discursive environment (classroom in this case) that presents reality in manifold ways creates scope for diverse socio-cultural lived experiences of participating students to enter the classroom discourse (Bakhtin, 1981).

Classroom discussions include several pedagogical elements, such as prompting students to revisit concepts; encouraging them to stretch their imagination, share personal experiences, evaluate their own and others' views, and engage in inferential reasoning and reflection. The teacher in the progressive school classroom is often seen stimulating students' thinking by asking questions that require them to reflect on their assumptions and the normative views they hold. The questions asked by the teacher not just seek students' participation but helps in generating 'social talk' inside the classroom. 'Social talk' according to Bakhtin (1981) is a natural way for participants to be engaged in an on-going discourse. Students in the progressive school classroom were engaged meaningfully and dialogically. Dialogue thus generated, leads students to express their individual voices assertively.

Dialogue is seen manifesting itself through critical pedagogical practices followed by the teacher: allowing the expression of doubts, observations, and beliefs; encouraging listening and acceptance of other's perspectives; contextualizing content with students' lived experiences; critically analyzing subject matter given in the textbook; and weaving classroom discussion around text material, students' varied responses and teachers' own views, collaboratively.

Teacher's Role in Creating a Dialogical Classroom

The dialogic environment in the progressive school classroom demonstrates an open, democratic, and egalitarian relationship between the teacher and students. The teacher in the progressive school is observed using 'talk' effectively for various classroom activities. It is not a teacher driven conversation, but an exchange of ideas occurring organically amongst all participants. Findings highlight the critical role of the teacher in mediating textbook knowledge; and the potency of transforming traditional authoritative schooling into a dialogical discursive environment that recognizes students as epistemic entities, capable of developing rational independent thought.

Engaging with Ascribed Identities

During the study the researcher found various other social factors and contestations that impact the Teacher- Students Interaction in the classroom. Socio-cultural identities that students bring to the classroom are further mediated by the culture of the classroom and its discourse. Every classroom too is a socially constituted. Interaction, which is relational in nature for Bakhtin, develops interdependently within the social environment of the classroom. As argued by Wortham (2004), when students and teachers discuss subject matter, students get socially identified as recognisable types of people. In a monological classroom, teacher-student interaction is seen embodying social prejudices that lead towards discrimination on the basis of ascribed identities such as religion and caste. As a result, children may attribute inadequacies pointed in them by the teacher and peers, to their social background. This internalisation of low self-worth silences them. It can be argued on the basis of this research, that pedagogic communication plays a critical role in constructing and re-constructing the social environment of the classroom as well as the sense of self of students.

Teachers of the government and the private school classrooms appear to reproduce normative voices of the cultural and semiotic world through a monologic classroom environment and discourse. Some examples of normative voices include the following: “majoritarian religion defines Indian identity; ‘normal’ Muslims are different; students from lower socio-economic backgrounds are deficient in learning; the marginalised sections of society require our sympathy.” Observations reveal that an authoritative discourse within the monological classroom encourages students to accept normative voices even when some students express counter voices.

Students in a progressive school classroom however, are encouraged to introduce novelty in their internalisations in ways that have the potential to transform cultural practices. Students are encouraged to think critically by exploring alternative perspectives and examining their own notions. However, instances of conflicting perspectives such as gender highlights the fact that the teacher found herself unable to handle the complexity of the discourse. In this case, dialogue becomes difficult to sustain. However, a classroom that is predominantly dialogical

in nature holds the promise of creating independent thinking and a disposition to engage.

Conclusion

The present paper captures several classroom conversations to understand the culture and discourse of select Indian classrooms. Teachers who foster authoritative discourse within their classrooms, create classroom environments that result in explicit positioning of students at a loss of their voice. Teacher’s control in such a classroom obstructs students thinking that further results in students doubting their own experiences. Teachers, on the other hand, who foster dialogic relationships with their students, create classroom environments more conducive to meet the academic, emotional, and developmental needs of a learner. Students’ empowered reasoning around various social and political issues further help in the construction of ‘democratic’ and ‘egalitarian’ classroom. Active responses from students lead discussions and their directions is determined during various debates and negotiations.

Reference

- Bakhtin, M. M., & M. Holquist. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: four essays* (Vol. 1). University of Texas press, Austin.
- Bakhtin, M. M. & C. Emerson. 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* (vol 8). University of Minnesota Press Minneapolis.
- Bakhtin, M., 1986. *Speech Genres and other Late Essays* (Vol. 8). University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Barekat, B., & S. Mohammadi. 2014. The Contribution of the Teachers’ Use of Dialogic Discourse Pattern to the Improvement of the Students’ Speaking Ability. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 353-362.
- Barnes, D. 1993. Supporting Exploratory Talk for Learning. *Cycles of Meaning: Exploring the potential of talk in learning communities*, 17-34.
- Bruner, J. 1996. *The Culture of Education*. Cambridge. Harvard University Press, Massachusetts.
- Cohen, L., L. Manion, & K. Morrison. 2002. *Research methods in education*. Routledge.
- Cooper, M., A. Chak, F. Cornish, & A. Gillespie. 2012. Dialogue: Bridging personal, community, and social transformation. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 0022167812447298.
- Coulter, D. 1999 *The Epic and the Novel: dialogism and teacher research*. *Educational Researcher*, 28(3), 4-13.
- Freedman, S. W., & A. Ball. 2004. Ideological becoming: Bakhtinian concepts to guide the study of language. *Bakhtinian perspectives on language, literacy, and learning*, 3-33.

- Holquist, M. 1983. Answering as Authoring: Mikhail Bakhtin's trans-linguistics. *Critical Inquiry*, 10(2), 307-319.
- Holquist, M. 2002. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*. Routledge, London.
- Matusov, E., & K. von Duyke. 2009. Bakhtin's notion of the internally persuasive discourse in education: Internal to what? *Perspectives and Limits of Dialogism in Mikhail Bakhtin*, 174.
- Miller, S. M. 2003. How literature discussion shapes thinking. *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*, 289-316.
- Moraes, M. 1996. *Bilingual Education: A dialogue with the Bakhtin circle*. SUNY Press.
- Nystrand, M. 1997. *Opening Dialogue: Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Learning in the English Classroom*. Language and Literacy Series. Teachers College Press.
- Nystrand, M. & A. Gamoran. 1991. Student engagement: When recitation becomes conversation. In H. C. Waxman & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Effective Teaching: Current research*. (pp. 257-276). McCutchan, Berkeley, CA.
- Read, M. 2008. Distributing agency by developing classroom activity. *Educational Review*, 60(2), 187-207.
- Rogoff, B. 1994. Developing Understanding of the Idea of Communities of Learners. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 1(4), 209-229.
- Skidmore, D. 2000. From pedagogical dialogue to dialogical pedagogy. *Language and Education*, 14(4), 283-296.
- Vadeboncoeur, J. A., & A. Luke. 2004. Who's at risk? answerability and the critical possibilities of classroom discourse. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1(2), 201-223.
- Vygotsky, L. 1962. *Thought and Language*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. *Mind in Society*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Wells, G. 2000. *Dialogic Inquiry in Education: Building on the legacy of Vygotsky*. In Lee, C.D. & Smagorinsky, P. (eds) (2000) *Vygotskian Perspectives on Literacy Research: constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge/New York.