

Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for Improvements

Saadi Takoua

Université Hassiba Ben Bouali Chlef, t.saadi97@univ-chlef.dz
Laboratory information and communication technologies in the
teaching of foreign languages and translation
(TICELET) C0882600

Received: 10/07/2023

Accepted: 12/03/2024

Published: 30/06/2024

Abstract:

This research paper examines the present condition of teaching literature dialogically in Algerian higher education for EFL context with the aim of striving for change in the current methods followed in teaching English literature in Algerian universities, shifting to a more dialogic approach. Through an extensive literature review and empirical analysis, this study investigates literature teachers' knowledge of dialogism and to what extent they are using it in their literary discussions. The research methodology involved is based on interviews held via Zoom meetings with teachers of literature around different Algerian Universities' English departments. There were five teachers in total, and there were 11 questions that were analyzed based on the theoretical framework and didactical implications. The analysis was scaled on how many teachers out of five agreed on certain answering criteria.

The findings of this study reveal teachers' lack of knowledge of dialogic teaching. The results highlight that there are so many shortcomings in the current literature on teaching approaches, arranging from curriculum design, time management, students' demotivation, teachers' lack of training, and teaching objectives. These findings contribute to the existing knowledge in the rise of literature teaching dialogically, providing insights into how to change for the best and upgrade different teaching practices.

Keywords: Dialogue, Teacher training, curriculum, Literature, Monologic

Corresponding author : Saadi Takoua, **e-mail:** t.saadi97@univ-chlef.dz

Introduction

A shift in values can pave the way for a transformative change in educational understanding. To keep up with the expectations and needs of modern students, it is essential to be aware of new trends in education and teaching methods. Also, spoken and written language gains meaning only through its use in social contexts. The meaning of a text does not exist in isolation and is shaped by those who use it, rather it is a product of social construction. (Zayed, 2016, p. 3) The growth of constructivism theory, which focuses on learning and meaning formation, has led to the development of a new teaching approach aimed at fostering students' questioning abilities. (Aygun, 2019, p. 112)

Dialogic teaching involves active participation from all parties in the classroom, facilitated guidance, provision of feedback, and promotion of critical thinking through the use of open-ended questions, it provides insight into a student's cognitive abilities as it is rooted in the connection between speech and thought. this approach implies that learning is a social process and that interaction among learners strengthens learning outcomes. The founder of social constructivism, Vygotsky (1968), believed that individuals acquire new knowledge through teaching and sharing with their peers. Similarly, dialogic teaching emphasizes the relationship between speech and thought as language is considered the most effective mode of communication and the acquisition of language involves cognitive skills. (Aygun, 2019, p. 112)

In dialogic teaching, the act of speaking is leveraged to enhance students' thinking, comprehension, and problem-solving abilities. Through dialogic teaching, teachers are mindful of the dynamics of classroom discourse and can strategically design their instruction to achieve specific educational objectives. (Reznitskaya & Wilkinson, 2015, p. 219). Advocates of dialogic teaching assert that it

*Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in
Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for
Improvements*

fosters inquiry and active learning through discussions where students' and teachers' ideas are challenged and supported. This type of teaching creates a supportive learning environment where relationships, both between teachers and students and among students, are strengthened. As a result, dialogic talks emerge which are crucial for developing critical thinking and communication skills, parties work together in the classroom to create and evaluate new interpretations, leading to a more comprehensive understanding of the material. Unlike a monologic approach where the teacher holds the sole knowledge, this approach involves teachers and students searching for truth through discussion and dialogue. Students are encouraged to express their thoughts and ideas and are frequently asked reflective questions to evaluate their knowledge. This interaction-focused approach leads to more effective and meaningful learning. (Aygun, 2019, p. 112) This teacher-student interaction pattern is called IRF (input, response, feedback). Dialogic teaching prioritizes student participation and involves the co-development of the lesson's content, with both teacher and student perspectives taken into consideration.(Arend & Sunnen, 2016, p. 2906)

Talking helps shape our thoughts, reasoning, planning, and reflection. Language serves as the primary tool in this process and can significantly transform individual cognition. In engaging classroom discussions, students internalize and develop their cognitive abilities, transitioning from a social, external understanding to an individual, internal one. For example, a student who initially communicates vague ideas during a discussion with peers will eventually learn to self-edit and clarify their thoughts before communicating them to the group, through a process of interpersonal interaction becoming a cognitive habit.(Reznitskaya & Wilkinson, 2015, p. 221)

Alexander (2018) demonstrates the power of teachers using dialogue to enhance students' thinking and support their learning. In his perspective, dialogic interactions between teachers and students involve building on each other's ideas and turning them into coherent thought processes and inquiries. He believes this leads to deeper intellectual engagement with the material being taught. Engaging pupils in educational dialogue can challenge their thinking and enhance their participation, which can meet their psychological needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. This creates a classroom environment that supports their psychological needs, driving their motivation and goal-setting. (Vasalampi et al., 2021, p. 2)

The Concept of Inquiry Dialogue

Bakhtin distinguished between authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse. He believed that authoritative discourse comes into our verbal consciousness as a complete and invisible entity that we must either fully accept or reject. On the other hand, internally persuasive discourse is a combination of our thoughts and those of others. He posited that there were two methods of assimilating discourse: reciting verbatim, which is a rigid form of assimilation that is authoritative and transmitted, and rephrasing, which is flexible, responsive, and transformative. The latter leads to internally persuasive discourse, which is a continual creative process that can be adapted to new situations as a result of the conflict between these two methods of assimilation, authoritative discourse, also known as official discourse, is frequently utilized by teachers and their peers to validate and reinforce their professional status. It is also imposed by management, who are under pressure to fulfill their obligations to the Ministry of Education, which often results in penalizing students for not following set goals. This is referred to as "pedagogical violence."(Zayed, 2016, p. 4)

Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for Improvements

According to Walton (1992), inquiry dialogue is differentiated from other forms of conversation such as negotiation or persuasion. Inquiry dialogue emphasizes collaboration to reach a sound conclusion, while negotiation aims to convince someone to accept a particular position. This difference in goals has a significant impact on the standards used in the dialogue, such as the norms, the criteria used to assess the validity of arguments, and the instructional strategies used to teach argumentation. (Reznitskaya & Wilkinson, 2015, p. 220)

Inquiry dialogue necessitates a shift from the conventional role of the teacher as a lecturing authority to becoming an expert facilitator of a collaborative and challenging intellectual experience.

To effectively facilitate inquiry dialogue, teachers need to have strong procedural skills while allowing students to take the lead in the discussion. Instead of supplying answers, teachers should model and support the use of effective communication to facilitate co-reasoning among students. (Reznitskaya & Wilkinson, 2015, p. 223)

Why Dialogic Teaching?

The research made by Aygun (2019) found that the learning environment in Turkish classes is primarily monologic. Teachers face difficulty in evaluating their practices effectively. It suggested considering the teacher profile when providing professional development and teacher training programs, as this can promote the use of dialogic questioning and leads to an improvement in the quality of the learning-teaching process. (Aygun, 2019, p. 121)

The study by Vasalampi et al (2021) found that exposure to dialogic teaching principles led to improvement in observed classroom engagement, this suggests that training teachers in dialogic interaction can promote active and sustained engagement among

students. (Vasalampi et al., 2021, p. 6) Similarly, Gregory et al. (2014) found that providing teachers with opportunities to learn about dialogic teaching practices leads to an increase in confidence and expertise in facilitating student involvement.

Student engagement is a crucial aspect of learning. Engaged students exhibit high levels of involvement, positive emotions, and motivation, while disengagement leads to boredom, giving up, and negative emotions and experiences (Frederick et al, 2004). Research has shown that factors, such as teacher-classroom practices and the teacher-student relationship impact student engagement. (Vasalampi et al., 2021, p. 1,2)

According to Graff (2003), argument literacy encompasses the capacity to comprehend and construct arguments through various modes of communication, including speaking, listening, reading, and writing. To foster argument literacy, teachers adopt a teaching approach called inquiry dialogue, where students engage in discussions of challenging and debatable questions arising from assigned readings. During this process, students are expected to assume some of the instructional responsibilities typically assigned to the teacher, such as controlling participation.

Even if the teacher does not align with the student's arguments, they provide a space where students can test their understanding against others and use arguments to seek information and explanations from the teacher and other students. (Arend & Sunnen, 2016, p. 2911) The instructor is a commentator who prompts alternative interpretations and perspectives. The purpose of the dialogue is not to find a single truth but to explore new possibilities, with no right or wrong answers. Students are allowed to engage in discussion and delve into the complexities and challenges within their curriculum. (Zayed, 2016, p. 9)

*Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in
Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for
Improvements*

Dialogic stance values student interpretations and challenges interpretive authority, even if their ideas are unconventional. The foundation of the dialogic stance is a genuine belief that student ideas are worthy of careful examination. (McElhone, 2015, p. 157) According to Auckerman (2008), if teachers relinquish their evaluative roles and allow students to explore non-standard interpretations, students can see reading as a process of creating meaning and engaging with ideas, which is more mentally challenging than simply recalling information. As students engage in authentic work together to make meaning, they will challenge each other to create defensible interpretations, even if they are not conventional. These discussions are academically rigorous and can help students examine texts carefully and critically. (McElhone, 2015, p. 168)

Traditional teaching methods remain unchanged despite new educational goals that focus on students' critical and independent thinking. Instead of promoting argumentation and problem-solving among students, teachers still tend to dominate discussions, steer clear of controversial topics, and have students simply repeat information from others rather than think for themselves. (Reznitskaya & Wilkinson, 2015, p. 220)

It is important to understand that dialogic teaching doesn't just involve talking or dialogue, but encompasses a wide range of language patterns. Teachers must be able to effectively adapt their language and methods to meet their instructional goals, whether that means using recitation, exposition, or discussion. Although dialogue is not the only tool used in dialogic teaching, research has shown that it is particularly effective in promoting higher-order thinking skills like argument literacy. Despite its proven benefits, dialogue is not commonly utilized in classrooms across subjects, grade levels, and countries.

While dialogic teaching has many advantages, it can be challenging for inexperienced teachers (Dunn 2018). O'Connor and McHale (2007) explain that dialogues exist in many forms, but some are more dialogic than others. Teachers may struggle to identify dialogical conversations that promote student growth. On one hand, monologic talk is associated with rigid ideas and permanent positions, while on the other hand, dialogic talk fosters equal relationships that promote evaluation, critique, creativity, and intellectual openness. (Iqbal et al., 2021, p. 378)

Multiple studies have shown the advantages of a dialogic teaching approach however the literature suggests that students often don't receive such education due to teachers having difficulty self-evaluating their classroom practices. Hence, there is a need for teachers to have more opportunities to assess themselves and enhance their teaching style to incorporate more dialogues. (Aygun, 2019, p. 112)

Evidence exists of specific elements of educational dialogue that support student participation in classroom discourse, despite the advantages of dialogic teaching, it is still uncommon in classrooms across different age groups. (Vasalampi et al., 2021, p. 1,2) Teachers often lack exposure to dialogic interaction during their observational learning phase as students. (Caughlan et al., 2013, p. 213) Fear of content coverage and negative feedback can also impede students' participation (Caughlan et al., 2013, pp. 219–220)

There have been numerous attempts to assist teachers in transitioning to the use of dialogic discourse practices and a few efforts to examine the professional development required to support them. Alexander (2018) found that students taught by teachers trained in dialogic teaching performed better than those taught by untrained teachers. (Iqbal et al., 2021, p. 377)

*Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in
Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for
Improvements*

Research on dialogic teaching has been conducted on all subject matters whether scientific or humanities, including literature. All studies agree that teaching literature is a process of meaning identification and interpretation, the latter involves building strong arguments supported by evidence, in addition to expecting counterarguments from the other; a passive monologic approach might be a bit restricting to meeting these goals, we couldn't expect our students to get enthusiastic to Investigate and look for clues, If the case was already solved.

considering the aforementioned data about dialogic teaching, this research investigates how teachers of English literature at the level of higher education in Algerian universities are using this approach In their classes; what are we doing wrong; and what to do to move forward.

Data Collection and Results:

Method:

To investigate current teacher practices in literature classes at the level of Algerian universities, interviews were conducted with five teachers from different English departments. There were 11 questions in total tackling the main aspect of using dialogism in teaching literature for different EFL teaching levels. The interviews were held via Zoom meetings, each meeting lasted 40 minutes, and all questions were answered. Each question was analyzed separately, on a scale of how many teachers out of five had similar or different answers, the results were discussed relying on the data collected in the theoretical framework in addition to didactical methods.

Results:

When the teachers were asked whether they were familiar with the concept of dialogic teaching, only one out of five knew what the concept of dialogism is, two teachers didn't know but they guessed the answer. One said that it was the first time she heard of this term, and one defined it as dialogism and intertextuality in literature but not in teaching.

After explaining the concept of dialogic teaching to the teacher participants, they were asked how they are using this approach in their literature classrooms. Most of the answers to this question targeted discussion inside the classroom and not dialogic teaching in particular, even though the concept was clarified to the teachers before answering the question. All of the teachers held classroom discussions but not group discussions due to lack of time. In addition, the teachers found that University requirements when it comes to curriculum coverage, make it hard to hold discussions so they just discussed the minimum to move on, they rarely devote time for inter-classroom debate, unless it happens spontaneously, one of the teachers said: "we never devote time for classroom debate, we have to deal with an entire novel in two sessions."

Two teachers referred to the level of the students as merely restricting to engaging in debates. One of the teachers said: "They don't have the spirit of discussing things, that is why it's kind of lecturing when it comes to the literature class. If something is hard or not understood, we may pause and discuss it to clarify it." Another teacher participant refers to students' reluctance to read, which makes them unaware of the concepts discussed inside the classroom, if they didn't understand she said, they would start guessing things, she then added: "There is no maybe in literature, there is no maybe in this class, this is what I say to my students." when she asked them why Mrs. Bennett was happy to see Mr. Bingley in *Pride and Prejudice*, some of them said maybe because she wants to marry him, she explained that

*Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in
Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for
Improvements*

only those who knew what we were talking about got into the debate. Only one teacher out of five assureds that she is using dialogic teaching in her classroom saying that the beauty of literature is that every person has a particular perception towards the text and so she encourages her students to do this saying that this was literature.

All participant teachers answered affirmatively and were excited about the idea of undergoing training to develop their teaching skills when it comes to dialogism in literature classes some of them considered it necessary, one of the teachers said: "As a teacher of literature, I had very little training in teaching, I acquired my skills in teaching by going directly inside the classroom, I would be curious about training, maybe there is something I would learn. " Another teacher was sad about the fact that she was teaching dialogism subconsciously and argued that she would love to do it consciously.

When answering: "Why are we teaching literature at the level of EFL higher education?" two teachers refer to the interrelationship between language and literature, they think that we can't teach one without referring to the other so mainly literature in the EFL context is language acquisition. Two other teachers believe that we cannot learn a language without referring to its culture and literature is a representation of culture and principles of the other, one of the teachers said: "We cannot teach English without studying about culture, and literature is one of the ways." This latter agrees with another teacher on the fact that we teach literature to develop critical thinking. Only one teacher believes that the aim of reading comprehension is not teaching linguistic references, she believes that they had classes for that, this class aims to teach students critical thinking, and extract hidden meanings, she adds: "For higher levels like master's degree we aim at work criticism and the cultural aspect, we are targeting events and Concepts that have changed modern

thought, not learning only illiterate text with images and metaphors, we are learning a whole culture Within.”

When it comes to whether we still use a teacher-centered approach in our classrooms or not, Participant teachers’ answers shifted between still using a teacher-centered approach, whether willingly or being forced to, some even said that they were struggling to shift to student-centeredness. Three teachers argued that the students are the main cause behind the current followed methodology, their answers ranged between their lack of motivation, The nature of the lecture, the students don't read, and the students are not active. In this regard, one teacher said:” I'm struggling with the lack of motivation, they are just not willing to talk or share their thoughts.” In the same concept, a second teacher uttered:” the Learners are not active, the teacher is the motivator, the instruction giver, the debater, facilitator, even ethically the teacher is in control of the classroom.”

All the teacher participants agree that students are open to sharing, discussing, thinking critically, evaluating, and engaging in dialogue inside literature classes. Two teachers mentioned the idea that students love challenges. All teachers mentioned the element of surprise when students are open to discussion, they have wonderful critical thinking skills, and they are so productive. two teachers believe that the only problem with students not open to discussion is that we were and are still using teacher-centeredness and teaching literature is purely lecturing no more, one teacher said:” They were used to the teacher talking all the time and taking control of the session after I gave them freedom to speak up, I discovered they are open to all sorts of interaction, even though some aren't.” Similar to the last point another teacher participant said: “once you motivate them, create a safe space for them, telling them I'm not a teacher, this is a friendly chat, and when you show them you're not judging them, we are all equal, everybody's voice matter, my knowledge as a teacher is merely from years of experience, only then they become willing to share.” she pointed at the need to be humble as a teacher.

*Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in
Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for
Improvements*

Two out of five teachers weren't comfortable with the idea of letting students assume some of the instructional responsibilities typically assigned to the teacher, the example of lecturing and managing participation was given. The given reasons for this position are mainly to keep the classroom organized and maintain discipline, according to them, this idea would lead the classroom to be chaotic. Moreover, two of them mentioned the concept of subjectivity, that if students are given such responsibility there will be a lack of tolerance, respect, and objectivity in the classroom especially when it comes to assessment. One of the teachers said: "I've had the experience of letting them manage their projects, not necessarily a classroom, there's always a sort of subjectivity inside, even though they claim otherwise. I have to evaluate, everything is part of their evaluation, I have no problem with them managing the classroom, delivering lectures, and evaluating others, but I wouldn't give total control to avoid subjectivity." 2/5 teachers were so comfortable with this idea, they take the side of being instructional not the rule givers, one of these teachers mentioned that at the beginning of her teaching experience, she thought that freshman levels must be controlled and restricted in comparison with Advanced students like in master degree when she can give them more freedom. however, through her experience she realized that she can rely on her students, she said: "I now can rely on my students whatever the level is, when I did so, they amazed me and surprised me, they learn better when they follow their way." One teacher gave a neutral position when it comes to this question, he believes that if students are manipulated in the right way, especially by applying problem-solving activities, implying challenges, which they love, might eventually lead to the students taking control of the classroom.

When they were asked about the criteria they use to assess the validity of arguments, two out of five teachers considered convincing

them the main criteria to use to validate an argument, they believe that students must back up their arguments, and lead up the discussion by asking open-ended questions so they won't limit the students, questions like, "Don't you think? and why?" The other two participants validate students' arguments through their closeness to the main topic, relying on schools of criticism, and how much they stick to the text, one teacher said: "I sometimes ask questions deliberately to see their grasp of what we've done in the lecture, we mainly take turns answering the same question, help them get to the answer I'm looking for, wrap up the discussion, and move on." The other teacher who followed the same position believed that students don't take time to think about the question, they just connect to the keywords and answer accordingly. In addition, three out of five teachers frowned upon answering randomly, they don't like the fact that students get the answer, and they don't assess the idea but how the students explained it, one of them said: "we don't have 'right and wrong in literature'." One teacher believes that logic is the criteria she uses to assess an argument; when she was asked how to assess logic, she mentioned the hardness of doing so, saying: "When it comes to literature, there are very clear things, if not, I just appreciate their opinion, and sometimes give positive feedback like saying, 'interesting point of view, that's something I haven't thought about before.' open to others to judge this point because we might deviate from the main topic, thus, we take more time than planned."

None of the participants in the interviews observe other teachers' teaching methods, some of them discuss classroom practices and methodology during meetings, seminars, and occasionally in informal settings. All of them said that at the beginning of their career, they used to go and attend classes of their colleagues to gain some experience, one teacher said that she discusses methodologies very often with her colleagues. One of the interviewees said: "When it comes to teaching and a new module, I would ask other teachers how they were teaching oral expression for example, how do you assess it,

*Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in
Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for
Improvements*

and I do this with all teachers no matter their rank even pre-service teachers.” The last interviewee believes in total teacher autonomy, so she never does this.

All teachers agreed on one main difficulty while teaching literature, or implementing student-led discussions, which is curriculum restrictions because it is overloaded compared to the time devoted to it in addition to the fact that it needs to be updated. Teacher 4 said: “The curriculum needs to be changed, I don't want to see Charles Dickens anymore, I want to see more contemporary works, even my students when I tell them I hate this work or this author, they tend to be encouraged to talk and discuss it.” In the same matter, teacher 2 said: “ we are using very ancient literature, students do not identify with this kind of literature, they don't appreciate it, they think that they are better than their teachers, as a result, I suggest a change of syllabus, including more recent works, at least at the beginning of the exposure to literature and then maybe going back to classical novels, to give time for students to grasp and show interest in literature.”

Two out of five teachers believe that the main difficulty is students don't read and they don't take discussions seriously, they lack Interest in the module, hence they are often demotivated and don't make an effort, because they don't read, they start giving random and non-solid arguments even while referring to their personal experiences. Teacher 3 said: “Students are not interested in the module; they usually say they were there just because they were obliged.” Another point of view was given by teacher 4, who referred to the fact that her teachers care only about exams, she mentioned that it was really hard to change this and that she wished they would change the way they look at assessments; she also believes that there's a lack of resources in our country. Teacher five had a different look at the difficulties she's facing in the classroom, among which she mentioned: “the

learners are passive, but not because of me as a teacher, they don't master the least skills in the literary classroom even writing and oral production, this is why you find yourself in a more traditional than modern literary class, teachers possess literary competencies but with slow and weak learners it doesn't work.”

Discussion of Results:

The tone sensed when it comes to the question of whether they are familiar with dialogic teaching or not is that teachers of literature see themselves as detached from didactical studies, they had been teaching literature using methods randomly, unconsciously, not knowing the process they are following. Even if you are at a certain level using let's say dialogism unconsciously in your classroom you can't apply it or use its benefits perfectly. The teachers showed an enraged reaction towards students answering questions in the literature classroom randomly, assuming that when you don't read a book, you can't really interpret or analyze it properly. This contradiction in responsibilities shows that teaching and learning are reciprocal in efforts. As Caughlan et al (2013) stated, To organize instruction dialogically, one needs skill and expertise as dialogue doesn't occur naturally in predominantly teacher-centered classrooms. Since dialogic instruction is not the usual practice in schools, teachers and students need to acquire the necessary skills. (Caughlan et al., 2013, pp. 217–218)

There are several parties responsible for the aforementioned problem of teachers not using dialogic teaching due to time constraints, this is an issue that needs to be looked at by literature curriculum designers, University policies when it comes to the coverage of the material, and teachers as responsible for time management inside the classroom and how to benefit the most from the curriculum, and why not change it completely if it doesn't suit the goals of teaching literature in EFL higher education. We keep asking ourselves why our students are not interested in the material. As

*Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in
Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for
Improvements*

Caughlan and colleagues pointed out, Fear of content coverage and negative feedback can also impede students' participation (Caughlan et al., 2013, pp. 219–220)

A literary work is written to be looked at from different angles and perspectives, it is not made to be merely read especially when it comes to the literature classroom. Teachers have a certain fear of the conversation diversion into deeper goals and objectives, they consciously or unconsciously persist in keeping the analysis of the literary text strictly related to the agreed perspectives, The lack of knowledge and training in the use of dialogic teaching inside classrooms and how it can bring about the beauty of exchanging literature within a group of different intellectual capabilities leads to a monologic classroom, where students, as well as teachers, will always have fear of exploring the unknown.

In a dialogic classroom, the instructor acts as a commentator who prompts alternative interpretations and perspectives. The purpose of the dialogue is not to find a single truth but to explore new possibilities, with no right or wrong answers. (Zayed, 2016, p. 9) Similarly, Teachers often lack exposure to dialogic interaction during their observational learning phase as students. (Caughlan et al., 2013, p. 213) This is another reason to seriously consider teacher training programs whether before engaging in higher education teaching or even for current teachers in practice.

The fact of being open to exploring and working on their contemporary teaching methods as well as learning more about dialogic teaching in teaching literature is a positive step ahead that needs to be encouraged by different parties, teachers included, as all research projects agree on the lack of trained teachers in dialogism and on its inevitable cruciality. As to Alexander (2018), students taught by teachers trained in dialogic teaching performed better than those taught by untrained teachers. (Iqbal et al., 2021, p. 377)

While all teachers agreed that the question of why we are teaching literature at the level of higher education in the EFL context is a very complex question to answer, this complexity and the interwoven very general teaching goals, show that teachers are not quite aware of where are they heading with this literature classroom, while culture and linguistics are dealt with as separate modules, where does literature stand in EFL education? the aims of the classroom should be precise and clear for both parties, teachers and students equally. everybody agrees on the richness of literature and its endless potential to form extraordinary social beings with high intellectual capabilities with strong Independent and codependent viewpoints, respectful, responsible, None authoritative, and most importantly Individuals with high argumentative skills that are necessary for today's ongoing developmental world, In this research and regarding all the data collected about dialogic teaching, This approach would help teachers reach all the above and more.

Ignacio Estrada said: "If a child can't learn the way we teach, maybe we should teach the way they learn." There's a concept among teachers, sadly, they teach the way they have been taught, knowing that generations change, needs change, and interests change, one of the teachers told me that when she gave the books as audiobooks to her students they spent hours listening and grasping what the book is about, however, when she asked them to read the book, they didn't. In the same concept after covid-19, students became reluctant to participate or read, and motivation decreased noticeably, this view was shared by three teachers in this study. the latter information shows that even the psyche changes, adaptation to these changes is important, we should teach students the way they learn. Two teachers added that one of the reasons why teacher-centeredness still exists is the conflict of generations, the older generation tends to rely on the basic teacher lessons, while the new generation of teachers, rather, depends on interaction.

*Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in
Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for
Improvements*

Moreover, teacher-centeredness is like rotten fruit given to students, as Shweta Tale said in her quote: “If you keep feeding your soul with rotten fruits, Don't expect your bones to be strong enough to climb.” Similarly, if you keep providing your students with outdated, basic information, that can be easily found or googled, they won't develop any skills that would bring about change in classroom practices, because when we mention student-centeredness, we are referring to students as individuals who had been fed with skills that strengthen their motivation and knowledge to be strong enough to climb on their own. Relatively, dialogism can also be the way for change in this matter, Alexander (2006) outlines five principles for effective dialogic teaching practices: collective, reciprocal, supportive, cumulative, and purposeful with specific learning goals. In these practices, students are encouraged to participate through open-ended questions and feedback to expand their thinking and participate in collaborative discussions on real-life topics. (Vasalampi et al., 2021, pp. 2–3) One teacher participant pointed out the teachers' need to encourage the students and tell them that their voices matter, they shouldn't underestimate themselves, and that they are smart, this positive feedback would lead to high self-esteem, she said:” the more I boost these aspects the more they give me.”

McElhone explained that a dialogic stance values student interpretations and challenges interpretive authority, even if their ideas are unconventional. The foundation of the dialogic stance is a genuine belief that student ideas are worthy of careful examination.(McElhone, 2015, p. 157) According to Auckerman (2008), if teachers relinquish their evaluative roles and allow students to explore non-standard interpretations, students can see reading as a process of creating meaning and engaging with ideas, which is more mentally challenging than simply recalling information. One of the main Concepts Bakhtin discussed when introducing dialogic teaching, is the notion of

authoritative discourse, in dialogism authority inside the classroom is tricky, teachers tend to be afraid to give total control to students inside the classroom, but at the same time, they struggle with not letting them be responsible for classroom input. In student-centeredness the teacher is supposed to be a guide, however, it is the conceptualization of guidance that teachers are unaware of, it's all about the psychology of students and how they view your control of the classroom, whether it is authoritative or motivational and internally persuasive.

Students assuming some of the responsibilities assigned to the teacher were mentioned in Graff (2003) and Vasalampi et al (2021); to foster argument literacy, teachers adopt a teaching approach called inquiry dialogue, where students engage in discussions of challenging and debatable questions arising from assigned readings. During this process, students are expected to assume some of the instructional responsibilities typically assigned to the teacher, such as controlling participation. Disengagement leads to boredom, giving up, and negative emotions and experiences (Frederick et al, 2004). Research has shown that factors, such as teacher-classroom practices and the teacher-student relationship impact student engagement. (Vasalampi et al., 2021, p. 1,2)

When analyzing the question of how teachers assess the validity of an argument, we go back to the reciprocity when it comes to knowledge for students and teachers equally, the fact of not knowing how to argue, how to assess an argument, and how to back your point of view, leads to inefficient and pointless conversations with closed questions that only answer what is supposed to be answered. Inquiry dialogue is one of the possible solutions, it emphasizes collaboration to reach a sound conclusion, while negotiation aims to convince someone to accept a particular position. This difference in goals has a significant impact on the standards used in the dialogue, such as the norms, the criteria used to assess the validity of arguments, and the instructional strategies used to teach argumentation. (Reznitskaya & Wilkinson, 2015, p. 220)

*Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in
Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for
Improvements*

Inquiry dialogue necessitates a shift from the conventional role of the teacher as a lecturing authority to becoming an expert facilitator of a collaborative and challenging intellectual experience. Moreover, to help students develop argument literacy through inquiry dialogue, teachers must: 1) comprehend the processes and standards of quality argumentation; 2) identify strengths and weaknesses in student reasoning; and 3) possess a range of strategies to promote sound reasoning. (Reznitskaya & Wilkinson, 2015, p. 223)

Since we are researching literature teaching we must quote a writer at least once in the paper, Ernest Hemingway said: “There’s nothing noble about being superior to your fellow men; True nobility is being superior to your former self.” Teachers must always strive for change, improvement, and originality in their teaching methods. Teaching literature is not independent of didactics of literature, teachers of literature must cooperate with teachers of didactics to improve, and why not, create, innovate, and come out with a curriculum that best serves both teachers and students equally, a syllabus that has clear, detailed, and definable aims and goals. One of the participant teachers, in an Eastern Algerian University, said that they had done something she was proud of at the level of her department, they had revised the syllabus, evaluated it, and modified it. she added that it had worked very well with the students and that this should be done in all Algerian universities’ English departments. The same view was shared by another teacher who told me that curriculum design should be done by the teachers because they know their learners, their strengths and weaknesses, and not dictated by the administration and authority however, this approach should be facilitated a little bit by the Ministry of Higher Education because all teachers agreed on the difficulty they would face if they decided to go on such a journey.

When we read about how to teach literature effectively in an EFL context, we always find the headline ‘text choice’ to be among the main requirements. In this regard, again, the goals of the literary classroom are still vague, are we teaching literature to introduce literary movements? or to teach the target language? To introduce a certain culture? or to improve literary analysis and critical thinking? Should the goals for the Common Core bachelor's degree be the same as the specialized master's degree? The latter question is answered affirmatively when it comes to the Algerian English literature curriculum, which is the teaching of literary movements via long ancient classic literature. As the teachers in the study affirmed, today's generation is reluctant to read such input, if you went to the annual book fair in Algiers, you would find the corridor leading to the Panda book Edition jammed with young adults standing in a queue for hours to gain access to the contemporary stories and books sold in this Bookshop, this is a proof that the curriculum must be updated at least at the level of the Common Core at bachelor's degree, where students are exposed to texts that meet their expectations and their interests in Reading literature, before being exposed to more specialized literary movements and classic books.

The problem is not that students are not interested in literature, or they are demotivated because of this area in itself, the problem is that students do not want to speak about the Target topics because they are discouraged, there's a teacher in the study who said that: “I keep encouraging my students to speak, when they hear the topic they become interested and start guessing even though they're not familiar with the concept, sometimes they surprise me with interpretations, I've never heard before.” The current curriculum design is making teachers face a dilemma of balancing between the standard and the desire to encourage meaningful classroom discussions among students, however, teachers in this research implied that they were not forced by any authority whether the curriculum or the University to follow a certain pattern in their teaching methods and that they were free to

*Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in
Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for
Improvements*

adapt according to their student's needs, as in McElhone's study, teacher Barbara, empowered her students by positioning herself as an observer rather than a leader, allowing them to see themselves as independent contributors. With supported inquiry and practical talk tools, she made strides toward a more dialogic stance and instruction by opening up the floor for student voices and adjusting her practice. (McElhone, 2015, p. 162) This approach was adopted by teachers of the same institution as Barbara who followed this as an inspiration to turn the literary classroom into a purposeful dialogic atmosphere. Similarly, Zayed (2016) added that teachers should attend to student questions, facilitate debates, create a fun learning environment, and be sensitive to students' learning styles and preferences. (Zayed, 2016, p. 4)

Conclusion:

In conclusion, this research paper has explored and analyzed the present condition of teaching Literature dialogically in higher education for EFL and why We should strive for improvements from various perspectives, aiming to shed light on the underlying issues and provide valuable insights. Through an extensive review of the literature, rigorous data analysis, and thoughtful interpretation of the findings, several key conclusions have been drawn.

Firstly, Teachers of English in Algerian universities aren't aware of the concept of dialogic teaching, they use debate unconsciously, and most classroom discussions are monologic in nature, teachers and students need to acquire the necessary skills for dialogic instruction because this approach addresses many problems faced by teachers of this material, arranging from curriculum design, time constraints, students lack motivation, students disengagement in classroom activities, and developing lifelong skills for the students, most importantly argumentation skills. In addition, teacher training programs in the use of dialogic teaching in literature classrooms are

advisable, if not necessary. Moreover, the question of why we are teaching literature in the EFL context must be answered clearly, to define precise and concise goals for this material. Furthermore, the need for change whether in curriculum or standard classroom practices, by teachers is inevitable, the same goes for self-assessment and self-improvement. Also, teachers in this study were confused and didn't know exactly how to assess an argument, argumentation skills are one of the most valuable requirements of dialogic teaching and it must be developed in the light of the classroom objectives. Finally, this research suggests the use of inquiry dialogue as one of the remarkable discussion methods, a result that is aligned with the necessity for curriculum change. These findings highlight the significance of using dialogism in teaching literature classes in the EFL context. They provide empirical evidence to support existing theories or propose new frameworks for future investigation.

Secondly, this study has identified certain limitations and potential areas for further research. While considerable progress has been made in addressing dialogic teaching theoretically, there is still a need for additional investigations to refine and expand upon its practical implication inside classrooms. Future studies could consider teacher training programs or well-defined dialogically oriented literary classrooms with a clear lesson plan, as guidance on how to use this approach.

Moreover, this research paper has implications for teachers of literature, curriculum designers, and education authority bearers. The insights gained from this study can inform policy decisions, guide practitioners, or influence future developments in teaching literature. By raising awareness of the challenges and opportunities surrounding dialogic teaching in literary classes, this research contributes to the ongoing discourse and encourages further dialogue among experts and stakeholders. We can aspire to address the existing gaps, drive innovation, and promote positive change in the teaching of literature as a whole.

Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for Improvements

Lastly, conducting this research has not been without its challenges. It was hard to reach out to teachers all over Algerian English departments and set up meetings, due to time constraints and teachers' overloaded schedules. Nevertheless, these limitations have been acknowledged and addressed to the best of our abilities, ensuring the reliability and validity of the findings presented.

Acknowledgment:

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to all those who have contributed to the completion of this research paper. I extend my heartfelt thanks to the participants who willingly dedicated their time and shared their experiences, as their contributions have been crucial in collecting the necessary data for this study. Their willingness to engage in the research process has been essential in shaping the findings and outcomes of this paper.

References:

- Abdelwahab, A. F. A. (2020). *The Effect of Using Dialogic Teaching on Developing English Majors' Critical Thinking Skills and Metacognitive Awareness*. 126–89, (4)44, *مجلة كلية التربية في العلوم التربوية*, <https://doi.org/10.21608/jfees.2020.152404>
- Alexander, R. J. (2017). *Dialogic teaching in brief*. Online at <https://Coleridgeprimary.Org/Wp-Content/Uploads/2019/11/Dialogic-Teaching-in-Brief-170622.Pdf>.
- Alles, M., Seidel, T., & Gröschner, A. (2017). *Toward Better Goal Clarity in Instruction: How Focus On Content, Social Exchange and Active Learning Supports Teachers in Improving Dialogic Teaching Practices*. *International Education Studies*, 11, 11. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v11n1p11>
- Arend, B., & Sunnen, P. (2016). *Dialogic Teaching—Investigating Teacher-Student Talk from a CA Perspective*. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education*, 7(4), 2906.

- Aygun, H. E. (2019). *Dialogic teaching in Turkish courses: What the teachers say and what they do?* *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 14(1), 111.
- Barekat, B., & Mohammadi, S. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.426>
- Billings, L., & Fitzgerald, J. (2002). *Dialogic Discussion and the Paideia Seminar*. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(4), 907–941.
- Brindley, S., Juzwik, M., & Whitehurst, A. (2016). *Diversifying dialogic discourses. Introduction to a special issue International Perspectives on Dialogic Theory and Practice*. *L1 Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 16, S.I. Dial. Ped., 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2016.16.02.01>
- Caughlan, S., Juzwik, M. M., Borsheim-Black, C., Kelly, S., & Fine, J. G. (2013). *English Teacher Candidates Developing Dialogically Organized Instructional Practices*. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 47(3), 212–246.
- Chisholm, J. S., & Loretto, A. J. (2016). *Tensioning interpretive authority during dialogic discussions of literature*. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2016.16.02.04>
- Davies, M., Kiemer, K., & Meissel, K. (2017). *Quality Talk and dialogic teaching—An examination of a professional development programme on secondary teachers' facilitation of student talk*. *British Educational Research Journal*, 43(5), 968–987. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3293>
- Doukma, R. (n.d.). *ARE YOU SURE YOU DON'T HAVE ANY QUESTIONS? DIALOGIC TEACHING IS A WAY TO PROMOTE STUDENTS' QUESTIONS*. Retrieved May 24, 2023, from https://www.academia.edu/9673779/ARE_YOU_SURE_YOU_DON_T_HA_VE_ANY_QUESTIONS_DIALOGIC_TEACHING_AS_A_WAY_TO_PROMOTE_STUDENTS_QUESTIONS
- Dunn, M. B. (2018). *The Complexity of Becoming a Dialogic Teacher in an English Language Arts Classroom*. *Changing English*, 25(2), 135–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2018.1452145>

Discussing the Present Condition of Teaching Literature Dialogically in Algerian Higher Education for EFL and Why We Should Strive for Improvements

- Haneda, M., Teemant, A., & Sherman, B. (2017). *Instructional coaching through dialogic interaction: Helping a teacher to become agentic in her practice.* *Language and Education*, 31(1), 46–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2016.1230127>
- Iqbal, L., Aurangzeb, S., & Shah, F. (2021). *Implications of Dialogic Teaching: Practices of and Reflections from English Language Teachers.* *Research Journal of Social Sciences and Economics Review (RJSSER)*, 2, 375–381. [https://doi.org/10.36902/rjsser-vol2-iss1-2021\(375-381\)](https://doi.org/10.36902/rjsser-vol2-iss1-2021(375-381))
- McElhone, D. (2015). *Using Stems and Supported Inquiry to Help an Elementary Teacher Move Toward Dialogic Reading Instruction.* *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 50(2), 156–171.
- Navaz, A. M. M. (2020). *Developing a Framework for Understanding Lecturer-Student Interaction in English-Medium Undergraduate Lectures in Sri Lanka: First Step Towards Dialogic Teaching.* *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(6), Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n6p395>
- Reznitskaya, A., & Wilkinson, I. (2015). *Professional development in dialogic teaching: Helping teachers promote argument literacy* (pp. 219–232).
- Skaftun, A. (2019). *Dialogic Discourse Analysis: A methodology for dealing with the classroom as a text.* *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2019.277>
- Sowe, M. (2018). *Strengthening dialogic argument: What teachers can learn from authentic examples of student dialogue.* *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 5(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.21913/jps.v5i2.1526>
- Vasalampi, K., Metsäpelto, R.-L., Salminen, J., Lerkanen, M.-K., Mäensivu, M., & Poikkeus, A.-M. (2021). *Promotion of school engagement through dialogic teaching practices in the context of a teacher professional development programme.* *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 30, 100538. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2021.100538>
- Zayed, J. (2016). *Dialogic Teaching to Improve Students' Learning: A Discussion with Reference to Teacher Education in KSA.* In *Online Submission*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED583668>

- Zhang, L. J., & Zhang, D. (2020). *Dialogic discussion as a platform for constructing knowledge: Student-teachers' interaction patterns and strategies in learning to teach English*. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1), 22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00101-2>