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Abstract
This research was undertaken in the context of English reading class in Thailand universities. The research aimed to (1) identify essential elements of dialogic teaching in English reading class, (2) develop the framework for promoting dialogic teaching, and (3) evaluate the framework. Data were collected in two stages: framework developmental stage and framework evaluation stage. In the developmental stage, data were collected from eighteen lecturers of English reading. The instruments included classroom observation survey, semi-structured interviews and non-participant observation. Data obtained were analyzed and crafted as a framework. In the evaluation stage, the framework was implemented in the researcher’s reading class, which had ninety-two students. Data were drawn from students’ grade reports and students’ evaluation of the courses. The results showed that dialogic teaching in a reading class is multi-faceted. The framework proposed in the study divides reading lessons into four stages: pre-, while-, post- and beyond- stages. Each stage has different aims and involves a wide range of activities. The framework enables the lecturer to manage dialogic teaching in a more systematic way, which results in better learning outcomes and higher students’ satisfaction of the course.
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บทคัดย่อ
งานวิจัยชิ้นนี้จัดทำขึ้นในบริบทรายวิชาการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษในระดับมหาวิทยาลัยของประเทศไทย โดยมีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อ (1) ศึกษาองค์ประกอบที่สําคัญของการสอนแบบไดอาล็อกในรายวิชาการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษ (2) พัฒนากรอบแนวคิดในการจัดการสอนแบบไดอาล็อก และ (3) ประเมินผลการใช้ กรอบแนวคิดต่างๆ โดยเก็บข้อมูลของระดับชั้นประถมศึกษาตอนปลายของข้อมูลจากอาจารย์ที่สอนรายวิชาการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษ 18 ท่าน โดยการสํารวจชั้นเรียนโดยการสังเกต การสัมภาษณ์แบบใด้โครงสร้าง และการสังเกตแบบไม่มีส่วนร่วม ในระยะการประเมินผลผู้วิจัยได้นํากรอบแนวคิดที่พัฒนาขึ้นไปใช้ในรายวิชา การอ่านของตนและเก็บข้อมูลจากการงานผลการเรียนและผลประเมินความพึงพอใจของอาจารย์ของนักศึกษาจำนวน 92 คนที่ลงทะเบียนในรายวิชานี้ ผลการวิจัยชี้ว่าการจัดการเรียนการสอนแบบไดอาล็อก
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Introduction

In the year 2014, the researcher started teaching a reading class for English-major students. The problems encountered during the teaching of the course were numerous, particularly students’ low engagement, inactive participation and interaction, and low learning outcomes. The number of students who failed (E) or received D (the lowest grade) in the researcher’s first year of reading course was relatively high. The researcher did some study in order to seek strategies for improving student learning, and found that one way to achieve this is by dialogic teaching. In the year 2015, the researcher started making the reading class dialogic but without any principle, guideline, or framework. Without any systematic guiding procedure or framework, the researcher felt lost and sometimes got stuck somewhere along the way. Questions such as: “What next?” and “If this, then how?” arose within the researcher.

The researcher started reviewing literature relevant to dialogic teaching, but found out that the research undertaken so far does not lead to a conclusive framework for the implementation of dialogic teaching and does not yield concrete models or manuals of steps to be taken if a lecturer/teacher aims to apply dialogic principles into his/her teaching. A number of studies have been conducted on the issues pertaining to classroom talks and dialogic teaching, but most of them are conceptual ones, discussing more of the topics rather than offering practical ways of how to make English reading class dialogic. This implies a lack of the linkage from an understanding of the principles and theories of dialogic teaching to actual implementation. Significantly, the empirical studies on dialogic teaching were conducted in pre-university education levels and mostly in the fields of mathematics and science, rather than in languages in tertiary level. This suggests that the practice of dialogic teaching in the field of English reading in tertiary level is still under-researched. This became the starting point of undertaking the study presented in this article.

Dialogic Teaching

Dialogic teaching is a teaching methodology that emphasizes the power of talks, which can be student-student or student-teacher interactions. Research has shown that dialogic teaching is closely associated with students’ learning proficiency. Its benefit is not limited to strengthening
students’ subject knowledge; but also is able to sustain students’ learning attention and participation. In addition to this, dialogic teaching does not only increase students’ oral language proficiency but also underlines students’ learning and reasoning skills (Cazden, 2001; Johnston, 2004; Johnston, Ivey & Faulkner, 2011; Mercer, Dawes, & Staarman, 2009). It becomes the foundation of student learning as teacher’s dialogue with the students can encourage students to go beyond telling knowledge and help students to deepen their understanding of the learning subject (Alexander, 2017). Two main principles underpin dialogic teaching. First, it emphasizes social interaction and the involvement of everyone in meaningful learning. In a dialogic class, learning takes place among peers. Second, dialogic teaching fosters students’ critical thinking as this teaching strategy provides opportunities for students to engage in dialogues and gain practical experience in “skills” and “dispositions” for critical thinking (Hajhosseiny, 2012, p.1360).

Characteristics of Dialogic Class

In a dialogic class, students work collaboratively with peers to construct knowledge. This teaching methodology is particularly associated with Alexander (2008), who proposes that through talks and collaborative works, students make sense of things happening in class and construct their own understanding and knowledge. Alexander (2017) the dialogic classroom is characterized as follows:

1) Collective: Everyone in the class, including the teacher and the students, share the responsibility of discussions. It involves every student in the class and the discussion is not led by the teacher. The questions that the teacher asks will be authentic, stimulate rigorous thinking, and gear the students to build knowledge from their prior knowledge.

2) Reciprocal and Supportive: Teachers and students have equal right to speak up or voice out their opinions. When someone in the class expresses their feelings/opinions or gives response, the rest of the class, including the teacher, listens attentively and respectfully. The dialogic teacher will treat all students in an equitable manner. In a sense, a dialogic class entails the balance of power between the teacher and the students.

3) Cumulative: The teacher and the students build on their own and each other’s ideas and string them into coherent sequences of thinking and understanding. In a dialogic class, the students’ answer or response is as important as the question. The true learning occurs through what the teacher does with what the students say. Their contribution will not be merely received or praised; rather, it will be a teaching resource for the teacher, which might be used in the form of a data-base for revising the teacher’s teaching plan or for constructing further questions.

4) Purposeful: The teacher plans and guides classroom talks with specific learning goals. The discussion will be steered by questions that have been well-constructed and built upon
the ideas contributed by the students, which finally should lead to a clear goal that has been set. Learning goals in a dialogic class go beyond subject content. These also involve teaching the students powerful learning, thinking and communication tools: that is to use talk to reason, explore, and construct their own understanding.

These attributes signify that in a dialogic class students play an active role in leading classroom activities; responsibility is then shifted from the teacher to students. Dialogic teaching, thus, challenges the traditional classroom teaching in which the teacher plays a dominant role (Doukmak, 2014).

**Dialogic Teaching and Effective Learning**

Previous studies on dialogic teaching confirmed that talk and interaction will promote learning. Students will be more likely to learn with understanding through their speech. In other words, students develop their thought or understanding while talking or interacting with the teacher or peers (Díez-Palomar & Cabré Olivé, 2015). However, how using the language leads to effective learning is a complex process. According to Vygotsky (1978), language is a means to mediate and maintain children’s thinking development and social interactions play a significant role in cognitive development in children. Goswami (2015) postulated that human learning even starts since being in the womb; this learning in an auditory domain is one basis of language acquisition. After birth, auditory learning occurs in babies in the context of communicative interactions with carers. However, babies will not learn language from watching television as the input from this source lacks the social elements, indicating a critical role of social interaction in mediating human learning.

Hawkes (2012) claimed that spontaneous teacher-learner dialogue provides greater opportunities for language learning as it enables students to attain new terminology and to gain greater control over their existing linguistic competency. Results of her study illustrate dialogic elements in the spontaneous talks, which are missing in planned speaking. When speaking is planned, both the teacher and students know what each other will ask and say and speaking patterns are planned and rehearsed, leaving limited opportunities for students to practice augmenting, discussing, or justifying their answers. Spontaneous talks, in contrast, incorporate collective and cumulative nature of dialogic teaching as the teacher’s questions are authentic and the teacher builds upon students’ responses.

Hajhosseiny (2012) investigated the effect of dialogic teaching methods on university students’ critical thinking and engagement in their learning. The study was conducted with 40 undergraduate students majoring in Education and data were collected through standardized open-ended interview. The results of the study demonstrate the effectiveness of dialogic teaching on fostering students’ critical thinking and increasing their participation in their own learning.
Another study by Doukmak (2014) provided evidence on how dialogic teaching can promote students’ questioning and opportunities for students to construct their knowledge. The study was conducted in Syrian EFL classes, using an ethnographic approach. Data were collected through interviews with twelve teachers and survey with 85 students. The results of the study illustrate the power of dialogic talks which encourage students to ask questions even in a teacher-led environment. This implies that the students’ ability to ask effective questions does not occur naturally; they need to be assisted or trained. And, the person to assist or train them is the teacher.

Purpose of the study
The main purposes of the present study were as follows:

1. To identify essential elements of dialogic teaching in English reading class.
2. To develop the framework for promoting dialogic teaching in English reading class.
3. To evaluate the framework.

Research Questions

1. What are the elements of dialogic teaching in English reading class?
2. What does the dialogic teaching framework look like?
3. Is the framework effective in terms of students’ learning outcomes and satisfaction?

Research Methodology

The study consists of two stages. The first stage explored how dialogic teaching was carried out in English reading class and identified its essential elements. Data obtained were used to develop a framework of dialogic teaching. In the second stage, the framework was implemented in the researcher’s reading class to evaluate its effectiveness in terms of students’ learning outcomes and satisfaction. Content analysis was adopted in both stages.

Population and Samples

In the framework development stage, the population was lecturers of English reading in Thailand’s universities. The samples were eighteen lecturers of English reading. The population in the evaluation stage was students of English reading class and the sample were ninety-two students who took the researcher’s reading course in Semester 2 of the Academic year 2016.

Research Instruments and Procedure for Developmental Stage

Data in the development stage were collected through Classroom-talk Observation Survey (COS), semi-structured interviews and non-participant observation.

Classroom-talk Observation Survey (COS) was originally developed by the researcher...
and was used as a tool for capturing interactions and talking behaviors of the lecturers. Items in the COS Toolkits were designated scores. The results of each observation were put in the COS Scoring Table for analysis. Eighteen lecturers of English reading participated in this stage. In total 54 observations were conducted (3 observations/each). Based on their scores from the observation survey, six participants were regarded as dialogic. They were invited to participate in this study research. However, only four agreed. They were interviewed. The interviews were semi-structured, conducted in Thai, and audiotaped. The interviews aimed to explore their views of teacher’s roles and of teaching English reading. The researcher also observed their class (2 observations/each) to investigate their classroom characteristics (atmosphere and physical environment) and to examine how they conducted reading lessons and what activities they employed in their class.

**Research Instruments and Procedure for Evaluation Stage**

The trial implementation of the framework was conducted to evaluate its effectiveness in terms of students’ learning outcomes and satisfaction. The framework was implemented in the researcher’s reading class of the year 2016. Ninety-two students majoring in Business English participated in this course. The course was compulsory for year 2 students and was conducted in both Thai and English while all courses materials were in the English language.

Data used for evaluating the framework were drawn from (a) students’ grades of this course from three years: 2014, 2015 and 2016; and (b) students’ evaluation of the course from the same three years. The evaluation of course was conducted every year by the researcher’s university.

**Findings and Discussion**

**Essential Elements of Dialogic Reading Class**

Four lecturers were interviewed once and observed twice for one and a half hour in their classrooms. All of them were female, aged 35, 38, 39 and 43 years old and taught English reading in different universities in southern Thailand. Data obtained from the interviews and observations of all four participants were reported in Table 1.
## Table 1 Dialogic Lecturers’ Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Elements</th>
<th>Lecturer A</th>
<th>Lecturer B</th>
<th>Lecturer C</th>
<th>Lecturer D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>- Flexible, not limited to only in the classroom</td>
<td>- Flexible, not limited to only in the classroom</td>
<td>- Flexible, not limited to only in the classroom</td>
<td>- Flexible, not limited to only in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Encourage after-class discussion/consultation</td>
<td>- Consultation Clinic, mobile phone</td>
<td>- Facebook chatroom, Line application, Face-to-face in the office</td>
<td>- After-class discussion/consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Facebook chatroom, Line application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Face-to-face, in the office, mobile phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lecturers’ Roles</strong></td>
<td>- Facilitate conversations</td>
<td>- Facilitate conversations</td>
<td>- Facilitate conversations</td>
<td>- Facilitate conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Listen carefully</td>
<td>- Listen carefully</td>
<td>- Listen carefully</td>
<td>- Listen carefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use questions to provoke thoughtful response from students</td>
<td>- Use questions to provoke thoughtful response from students</td>
<td>- Use questions to provoke thoughtful response from students</td>
<td>- Use questions to provoke thoughtful response from students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stimulate students to elaborate on their response</td>
<td>- Stimulate students to elaborate on their response</td>
<td>- Stimulate students to elaborate on their response</td>
<td>- Stimulate students to elaborate on their response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Atmosphere</strong></td>
<td>- Idea of equality (democratic)</td>
<td>- Student voice (democratic)</td>
<td>- Student voice and emphasize the idea of equality voice (democratic)</td>
<td>- Power of the student and emphasize the idea of student voice (democratic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supportive &amp; safe</td>
<td>- Supportive &amp; safe</td>
<td>- Supportive &amp; safe</td>
<td>- Supportive &amp; safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Create learning circumstances that require students to interact, discuss, argue, acquire information</td>
<td>- Create learning circumstances that require students to interact, discuss, argue, acquire information</td>
<td>- Create learning circumstances that require students to interact, discuss, argue, acquire information</td>
<td>- Create learning circumstances that require students to interact, discuss, argue, acquire information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Collaborative; group work; peer tutoring</td>
<td>- Collaborative; group work</td>
<td>- Collaborative; group work</td>
<td>- Collaborative; group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Evening tutorial by peers (peer tutoring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Pedagogic Strategies: Procedure & Materials/Texts | - 3 reading stages: Pre-, While- and Post-Reading  
Pre-stage: Familiarize students with the topic by classroom discussion  & While-stage: Post a series of questions  
Post-stage: Class discussion, students presentation  
- Activities have a clear goal and constantly check if students misunderstand key learning concepts while doing activities  
- Google & library- Small group work  
- One or two group projects per one semester; allow students to explore their own ideas and reflect on their working procedure  
- No textbook  
- Reading texts: authentic, from varieties of sources, students select the texts to be read | - 4 reading stages: Pre-, While-, Post- and Beyond-Reading  
Pre-stage: Familiarize students with the topic by watching news or YouTube clip, or by newspaper/magazine  
While-stage: Series of questions, Post-stage: Class discussion, making prediction  
Beyond-stage: Attending conference (poster presentation)  
- Activities have a clear goal and make sure students understand and agree with it  
- Encourage searching skills (from library & interviews with people)  
- Small group work  
- No textbook | Pre-and while reading (Post activities not clear)  
Pre-stage: Familiarize students with the topic by initiating questions & encouraging brainstorming  
While-stage: Work-sheet provided to students  
- Activities have a clear goal  
- Encourage searching skills (from Google)  
- Small group work  
- Enough time is given to each reading activity  
- No textbook | While- and Post-reading stages (started with the reading with no introduction activity)  
While-stage: Series of questions, lecturer walked around,  
Post-stage: Class discussion, retelling the story  
- Activities have a clear goal and make sure students understand and agree with it  
- Encourage searching skills (from Google)  
- Small group work  
- Enough time is given to each reading activity  
- No textbook |
Table 1 indicates five core elements that need to manage in ways that support dialogic teaching: communication, lecturer roles, learning atmosphere, pedagogic strategies, and assessment.

Communication in all four participants was found to be flexible. The lecturer and the students in dialogic classes were able to interact with each other in various communication platforms, which were not limited to the boundary of the classroom, such as Facebook chatroom, Line application, or mobile phones. Outside class face-to-face communication was also encouraged, which took place at the lecturer’s office. Two out of the four lecturers organized consultation sessions for the students at their office, where students could consult with the lecturers on any topic. The Consultation Clinic served as a remedy for the students who had problems. Conversations that took place in the clinic resemble a doctor-patient dialogue, which focuses on a mutual trust. According to Lykke, Christensenb, & Reventlowa (2013), dialogues between the teacher and the student should be open and reflective, in the same way which a doctor uses dialogue to assess a patient and strengthen a mutual trust.

As for the roles of the lecturers, findings show that dialogic lecturers (1) move from being the center of the class to facilitate interactions and conversations in class; (2) listen carefully to their students; (3) initiate questions that invite students to think and provoke thoughtful response; and (4) stimulate their students to elaborate on their response. Four learning atmospheres are prominent in a dialogic reading class: democratic; supportive and safe; constructivist; and collaborative. The findings relevant to learning atmosphere implies the nature of a dialogic conversation, which changes power relations in contrast to conventional pedagogy, in which lecture is centered on the teacher and suppresses the voice of students (Rungwaraphong, 2014).

As for pedagogic strategies for a dialogic reading class, the findings propose that reading lessons are divided into different stages including pre-, while-, post-, and beyond- stages. All these stages cover a wide range of activities. Significantly, the study found that in a dialogic class there is no need to generate a lot of assignments. The key is to how best to stimulate students to develop deep knowledge in small groups. Dialogic lecturers were likely to assign one or two group
projects per one semester and comprise layers of mini-activities, allowing students to elaborate on each layer of the project. The lecturers participating in this stage of the study explained that time provided for each assignment or project is significant, and it should allow students to explore their own ideas and elaborate on the process of knowledge acquisition.

Finally, Table 1 indicates that assessment in a dialogic reading class must not assess students' factual memories, but to give chances to justify their answers or elaborate on their ideas. Students should be provided with a platform to demonstrate robust, evidence-based reasoning and must not be limited to a written assessment but also through oral communication (Bugarcic, Colthorpe, Zimbardi, Su, & Jackson, 2014).

Framework of Dialogic Teaching in English Reading Class

Essential elements and procedures of teaching reading in a dialogic class identified and reported in Table 1 were incorporated and crafted as a framework for promoting dialogic teaching in English reading class, which was presented in Figure 1.

According to the framework, reading lessons are divided into 4 stages: pre-, while-, post- and beyond- stages. Each stage has different aims and involves a wide range of activities. The first stage of a reading lesson is the familiarization of the topic, which takes place before the students start to read a given story. The lecturer posting questions and having students brainstorm is one of many ways. The lecturer might introduce the topic to the students by having them read a relevant article or news from magazines or newspapers. Significantly, the framework shows that even in the reading class the lecturer can have students watch YouTube or a video clip, suggesting that activities in a reading class are not limited to reading.
The second stage happens while the students are reading the given story. Activities that the lecturer implements during this stage aim to stimulate students’ comprehension, as well as encourage them to elaborate on the topic and deepen their understanding. Reading in a small group is one way to provide opportunities for students to have dialogue, building arguments and discussions with their peers. Figure 1 demonstrates the importance of the text to be given in a dialogic class, which needs to be authentic and selected from a variety of sources. Interestingly, one of the participants expressed that involving students in the text selection process, helps increase students’ talks. Furthermore, the framework suggests that dialogic lecturers prefer to make their own reading materials rather than relying on a commercial textbook. Another important issue at this stage of the reading lesson is that the goals of tasks or activities need to be clear.
and well communicated. The number of tasks or activities, while the students are reading, is important. Findings of the present study suggest that dialogic lecturers minimize the number of activities so that the students have sufficient time to elaborate on the reading topic and deepen their understanding, by discussing with peers, searching from other sources (e.g. Google, library, etc.), and/or consulting with the lecturer.

In the post-stage, which takes place after the students finish reading, the lecturer carries out activities that reflect students’ comprehension and encourage them to make arguments and express their opinion. The framework suggests that activities in this stage should be done orally in many forms, such as individual/group presentation, panel discussion, mock conferences, or debates. This provides opportunities for students to use language as a tool to explore their own understandings or construct knowledge (Mercer, Dawes, & Staarman, 2009). The assessment is regarded as one of the post reading activities, as is suggested in the framework to include oral assessment. This is a form of assessment by questioning the students and must not be employed to assess students’ factual memories, but to give chances for the students to logically justify their answers, reason aloud, clarify their misunderstanding, and to challenge their views. This finding signifies the importance of lecturers’ questions. According to Tofade, Elsner & Haines (2013), well-framed questions can stimulate learner’s discussion and interaction. Questions supportive to a meaningful dialogic learning will go beyond yes-no questions and one-word answer questions, which usually elicit isolated, surface-level facts.

Beyond stage is the final stage. Activities carried out in this stage aim to stimulate students to apply knowledge from reading the given story to other contexts, enabling them to connect classroom knowledge to the real world. This stage includes activities such as making a brochure or attending conferences (oral or poster presentation). According to the participant who implemented this stage in her reading class, the activities in this stage did not take place within the boundary of the classroom, thus this stage is optional but highly recommended if possible.

Implementation of the Framework: Learning Results and Student Satisfaction

The researcher taught her reading course in every semester 2 since the year 2014. Dialogic teaching was not adopted in the year 2014, while the researcher started making her class dialogic in the year 2015 but without any framework. The framework obtained from this study was adopted in the year 2016.

In year 2016 class, the researcher followed four stages as illustrated in the obtained dialogic teaching framework in Figure 1. Fortunately, during the middle of the semester, an undergraduate national conference was held at the researcher’s university. The researcher gave a poster presentation project to the students, which were activities in Stage 4 of the framework.
This was a team-based project, which was assigned after midterm examination and consisted of 4 layers of activities: making a poster, presenting the poster, answering questions at the conference, and organizing a quiz. The students were given one month to complete the whole project and were given the project details handout, which indicated important information requirements, task objectives, and deadlines. Consultation sessions were available.

Learning results of students taking the researcher’s reading courses in three different academic years were reported in Table 2.

**Table 2 Students’ Learning Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Criteria (Points)</th>
<th>Year 2014</th>
<th>Year 2015</th>
<th>Year 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>80.00-100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>75.00-79.99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>70.00-74.99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>65.00-69.99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>60.00-64.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>55.00-59.99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>44.00-54.99</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0-43.99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 2, the number of the students who got Grade A and B+ in years’ 2015 and 2016 (25.33 % and 28.26 % respectively), in which reading lessons were managed dialogically, were obviously higher than that of the non-dialogic year 2014 (15.52 %). In contrast, in the dialogic class of years 2015 and 2016 the number of students who got the lowest grade (D) was 12.00 % and 8.69 %, compared to 22.41% in the year 2014. Surprisingly, no students failed in the year 2016, while 13.79% of students failed in the year 2014 class. The class of the year 2014 shows the highest rate of withdrawals, while only 2.17% of the students withdrew from the class of 2016. It can be concluded from these findings that dialogic teaching can lead to better learning outcomes and better course retention (fewer or no withdrawal rate). Importantly, the dialogic class
which is managed in a more systematic way, i.e. by following a framework such as the one implemented in the present study (in the year 2016), leads to a better result than the one that does not follow any guiding procedures (in the year 2015).

**Students’ Course Satisfactions and Feedback**

To examine students’ satisfaction of the course and to gain their opinions about the course, data were drawn from the course evaluation system of the researcher’s university in three consecutive years: 2014, 2015 and 2016. The evaluation consists of two main parts: overall satisfaction (5-Likert scales) and Feedback or Recommendation for the course (open-ended question, originally in Thai language and optional). This online course evaluation is conducted every semester by the university and the instructors view the evaluation results online. The overall scores and written feedback and recommendations from the mentioned three years were reported in Tables 3 and 4.

**Table 3 Overall Satisfactions of Course from Years 2014-2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Satisfaction Scores (5-point Likert Scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 3, the reading class in the year 2016 received the highest satisfaction score (4.43) while that of the year 2014 received the lowest (3.89). Interestingly, even though the researcher adopted dialogic teaching in the classes of both year’s 2015 and 2016, the class of the year 2015 received less than 4 score, which is quite a great deal lower than that of the year 2016, and was not much different from the non-dialogic class in the year 2014. These findings seem to suggest that the students are likely to be more satisfied when the class is managed following a systematic guiding framework.
According to Table 4, the amount of feedback given by the students in three consecutive years was different. A lot more feedback/comments were given by the students in the year 2016 compared to those from the year 2014 and 2015. It can be said that the students from a dialogic class are likely to express their opinions and their responses go beyond yes-no questions and one-word answer. By comparing the students’ feedback, it can be concluded that the class which followed the dialogic framework (the year 2016) was better managed and received more positive feedback from the students. The students’ feedback presented in Table 4 illustrates that the students from Year 2016 perceived their development of critical and analytical skills from their reading class.

**Conclusions and Recommendations for Future Research**

The study presented in this article postulates that in a dialogic class, knowledge will be constructed by students, usually through collaborative work with peers. The teacher no longer transmits knowledge, interprets the meaning or provides answers to the students. On the contrary, the teacher creates opportunities for the students to explore their own understanding. As for essential elements of dialogic teaching in an English reading class, the findings suggest that dialogic class comprises of five core elements: communication, lecturer's roles, learning atmosphere,
learning activities, and assessment. The framework of dialogic teaching proposed in this study

take into account all five elements and divide procedures of teaching English reading into four

stages: pre-, while-, post- and beyond-. The final stage is optional as it takes place outside
the boundary of the classroom and depends on the actual events such as conferences. The

findings of the study also highlight the authenticity and the number of texts given to the students
and suggest that the involvement of students in the text selection is beneficial to students’ learning

participation. This proves that dialogic teaching is multi-faceted, taking into account the aspects
of teaching and learning, and classroom management.

The application of the framework to the English reading class has proven to be effective

in improving students’ learning outcomes and course satisfaction. However, the framework

presented in this article was tested within the researcher’s contexts and circumstances, thus its
generalizability might be bounded to contexts or circumstances similar to the ones described in
this study. Therefore, in the future the framework should be experimented within a controlled

group, and in wider reading contexts. For example, it could be implemented in reading classes

in universities across Thailand or other countries. Also, future research might be conducted to

investigate limitations and challenges of each stage of the reading procedure postulated in the
framework in the present study.
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