

Exploring opportunities for dialogic teaching within the genre pedagogy teaching and learning cycle in primary classrooms

EHIYAZARYAN-WHITE, Ester <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7013-1995>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/35703/>

This document is the Accepted Version [AM]

Citation:

EHIYAZARYAN-WHITE, Ester (2025). Exploring opportunities for dialogic teaching within the genre pedagogy teaching and learning cycle in primary classrooms. Language and Education, 1-21. [Article]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Title:

Exploring opportunities for dialogic teaching within the genre pedagogy teaching and learning cycle in primary classrooms

Dr Ester Ehiyazaryan-White

Sheffield Hallam University

Email: e.ehiyazaryan-white@shu.ac.uk

Orcid ID: 0000-0001-7013-1995

Acknowledgement: The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Ehiyazaryan-White, E. (2025). Exploring opportunities for dialogic teaching within the genre pedagogy teaching and learning cycle in primary classrooms. *Language and Education*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2025.2504462>

Abstract

There has been an increasing focus on oracy in the curriculum in England. This focus is justified as the need for children to develop skills essential for future success. However, beyond oracy as skill, classroom talk is a powerful tool for developing thinking and shared meaning as evidenced by dialogic teaching pedagogy. This raises the question of how to establish spaces for such dialogue, leading to meaningful engagement with texts. Grounded in systemic functional linguistics, genre pedagogy is a well-known approach to structuring talk leading to writing. Based on interview data from a large-scale genre pedagogy intervention in primary schools, this paper explores teachers' accounts of how they implemented the genre pedagogy teaching and learning cycle (TLC). It provides authentic insights from teachers on how aspects of the TLC supported them to gradually enable learner talk to predominate. On the basis of these insights, the article proposes possible ways of aligning the genre pedagogy TLC with some of the principles of dialogic teaching while taking into account relational aspects of talk. In this way the paper offers opportunities to consider the TLC as a possible organising framework for oracy within the primary curriculum.

Keywords: Genre pedagogy, dialogic teaching, teaching and learning cycle, learner agency, EAL

1. Introduction

The recent focus on oracy in the classroom has been a welcome development, emphasising the importance of classroom talk to the development of children's thinking, a bridge to writing and a deeper and more meaningful engagement with texts (Oracy Education Commission, 2024). This work and a number of speech and language interventions in classrooms (e.g., NELI, Infant language link, Welcomm) tend to emphasise articulatory and precision in spoken language. Beyond articulatory and precision in spoken language, oracy draws on evidence-based research on dialogic teaching, emphasising language as a tool for thinking and the conditions for supporting and promoting such use of oracy or classroom talk (Mercer et al., 2019; Alexander, 2020; Jay et al., 2017; Snell, 2024).

This recent focus on oracy in classrooms in England (Oracy APPG, 2021) based on a pedagogy of dialogic teaching (Alexander, 2020; 2017; Mercer and Hodgkinson, 2008) closely overlaps in its approach with the principles of the Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) genre pedagogy teaching and learning cycle (TLC) (Rose and Martin, 2012). Both focus on the teacher modelling talk, on pupils shaping and articulating ideas in dialogue with their peers, as well as on the value of pupils engaging in different types of talk, varying the context (field) and audience (tenor). Such substantial overlap indicates that SFL genre pedagogy could provide a useful approach to scaffolding dialogic interactions which deepen understanding of texts and underpin writing.

In the English primary classroom context, understanding of and working with curriculum genres is built into the curriculum (DfE, 2013). However, the interactional framework for scaffolding teacher and learner interactions – the teaching and learning cycle (TLC) – is less known and rarely

implemented in primary contexts in England. Therefore, the possibilities for constructively aligning the valuable aspects of dialogic teaching with the scaffolding framework of the TLC has rarely been explored in English primary classrooms.

This paper argues that such constructive alignment has potential to provide a useful organising framework for teachers looking for opportunities to weave in oracy in their existing practices across the curriculum. The paper draws on qualitative empirical data from a large-scale implementation of a SFL genre pedagogy intervention in primary schools in England – the Language in Learning Across the Curriculum (LiLAC) programme. The formal evaluation of the programme (Culliney et al., 2019) focussed primarily on issues of fidelity of implementation of the programme, however, did not examine in detail the dialogic interactions underpinning the pupils' learning within the TLC. This paper engages with these aspects in more depth and offers an exploration of the teachers' perceptions of the dialogic interactions which took place within the genre pedagogy approach. Based on teachers' first-hand experiences of implementing the genre pedagogy approach through a variety of dialogic tasks in the classroom, the paper examines the opportunities for constructively aligning the TLC with specific principles and repertoires characteristic of dialogic teaching. The following research questions (RQs) guided the subsequent analysis of teacher interview data:

RQ1 How did teachers perceive the ways in which dialogue was enacted within the stages of the TLC and what did this reveal about children's learning through dialogue?

RQ2 How was ownership of talk perceived by teachers and enacted within the TLC?

RQ3 Was there evidence in teachers' accounts that talk emerging within the TLC led to or underpinned writing?

RQ4 How did teachers perceive the ways in which EAL children responded to the genre pedagogy approach?

While the data presented in the paper is limited to the teachers' perspectives, teachers' first-hand accounts of implementing the TLC provide authentic insights into which aspects of the TLC they foregrounded as working well to promote learner talk. Teachers' accounts were also particularly relevant in exploring the relational aspects of talk – providing insights into how aspects of the TLC supported teachers to gradually enable learner talk to predominate and for children at times to take the lead in the spoken interactions. These accounts of what works well in scaffolding oral interactions in the classroom would be of particular value to other teachers in the primary context planning for oracy across the curriculum. They further provide opportunities to consider how aligning the principles of dialogic teaching with the TLC can provide a possible organising framework for oracy in the primary curriculum.

2. Literature review

SFL genre pedagogy emerged in the work of the Sydney School and has evolved as an approach frequently used with learners speaking English as an additional language (EAL) (Caplan and Farling, 2017; de Oliveira and Lan, 2014). Subsequently, SFL genre pedagogy has been developed as a scaffolded teaching and learning process to incorporate a '*staged, goal oriented and social*' approach to working with texts (Rose and Martin, 2012, p.62), through implementing the teaching and learning cycle (TLC). The three key stages on the TLC include:

- *Deconstruction*, in which the teacher introduces the model text; through iterative discussion pupils deconstruct the text, in the process gaining awareness of the linguistic features characteristic of this genre, as well as gaining a deeper understanding of field (the context in which this text is set);
- *Joint construction*, in which teacher and pupils engage in shared writing of a new text in the same genre as the model text, applying the knowledge gained in the deconstruction stage of the text's genre, characteristic linguistic features and the context (field) in which it is situated.
- *Independent construction*, in which pupils draw on knowledge developed in the previous two stages to independently work on their own example of text in the target genre.

In this way SFL provides a clearly articulated pedagogical approach underpinning children's ability to write in curriculum relevant genres (Hyland, 2003; Christie, 2008). The pedagogical activities are scaffolded by the teacher in the earlier stages of the TLC through modelling the target genre, but gradually bestowing increasing control over the spoken and written interactions to the learners (Rose and Martin, 2012; de Oliveira, 2017). This handover of control is intended to place learners in an agentic role, through engaging them in deconstructing, jointly and then independently constructing texts. Importantly, the aspects of deconstructing and then jointly constructing text within the TLC unfold within a context of a substantial amount of oral and dialogic work. Learners gradually and collaboratively build understanding of field and register, deconstruct and jointly, then independently construct new texts (Rose, 2018; Coffin et al., 2013).

While there has been recent work on genre pedagogy in Europe and in the Global South (Acevedo et al., 2023; Whittaker and Parejo, 2018), in the context of English primary schools, genre pedagogy is less known and infrequently applied. Previous research in the English context has examined the impact of professional learning relating to SFL on teachers' confidence with using language knowledge across curricular subjects (Acevedo, 2020). Knowledge of how to teach language across the curriculum and as embedded in subject areas has also been given attention by the EEF, who have developed the notion of disciplinary knowledge as a way of improving literacy across the curriculum in secondary schools (Quigley and Coleman, 2019). Yet, besides the project which this paper draws on (Culliney et al., 2019), there is no evidence of another large-scale implementation of genre pedagogy in primary classrooms in England.

There is some acknowledgement of the value of understanding curriculum genres within the National Curriculum in England (DfE, 2013). This guidance specifies that as part of reading comprehension children are expected to engage with a variety of text types - poetry, stories, non-fiction – yet no further distinction is made between these curriculum genres. SFL scholars have provided a more detailed typology of curriculum genres and their features (Derewianka, 2003; Coffin, 2006) and further described these with relevance to the primary stage (Rose and Martin, 2012). According to the English curriculum, as part of developing *reading comprehension*, children are implicitly expected to learn to understand the features of the genre and reproduce these genres making appropriate choices on the language continuum, tenor and appropriate use of mode, however there is no reference to the need to teach these key concepts of genre knowledge.

Separately, and under *spoken language*, the requirements for spoken language are discussed as underpinning reading comprehension and laying the foundations of writing. These principles are also evident in the genre pedagogy approach, where a substantial amount of oral work takes place in the deconstruction and joint construction stages leading on to writing (Rothery, 1994; Rose and Martin, 2012). While curriculum guidance in England acknowledges the relationship between talk and

writing, an underpinning pedagogy for linking the two is not articulated. This suggests the need to further examine the relationship between classroom dialogue as underpinning writing and the value of a pedagogical framework designed to achieve this. This paper proposes that the TLC is one such possible framework (Rose and Martin, 2012).

While genre is less understood or adopted in England's primary curriculum, there is a growing interest and emphasis both in policy (The Labour Party, 2023) and practice on oracy – learning to, through and about talk (Oracy Education Commission, 2024). The underpinning pedagogy of oracy is dialogic teaching (Alexander, 2020; Littleton and Mercer, 2013). Currently however oracy is often enacted in primary classrooms through speech and language interventions such as NELI which prioritise practicing expressive and receptive language skills (Dimova et al., 2020). Such interventions focus on oracy as skill, rarely emphasising dialogue as a bridge to writing. Conversely, placing text at the heart of the teaching and learning interactions and scaffolding talk around text, while gradually leading to writing is the purpose of the TLC. Considering the significant potential for dialogue to unfold within the TLC, leading to learners taking fuller accountability for their talk interactions and to developing thinking which foregrounds writing, this paper explores this SFL approach as a possible organising framework for oracy in the primary context.

The following section discusses the characteristics and principles of dialogic teaching and shows the relationship between dialogic teaching and dialogic practice evidenced within studies exploring the TLC.

2.1. Dialogic teaching, its characteristics, principles and relationship to genre pedagogy

In his dialogic teaching framework, Alexander outlines the principles of dialogic teaching and the justification for proposing a repertoire approach to organising classroom talk.

The six principles of dialogic teaching define classroom talk as meaningful when it is collective, supportive, reciprocal, deliberative, cumulative and purposeful (Alexander, 2020, p. 131). The first three of these principles relate to establishing a supportive culture of learning in the classrooms (collective, supportive and reciprocal) with the latter three emphasising the value of talk as exploratory thinking and underpinning the making of new meanings collaboratively with others (deliberative, cumulative and purposeful).

Focussing on establishing a supportive culture of learning, work on dialogic teaching has consistently foregrounded the importance of this aspect of organising classroom talk. Drawing on evidence from the DIALLS project, Maine (2024) identifies the need for dialogic space, a concept initially articulated by Wegerif (2011), created between speakers and through the interaction of these speakers' ideas. Underlying such dialogic space is the principle of tolerance – recognising that children will feel uncertainty in speaking out and the need to build their resilience to tolerating the feeling of being uncertain about speaking out (Maine et al., 2019). This uncertainty can often be experienced by EAL learners, who, under the stressors of dominant ideas of the requirement to speak standard English, may be uncertain about how their speech will come across (Brea-Spahn and Bauler, 2022). In response to this, the DIALLS approach focussed on developing learners' dispositions of tolerance, respect and empathy through dialogue (Maine, 2024).

In the TLC articulated by Martin and Rose teacher and learners engage in various forms of negotiation of texts (2012) the aim of which is to gradually bestow increasing ownership of talk and

of ideas to the learners, and in this way scaffold their entry into writing. Further exploration is needed into whether and how such supportive culture develops when teachers are implementing the TLC in classroom teaching.

The latter three principles in Alexander's framework emphasise the value of talk as exploratory thinking and underpinning the making of new meanings collaboratively with others (deliberative, cumulative and purposeful) (2020, p. 131). These exploratory aspects of talk are recognised as challenging to implement, particularly as they require a level of maturity in those engaging in the dialogue, which may be beyond the reach of younger learners (Alexander, 2020; Kim and Wilkinson, 2019). In the TLC the iterative negotiation of meaning between teacher and students is an essential practice (Rose and Martin, 2012). Evidence from studies focussing on the TLC have shown examples of cumulative dialogic exchanges in the joint construction stage (Caplan and Farling, 2017). Scaffolded earlier in the deconstruction stage through building field, the joint construction stage emerges as a space where increasing ownership of ideas can be bestowed to learners and where learners can 'guide the interaction in an unexpected direction' (Caplan and Farling, 2017, p. 573). In a high school History lesson context, Schall-Leckrone (2017) shows how students engaged in developing historical arguments through enacting the identities of individuals in an ancient Roman context. In a primary school science lesson context, de Oliveira and Lan (2014) provide examples of children engaging in purposeful dialogue with the teacher, as part of constructing a procedural recount of an experiment and leading to children's jointly constructed and then independent writing on the topic. While these examples demonstrate the opportunities which the TLC provides for development of exploratory and cumulative talk, it is evident that in examples with younger learners the dialogic exchanges are strongly scaffolded by the teacher and predominantly teacher led (de Oliveira and Lan, 2014). Addressing this, and as part of the dialogic teaching framework, Alexander further outlines the importance of dialogic repertoires which enable us to consider aspects of the organisation of talk and different types of talk as part of enabling the gradual move towards more learner owned ideas leading to writing.

A repertoire approach is an acknowledgement of the complexity and situated and context specific nature of classroom talk. The eight repertoires proposed by Alexander (2020) aim to provide teachers with a broad range of choices for organising classroom talk (relationally, temporally, spatially, placing varying emphasis on learning talk and teaching talk etc.) Particularly relevant to this paper are the following repertoires:

Repertoire 1 refers to establishing classroom norms which are conducive of developing a 'culture of productive talk' (Michaels and O'Connor in Alexander 2020, p. 137). This aspect echoes the principles of dialogic talk described earlier around establishing a supportive culture of learning and essential for all children, including those who have to overcome additional challenges in order to have a voice in the classroom (for example EAL children).

Repertoire 2 offers options for organising talk according to relational aspects, including whole class, paired and small group talk, as well as individual work. The genre pedagogy literature foregrounds examples of whole class interaction (Trojan, 2021) but rarely places an emphasis on how paired or small group work dialogue unfold within the TLC or the role which they play. This paper draws on an intervention which emphasised the use of small group and paired talk therefore Repertoire 2 provides part of the analytical framework for the data.

Repertoire 3 focuses on learning talk – the multiple types of talk which are conducive to learning, ostensibly moving beyond teacher led initiation-response-feedback (IRF) sequences. Here Alexander considers both presentational talk (more concerned with articulacy, clarity and precision of speech)

and exploratory talk (often including uncertain and unfinished utterances) – both valuable as they address an audience and encourage the learner to consider tenor (a key concept in genre pedagogy). The functions of different forms of talk are foregrounded here drawing on Halliday's typology of spoken language (1975). In the genre pedagogy intervention discussed in this paper, talk as process and talk as presentation were considered key features of the approach, enabling learners to explore ideas verbally as a scaffolding mechanism leading to writing. Repertoire 3 provided a further part of the analytical framework for the data aiming to examine the way teachers used and perceived the effectiveness of these types of talk in practice with the children.

3. Methodology

This article draws on semi structured interview data with teachers implementing a genre pedagogy approach in years 5 or 6 in primary classrooms in England. Language in Learning Across the Curriculum (LILAC) was developed and widely applied in schools in Australia and owned by the Australian Government (Custance, Dare and Polias, 2012). The findings reported here are drawn from a large randomised controlled trial (Cullinney et al., 2019) evaluating the programme's implementation. Overall, 91 schools across England participated in the trial. Within the schools participating, 53% of pupils were EAL learners and 44% were eligible for free school meals (EEF, 2023). As part of the implementation and process evaluation (IPE) stage of the trial 14 schools were visited. The interview data reported on in this paper was collected as part of this IPE process.

As part of the programme, teachers received 5 days of continuing professional development (CPD) in which four key features of the SFL genre pedagogy approach were emphasised:

- Scaffolding children's understanding of writing and speaking in the variety of genres in the primary curriculum
- Embedding a more gradual approach to teaching writing through applying the TLC
- Developing children's sense of the changing formality of language through the register continuum
- Developing children's verbal communication skills, embedded in a specific genre, through structured talk

As part of the training, teachers were supported in developing schemes of work, with the objective to scaffold the learning of genre specific linguistic features across the curriculum. Implementing the TLC was also encouraged as a supportive framework, as was the use of different types of structured talk.

Following a period of implementation, semi structured interviews lasting up to 30 minutes were carried out with teachers in 14 schools implementing the programme in their lessons. These interviews engaged with teachers' perceptions of the value of implementing the genre pedagogy approach in the classroom and on any perceived impact on pupils as well as on their own practice. Four of the schools had implemented the programme in year 5 and ten of the schools had implemented it in year 6 (14 schools overall participated in the implementation and process evaluation). In multi-form entry schools, more than one teacher was interviewed, providing a dataset of 26 interviews (seven of these interviews were carried out with Year 5 teachers and 19 with year 6 teachers).

Purposive sampling was applied to the selection of schools participating in the IPE process. Criteria included schools with no fewer than 10 EAL children in year 5 and 6 and schools geographically

spread across five regions in England. The programme was aimed at supporting EAL learners but also all learners with their knowledge of genre and writing in relevant genres across the curriculum. Ethical approval was obtained from the author's affiliated institution's ethics committee. Informed consent was gained from all participants in the study.

The focus of the programme evaluation was to test the efficacy of the programme expressed as improvement in children's written skills pre and post intervention. Therefore some of the interview questions focussed on: which ideas from the training teachers found most useful; whether the language based objectives set for the lesson were met; what effects teachers observed on the pupils as a result of applying the genre based approach; whether teachers perceived changes to their own teaching through using the materials and training received; whether external pressures from the curriculum affected their delivery of the genre based approach in the classroom.

In addition, a key principle underlying the genre pedagogy approach was to enable teachers to implement the teaching and learning cycle (TLC) through a range of dialogic tasks, in this way promoting both tutor-led talk and small group discussion, gradually leading from deconstruction and joint construction to independent writing. Therefore some of the interview questions focussed on: how teachers implemented the TLC; what challenges they experienced in the process; how group work, paired work and other relational options in organising talk were used in the context of the TLC; how teachers used different forms of structured talk (talk as progress, talk as presentation) to support children's talk leading to writing and to scaffold their interactions within the deconstruction and joint construction stages of the TLC. This latter set of questions reveals teachers' experiences of implementing the TLC with pupils; in responding to these questions, teachers further emphasised aspects and principles associated with dialogic teaching. Therefore, the data analysis presented here focussed on this latter set of questions, rather than on those pertaining to compliance with trial requirements.

3.1. Data analysis

Data analysis was framed by the pedagogical features of the TLC (Rose and Martin, 2012), as well as by the principles and characteristics underpinning dialogic teaching (Alexander, 2020). Combined, these pedagogies provided an analytical lens for teachers' experiences of the dialogic interactions developing between children and between children and teacher in the classroom context.

Features of genre pedagogy informing the analysis

The analysis focussed on aspects of genre pedagogy which teachers emphasised most in their accounts of the programme implementation – these were the teaching and learning cycle and the relational aspects between teacher and learners which unfolded in the process of implementing it.

In interviews with teachers as part of the process evaluation of the programme, they described their experiences of implementing the TLC. As the data collection took place midway through the intervention most teachers had not completed a full cycle of the intervention. The analysis therefore focussed on teachers' perceptions of the value of the TLC, with a particular focus on the **deconstruction and joint construction phases** on the approach.

As described by Rose and Martin (2012), part of the aim of staged work with learners within the TLC is to bestow increasing control over the teaching and learning interactions to learners. This also resonates with more recent writing regarding accountability of talk (Resnick et al., 2018). Teachers frequently commented on the **shifts in the relational aspects of talk** within the TLC and this formed an important aspect of the approach which the analysis focussed on.

Principles and repertoires of dialogic teaching informing the analysis

In describing their experiences of implementing the TLC, teachers frequently reflected on the supportive nature of the dialogic interactions developing among the learners. Therefore, the **supportive and reciprocal** principles of dialogic teaching were explored in the analysis. In addition, principles in the framework relating to its value as exploratory thinking and meaning making (**deliberative, cumulative, purposeful**) were focussed on in the analysis, as those were also foregrounded by teachers in the interviews.

The notion of repertoires formed a further focus of the analysis – firstly in the vision of repertoires as placing a focus on relational aspects of talk, and secondly as resisting binary definitions of talk and recognising the dynamic nature of dialogic exchanges. The analysis focused on those repertoires which were noted in teachers’ interviews and which included:

- Repertoire 1 - relating to **establishing a supportive culture of dialogic talk** in the classroom
- Repertoire 2 – focussing on **options for organising talk according to relational aspects** such as whole class, paired, small group work.
- Repertoire 3 – focussing on the **types of talk which are conducive to learning** and their functions.

The two-stage coding approach from Miles et al (2014) was applied, consisting of a first cycle of initial coding, allowing for descriptive and exploratory coding categories to emerge and a second cycle of theoretical coding, involving integrating the emerging codes around a ‘*central/core category [which] suggests a theoretical explanation for the phenomenon*’ (Saldaña, 2021, p. 314).

The 1st cycle coding included procedural (deductive) coding and exploratory (inductive) coding (Saldaña, 2021). As part of procedural coding, pre-existing categories of interest were coded to explore mention of the key features of the genre pedagogy programme:

- the components of the TLC: deconstruction, joint construction, independent writing;
- specific genre pedagogy approaches to structured talk, aimed at scaffolding learners’ understanding
- mention of EAL pupils and their response to the programme

From this initial procedural coding stage, the coding progressed to examine how these elements of genre pedagogy and instances of teachers’ perceptions related to the research questions (see introduction). This included examining how these features of the programme enabled different aspects of children’s and teachers’ dialogic exchanges. The coding was then grouped under broader themes guided by the RQs listed above (Appendix A - Coding frame).

Having completed this initial themeing stage, procedural and exploratory coding moved on to a second cycle of theoretical coding (Saldaña, 2021). Theoretical coding was led by the framework for dialogic teaching and by the features of the TLC outlined earlier in this section. This stage involved integrating the themes emerging from first cycle coding around teachers’ perceptions of:

- Shifts in the ownership of talk in the joint construction and deconstruction stages
- Supportive and reciprocal dialogic exchanges within the TLC
- Deliberative and cumulative exchanges within the TLC
- The value of structured types of talk

Coding categories identified through first cycle coding, led by features of genre pedagogy were examined in the context of how or whether they enabled or facilitated the principles and characteristics of dialogic teaching. The analysis therefore sought to establish whether the TLC offered opportunities for enacting dialogic teaching, in this way supporting children in developing more meaningful engagement with texts.

4. Results

The findings present teachers' perspectives on the ways in which a variety of dialogic teaching opportunities were enacted within the Teaching and Learning Cycle. Characteristics of the TLC and their contribution to more agentic interaction by learners are discussed, including deconstructing and jointly constructing texts. The relational and iterative shifts between teacher owned and learner owned talk are discussed in the context of children's enjoyment of their agentic use of talk. The use of talk as performance within the TLC is explored and the varied purposes which teachers ascribed to it – in some instances as developing rhetorical skills and in others as laying the foundations for writing.

4.1. Deconstruction and joint construction as dialogic teaching spaces

The teaching and learning cycle is the signature scaffolding mechanism of the genre pedagogy approach. The data revealed that the different forms of engagement with texts, characteristic of the TLC supported the core principles of dialogic teaching, in particular – dialogue as cumulative, supportive and reciprocal (Alexander, 2020). In Table 1 presented below, a teacher interviewed in this study described the application of the TLC, emphasising the dialogic interactions and types of talk taking place as significant in scaffolding children's meaningful engagement with texts. Particular emphasis is placed on the stages of deconstruction and joint construction. For each part of the data extract the relevant stage in the TLC is identified and the activities supporting this stage (Column 2), the relational aspects of dialogue are identified (column 3) and the dialogic teaching principle guiding classroom talk is identified (column 4):

Data extract, School 11, Year 6, Teacher 2	TLC stage and activities supporting this stage	Relational aspect of dialogue	Dialogic teaching principle
<i>We started with a lot of previous knowledge input, so we thought about what did they know already, without giving them all of that information to start off with, and really spoke about what it was that they knew first.</i>	Deconstruction stage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint negotiation of text Research Building field 	Teacher led	Collective
<i>Then to build up, especially in that lesson, there was a lot of group work, so they were able to have opportunities to discuss their ideas through and really get an understanding</i>	Joint construction through negotiation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group work Discussion – peer negotiation Rehearsing ideas 	Learner led; peer negotiated	Supportive, reciprocal

<i>of what they're going to be taking to the inner circle.</i>			
<i>Then we had the talk as performance, so they had a chance to all of those ideas that they got together, show them and showcase them (...) to really display what they wanted to get across. We spoke a lot about different types of language that we could discuss, so any vocabulary that they didn't understand they had a chance to either get an answer from somebody else or find their meaning themselves. So there were a couple of instances where if they weren't sure what a word might mean or how to spell something, they would then take it upon themselves to either ask a partner, or to go and check for them, so they are accountable for the vocabulary that they're using. It was more the performance-based idea around it, so really getting those ideas across.</i>	Joint construction through presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presenting jointly constructed ideas through talk as performance; • Discussion of linguistic features (e.g. register continuum) • Clarifying vocabulary 	Teacher led; Learner led and peer negotiated	Deliberative, cumulative

Table 1: Interview with Teacher 2, Year 6, School 11; description of dialogic interactions within the TLC

There are several aspects which emerge as interesting in the teacher's description of the application of the TLC – the gradual shift in ownership of talk; the supportive nature of the children's interactions and the role of structured talk in enabling the supportive, purposeful and cumulative development of ideas.

From the teacher's description it is evident that some of the interactions are teacher led (column 3) – such as the initial work on building field and deconstructing the text. However, particularly in the joint construction stage, there is movement towards discussion which is more learner led and owned – for example small group work and talk as performance – these are seen as interactions in which learners take responsibility or become accountable (Resnick et al., 2018) for their language choices. This indicates the different ways in which dialogic interactions play a significant part in the TLC to gradually bestow greater ownership of ideas and linguistic and register choices to the learners. This movement in ownership is made possible by the teacher and children mobilising different types of talk within the TLC (column 2) - small group discussion, talk as performance, varying on the register continuum, and marked by gradually diminished teacher input.

Aligning with the 'supportive' principle in Alexander's framework of dialogic teaching (2020) it is evident that the learners were able to engage in negotiating meaning, expressing uncertainty about language and language choices, exploring and finding out new information, referring to each other as well as the teacher to build understanding of field. These activities, as described by the teacher, foreground the uncertainty which children experience in the process as well as the way children supported each other as a way of managing this uncertainty. Maine (2024) identifies this supportive aspect as important for developing tolerance – the ability to demonstrate resilience and tolerate uncertainty in the use of language and linguistic features.

It is interesting that these acts of exploration and uncertainty seem to have emerged in the context of a talk as performance activity – traditionally thought of as fairly scripted presentation talk, but as these data instances illustrate is in fact a form of spoken, low stakes, peer and teacher supported exploration. This invites a rethinking of the opportunities which talk as performance can offer in the context of the TLC. 'Talk as performance' emerges as more than talk for articulacy or performative talk and is instead reconceptualised as a form of exploratory thinking aloud (Mercer, 2000) – more learner than teacher owned, leaving space for imperfect thought-in-progress contributions, building up resilience and tolerance (Maine, 2024).

4.2. Deconstruction as a bridge to writing for EAL learners

In the above example, deconstruction and joint construction of texts emerged as spaces for cumulative and reciprocal dialogue. The processes embedded within deconstructing text were also seen as particularly useful for EAL learners:

Even the low ability EAL kids could identify similes and metaphors. It was really effective. We also do things like comprehension questions within English. We do them in guided reading, but we started bringing them into English for the deconstruction stage where we break down the evidence, we make inferences, we define unfamiliar words, just so we really deconstruct it.

(School 1, Year 5)

It is evident from the teacher's comment that the deconstruction phase enabled learners to familiarise themselves with writing in the target genre through exploring its linguistic features (in this case these included the use of similes and metaphors). Such linguistic features can be particularly challenging for EAL learners as they are associated with cognitive and academic language proficiency (Cummins, 2000; Conteh, 2012). Beyond placing an emphasis on genre specific linguistic features, the teacher further emphasised the act of breaking down the evidence and taking apart the text as supportive of EAL learners; the literature discusses this aspect as an essential element of good practice in working with EAL learners - reducing the cognitive load by breaking down the '*amount of information that must be processed simultaneously or in close succession by the student in order to carry out the activity*' (Cummins 2000: 66). Beyond this, the deconstruction phase is characterised by situating the text within a rich context (Rose and Martin, 2012; de Oliveira and Lan, 2014). Such rich context addresses a key issue which EAL learners face with academic literacies – the decontextualised nature of texts (Cummins, 2000; Halbach, 2012).

In discussing the TLC deconstruction stage, teachers further foregrounded the value of oral rehearsing of ideas before committing these to writing:

Researcher: *Have you noticed an effect on the EAL students' use of language as a result of this approach?*

Teacher: Yes (...) I really do think it helps that they're able to talk about their ideas and maybe get their ideas sorted before they put them down in writing. Having a chance, looking at deconstructed examples of texts, it all forms part of a journey towards the end product, and I think it does give a better end product.

(School 10, Year 6, Teacher 1)

As Gibbons highlights the oral rehearsing of ideas prior to writing is an essential support mechanism for EAL learners (2002). This highlights the planning (*'get their ideas sorted'*) and bridging (*'before they put them down in writing'*) qualities of the TLC connecting speech and writing, as particularly valuable to EAL learners. The teacher's characterisation of this as a journey is further reminiscent of Alexander's view of the interdependent and iterative nature of talk and writing (2020).

4.3. Joint construction as supportive, cumulative and engaging children in thinking about the linguistic choices made

Deconstruction and joint construction are both important stages of negotiating meaning within the genre pedagogy approach. In its design, genre pedagogy is an approach which aims to *'hand over control to students by first establishing common ground and then making meaning with them – before asking them to write on their own'* (Rose and Martin, 2012, p. 67) This shift in the relational aspect of talk is evident in teachers' descriptions of enacting the approach in the classroom. In Table 2, the teacher discusses children's interactions within the joint construction stage, making frequent reference to this stage giving opportunities for learners to be supportive of each other, build on each other's talk in a cumulative way and make linguistic choices through talking about text (Myhill and Newman, 2020). Column 2 identifies how the teacher's description of the children's talk relates to specific dialogic teaching principles as defined by Alexander (2020); column 3 identifies the relational aspects of talk which enabled these dialogic principles; column 4 identifies dialogic teaching principles guiding classroom talk:

Data extract, School 13, Year 6, Teacher 1	TLC stage and activities supporting this stage	Relational aspect of dialogue	Dialogic teaching principle
<i>Later in the lesson there will be some group work in which they will be working collaboratively to do some joint construction as well (...) giving them opportunities to construct texts together so that the children are able to support the others.</i>	Joint construction stage	Group work	Supportive
<i>Some of them are stronger at ideas. Some of the children who aren't the best writers, they're usually the ideas children, so it's bringing those different skills and strengths together in their groups as well.</i>	Joint construction through negotiation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group work • Discussion – peer negotiation • Rehearsing ideas 	Group work	cumulative

By the end of this lesson, they will have peer assessed. They will have performed their texts. This is essentially a talk for performance lesson and they will have peer assessed their performances based on the features that we're hoping they will use in their writing.	Joint construction through presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presenting jointly constructed ideas through talk as performance; 	Paired work - peer assessment Group work - talk as performance	Supportive, Deliberative, purposeful
--	--	---	--------------------------------------

Table 2: Interview with Teacher 1, Year 6, School 13; Dialogic teaching principles and relational aspects occurring within the joint construction stage

The cumulative and supportive aspects of these exchanges between the children are underpinned by a shift in the relational aspect of talk - more learner than teacher owned, underpinned by student led group discussion or paired work. In the same teacher's further comment, it is evident that they become aware of the value of this shift in the ownership of talk as an important scaffolding mechanism leading to independent work:

That's probably something that I personally wasn't doing enough of prior to the LILAC training, that joint construction. It was very much me modelling and then the children going into their own independent, so having that middle stage in there with the joint construction has been really helpful as well.

(School 13, Year 6, Teacher 1)

The TLC joint construction stage in this extract emerges as a supportive space for dialogic teaching and for enactment of its key principles. Further evidence of the cumulative and supportive nature of the talk which developed within the joint construction stage emerged in the context of EAL learners working together. The bellow instance from the data illustrates how bringing together different skillsets enacts cooperative groups '*in which members undertake separate but related tasks*' (Alexander, 2020, p.140) – drawing on different strengths to develop jointly constructed writing, working towards being '*less dependent on the teacher*' (Blatchford et al., 2010):

What I've noticed particularly with her, with the young Hungarian girl, she's a very, very able thinker, very quiet and sometimes she just accepts that she's not going to use certain words (...) The other young girls who's Italian, they're very good friends, and the flipside of that, one of them is very good at getting things on paper, the Hungarian girl, and the Italian girl is very, very good at telling you things. She's less organised, but she loves having a good conversation, loves word play, but then when it comes to writing you can see it's not a strength with non-fiction (...) They as a pair work really well together during the planning stage and it's about sometimes making children do the work for you.

(School 6, Year 6, Teacher 2)

This is a clear example of the cumulative principle of Alexander's dialogic teaching framework where '*participants build on their own and each other's contributions and chain them in coherent lines of thinking and understanding*' (Alexander, 2020, p. 131). In this case, the teacher describes that for the

two learners moving from ideas and towards writing was made possible by the dynamic and cumulative dialogic interchange of ideas and actions.

4.4. The use of talk as performance as developing articulatory and as a bridge to writing

As evidenced above, a shift in the relational aspect of talk from teacher owned and led to more learner owned and led is characteristic of genre pedagogy as well as supportive of enabling children's voices in the classroom. In the LILAC genre pedagogy programme talk as performance was a key feature, essential to deconstructing and jointly constructing texts. In the Oracy Benchmarks (Voice 21, 2019) talk as performance is typically associated with the development of articulatory in children and confidence with public speaking. The following two comments from teachers support this view of talk as performance as an opportunity to develop articulatory and 'oracy as skill':

Towards the end of that lesson in particular, we did a bit of talk for performance, with the children reading their persuasive pieces, so their intonation, their expression, the way they read, the practising of reading, so to practise reading before we actually presented it.

(School 2, Interview 1, Year 5 teacher)

The other thing we use a lot of is talking for performance (...) So by giving people a reason for their performance, it makes them become sharper with their speaking with their partner or with their group, and actually preparing more quickly what they're going to say. It helps them to become a bit more articulate.

(School 8, Year 6, Teacher 1)

In the examples above, teachers associated talk as performance with the development of articulatory, correct use of intonation expression and fluency in reading. Alexander problematises this idea of oracy-as-skill as diminishing the potential of classroom talk to lead to the development of creative and critical thinking (2020). Dialogic teaching, in Alexander's articulation, is more than the acquisition of a set of skills and returns more significant gains in cognition, reciprocity and a supportive attitude to others, than the development of articulatory on its own would. This association of structured talk with cognition and as more than articulatory was also evident in the data. One example of this was teachers commenting on talk as performance being used as a bridge to writing:

(...) If they talk about it and they use that language first and they say things out loud, when it comes to the actual writing of a piece of work then that really does help them make sure that everything makes sense. I think with some of the writing, they write it down, they may go back and look at it, but it's only when they start to speak it, I think that's a really useful tool for them, and to listen to other people speaking in a certain way as well. They can then pick up on those things as well.

(School 11, Year 6, Teacher 1)

Similarly in the following comment talk as performance is seen as bridging writing:

Talk for performance has been commonplace. Talk for writing as well, so lots of opportunities for talk, for verbalising what they're going to write before they actually write it and doing that in mixed

groups. That's been quite important, so bringing up those children who may sometimes find speaking and listening a challenge, but it's exposure to quite difficult language.

(School 2, Year 5)

As the data extracts presented here demonstrate, teachers perceived talk as performance in different ways – some saw this form of talk as refining the skills of rhetoric and others saw it as underpinning the cognitive processes leading to writing. The latter examples of talk as performance as a bridge to writing are similar to the data presented in Data extract 1 where talk as performance was seen as exploratory, more learner than teacher owned and underpinning writing. This sits in contrast with dominant oracy pedagogy descriptions of classroom-based performance talk as an approach to building skills in rhetorical confidence (Voice 21, 2019).

5. Discussion

This paper set out to explore teachers' perceptions of the ways in which dialogue was enacted within the stages of the genre pedagogy teaching and learning cycle (TLC) and whether this supported children's learning (RQ1). Informed by the principles and characteristics of dialogic teaching and by the characteristics of dialogue embedded within the TLC, emphasis was placed on the ownership of talk and how this unfolded within the staged interactions (RQ2). Further, emphasis was placed on teachers' perceptions and experiences of how and whether the deconstruction and joint construction stages led to writing and what aspects facilitated this (RQ3). Finally, as this genre pedagogy intervention was aimed at improving all children's but specifically EAL children's literacy, teachers' perceptions of this aspect were explored (RQ4).

5.1. Relational aspects of dialogue enabled by the TLC

A key aspect of the findings were the shifts in the relational aspect of the organisation of talk - often emphasising instances in which children supported each other within the deconstruction and joint construction stages of working with texts and relied less on the teacher's guidance. In other research on implementing the TLC (Trojan, 2016) explicit teacher-led instruction is considered essential to learners constructing an understanding of genre. Other studies however, particularly ones set in a creative curriculum subject, emphasise the value of a 'weaker framing' (Xu, 2020) when scaffolding interactions, in order to enable the children's voices to predominate. This is also characteristic of dialogic teaching where in considering the relational options for organising talk (whole class, teacher or student-led group interaction) there is also a need to consider how these options enable learner voice – being heard and having opportunities to speak (Alexander, 2020). The oracy agenda emphasises the need to move away from the idea of a silent classroom predominated by teacher talk (Bercow, 2018). Similarly, the findings of this study illustrated the ways in which the stages of the TLC and dialogic activities within these stages enabled children to take responsibility and become more accountable for their language choices, as well as to each other (Resnick et al., 2018).

5.2. Deconstruction and joint construction and their relationship to writing

It is important to acknowledge that these fluid shifts in the relational aspects of teacher to learner and peer to peer talk were facilitated by the scaffolded nature of the TLC and its stages of deconstruction and joint construction. The emphasis on continuously negotiating meaning within these stages moves away from the notion of talk as articulatory and towards meaning making

exchanges, within which ownership of talk fluidly moves from teacher to learner-owned and negotiated. In teachers' descriptions of the dialogic exchanges within the TLC, it was evident that these forms of talk featured the key characteristics of dialogic teaching – instances were described of children building on each other's ideas and bringing in different strengths to the discussion (cumulative); the supportive nature of the exchanges was often emphasised as emerging not only in small group discussion but also during talk as presentation. In the joint construction stage in particular, leading up to writing independently, children were described as using both discussion which occurred in talk as performance and peer assessment tasks as a foundation for their independent writing. It is important to note that the cumulative nature of the discussion in the deconstruction and joint construction stages was discussed by teachers as particularly helpful to EAL learners – in deconstruction to define unfamiliar words and break down evidence and in joint construction as a cumulative form of dialogue in which EAL learners brought different strengths to develop the written text.

While these examples evidence multiple instances of scaffolded dialogic exchange leading to writing, in Alexander's dialogic framework talk and writing are described as engaging in a continuous interplay – with talk leading to writing and writing generating further dialogic exchange underpinning meaning making and understanding (Alexander, 2020). Similarly, while the TLC is not a linear form of engagement with text and talk and is therefore rich with potential for textual and spoken interplay, it was not possible to identify or explore this in this data. Further studies could explore how the acts of continuously building field through constructing and deconstructing texts may naturally offer opportunities for such two-way interaction between writing and dialogic talk.

5.3. Structured talk as opportunities for supportive and cumulative dialogue

The evidence demonstrated that talk as performance enabled aspects of dialogic teaching to unfold in the children's interactions with peers and with the teacher. Rather than performing a rehearsed presentation, children used talk as performance as an opportunity to discuss vocabulary, engage in meta-talk about language (Myhill and Newman, 2020) and check the meaning of words where they were unsure. Contrary to the way in which talk as performance is discussed in the Oracy benchmarks for example (Voice 21, 2019) talk as performance offered more than an opportunity to develop articulacy and was utilised by teachers and children as a space for supportive and cumulative dialogic engagement with texts. This invites a reimagining of performance talk as a supportive space for unfolding understanding and negotiation of texts rather than as a space for rehearsed forms of communication.

6. Conclusions

This study set out to reexamine the data from a large efficacy trial of a genre pedagogy programme in primary schools in England. Focusing specifically on the dialogic interactions as described and experienced by teachers implementing the programme, the paper identified several significant aspects of the value of the TLC as leading to meaningful engagement with texts. These aspects included:

- the potential of the TLC to underpin shifts in the relational aspects of talk and gradually enabling children to take the lead in the dialogic interactions;

- the value of the staged nature of the TLC (including deconstruction, joint construction and independent construction) to enabling these relational shifts and encouraging discussion which has the characteristics of dialogic talk (cumulative, supportive and reciprocal);
- the opportunities which talk as performance enabled for children to discuss vocabulary, engage in meta talk about language and build on each others' ideas.

This research provides opportunities to consider the TLC as an organising framework for oracy more consistent with dialogic teaching than with oracy as a skill for future success. As the findings indicate, the spoken aspects of children's engagement with texts were more often used to underpin thinking, meaning making and organise ideas leading to writing in a way which was supportive for EAL and all children. This orientation to oracy aligns more closely with the principles of dialogic teaching rather than those of oracy as skill. These findings invite a revisiting of the oracy framework (Voice 21, 2019) to consider opportunities for structured talk in the classroom as opportunities for developing thinking leading to writing and to develop reciprocal and supportive forms of dialogue rather than as opportunities to rehearse polished and complete verbal recounts of information. The evidence pointing to the value of deconstructing and jointly constructing texts as an oral and written engagement with texts is a further invitation to consider this approach as a vehicle for dialogic teaching.

While the study provides relevant insights into the teachers' perspectives of the value of dialogic interactions within the teaching and learning cycle, the study is limited to teachers' perceptions and experiences of the genre pedagogy approach in practice. Further research is needed into how this approach is experienced by the children themselves as well as understanding how these interactions vary across different curriculum genres and how such dialogue should be supported depending on the subject specific curriculum content.

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank Dr Lisa McGrath for her valuable guidance and support in the writing of this paper.

Disclosure of interest:

The author reports there are no competing interests to declare.

References:

Acevedo, C., Rose, D., & Whittaker, R. (Eds.). (2023). *Reading to learn, reading the world: How genre-based literacy pedagogy is democratizing education* Equinox Publishing Ltd.
doi:10.1558/equinox.41261

Acevedo, M. C. (2020). *Bringing language to consciousness: Teacher professional learning in genre-based reading pedagogy* (Order No. 28032089). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2429557043). Retrieved from
<https://hallam.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/bringing-language-consciousness-teacher/docview/2429557043/se-2>

Alexander, R. (2017). *Towards dialogic teaching: rethinking classroom talk* (Fifth edition.). Dialogos.

Alexander, R. J. (2020). *A dialogic teaching companion*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351040143>

Bercow, J. (2018) *Bercow: Ten years on. An independent review of provision for children and young people with speech, language and communication needs in England*. Available online at: <http://www.bercow10yearson.com/>

Blatchford, P., Hallam, S., Ireson, J., Kutnick, P., Creech, A. (2010) Classes, groups and transitions: Structures for teaching and learning. In Alexander, R. J., & Doddington, C. (2010). *The Cambridge Primary Review research surveys*. Routledge.

Brea-Spahn, M. & Bauler, C. (2023) Where Do You Anchor Your Beliefs? An Invitation to Interrogate Dominant Ideologies of Language and Linguaging in Speech-Language Pathology. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 54(3), 675-687.
https://doi.org/10.1044/2023_LSHSS-22-00135

Caplan, N. and Farling, M. (2017). A Dozen Heads Are Better Than One: Collaborative Writing in Genre-Based Pedagogy. *TESOL Journal*, 8(3), 564–581. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.287>

Christie, F. (2008). Ongoing dialogue: functional linguistic and Bernsteinian sociological perspectives on education in Christie, F and Rose, D. (Eds.) *Language, knowledge and pedagogy functional linguistic and sociological perspectives*. Continuum.

Coffin, C. (2006). *Historical Discourse: The language of time, cause and evaluation*. Continuum.

Coffin, C., Acevedo, C. and Löfstedt, A. (2013). *Teacher Learning for European Literacy Education (TeL4ELE)*, Final Report for Comenius Multilateral Project. [10.13140/RG.2.2.25434.47043](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.25434.47043)

Conteh, J. (2012). *The EAL teaching book: Promoting success for multilingual learners in primary and secondary schools*. 2nd Ed. SAGE.

Culliney, M., Moore, N., Coldwell, M., Demack, S. (2019) *Integrating English Evaluation Report*. Education Endowment Foundation. <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/projects-and-evaluation/projects/integrating-english>

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, Power and Pedagogy*. Multilingual Matters.

Custance, B., Dare, B. and Polias, J. (2012) *Teaching ESL students in mainstream classrooms: Language in learning across the curriculum*, Hindmarsh: DECD.

de Oliveira, L. (2017, July) A genre-based approach to L2 writing instruction in K12. *TESOL Connections*. <http://newsmanager.commpartners.com/tesolc/print/2017-07-01/3.html>

de Oliveira, L. C., & Lan, S. (2014). Writing science in an upper elementary classroom: A genre-based approach to teaching English language learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 25, 23-39. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2014.05.001

Derewianka, B. (2003). Trends and issues in genre-based approaches. *RELJ Journal*, 34(2), 133–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820303400202>

Department for Education (2013) *English programmes of study: key stages 1 and 2*. National Curriculum in England.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7de93840f0b62305b7f8ee/PRIMARY_national_curriculum_-_English_220714.pdf

Dimova, S., Ilie, S., Brown, E., R., Broeks, M., Culora, A., Sutherland, A. (2020) The Nuffield Early Language Intervention Evaluation Report. *Education Endowment Foundation*
<https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/projects-and-evaluation/projects/nuffield-early-language-intervention1>

Education Endowment Foundation (2023, August 5) *Integrating English: Training mainstream teachers in improving their language pedagogy, through “LILAC” and ongoing support*.
<https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/projects-and-evaluation/projects/integrating-english>

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Heinemann.

Halbach, A. (2012). Questions about Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills and Cognitive Language Proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(5), 608–613.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams058>

Halliday, M.A.K. (1975) *Learning how to mean: Explorations in the development of Language*. Edward Arnold Publishers.

Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 17–29. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(02\)00124-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00124-8)

Jay, T., Willis, B., Thomas, P., Taylor, R., Moore, N., Burnett, C., Merchant, G. and Stevens, A. (2017). *Dialogic Teaching: Evaluation Report and Executive Summary*. London: EEF
<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/17014/>

Kim, M.-Y., & Wilkinson, I. A. G. (2019). What is dialogic teaching? Constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing a pedagogy of classroom talk. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 21, 70–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2019.02.003>

Littleton, K. and Mercer, N. (2013) *Interthinking: Putting talk to work*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203809433>

Maine, F. (2024) *More than talk: teaching dialogue to build learning communities*. UKLA Minibook Series. UK Literacy Association.

Maine, F., Cook, V. and Lähdesmäki, T. (2019) ‘Reconceptualizing Cultural Literacy as a Dialogic Practice’, *London Review of Education*, 17(3), 384–393. <https://doi.org/10.18546/LRE.17.3.12>

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

Mercer, N. and Hodgkinson, S. (2008). *Exploring talk in school*. SAGE.

Mercer, N., Mannion, J. and Warwick, P. (2019). ‘Oracy Education: the Development of Young People’s Spoken Language Skills’, in Mercer, N., Wegerif, R. and Major, L. (eds.) *The Routledge International Handbook of Research on Dialogic Education*. Routledge, pp. 292-305.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429441677>

Miles, M., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: a methods sourcebook* (Edition 3.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Myhill, D., & Newman, R. (2020). Writing talk: Developing metalinguistic understanding through dialogic teaching. In *The Routledge International Handbook of Research on Dialogic Education* (1st ed., pp. 360–372). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429441677-30>
- Oracy All-Party Parliamentary Group (2021) Speak for change: Executive summary from the final report and recommendations from the Oracy All-Party Parliamentary Group Inquiry. Oracy All-Party Parliamentary Group. <https://voice21.org/publications/>
- Oracy Education Commission (2024) We need to talk: The report of the Commission on the Future of Oracy Education in England. <https://oracyeducationcommission.co.uk/oec-report/>
- Quigley, A. and Coleman, R. (2019) Improving literacy in secondary schools: guidance report. EEF. <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/literacy-ks3-ks4>
- Resnick, L. B., Asterhan, C. S. C., & Clarke, S. N. (2018). Accountable Talk: Instructional Dialogue That Builds the Mind. Educational Practices Series 29. In *UNESCO International Bureau of Education*. UNESCO International Bureau of Education.
- Rose, D. (2018). Languages of Schooling: embedding literacy learning with genre-based pedagogy. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 59–89. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2017-0008>
- Rose, D. and Martin, J.R. (2012) *Learning to write, reading to learn: Genre knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney school*. Equinox.
- Rothery, J. (1994) *Exploring literacy in school English (Write it Right Resources for Literacy and Learning)*. Sydney: Metropolitan East Disadvantaged Schools Program.
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (Fourth edition.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Schall-Leckrone, L. (2017). Genre Pedagogy: A Framework to Prepare History Teachers to Teach Language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(2), 358–382. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.322>
- Snell, J. (2024). ‘What do teachers need to learn about oracy?’, *Speaking Volumes*. London: The Oracy Education Commission. <https://oracyeducationcommission.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Speaking-Volumes-OEC-v6b.pdf>
- The Labour Party (2023). *Five Missions for a better Britain: Breaking down the barriers to opportunity*. The Labour Party. <https://labour.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Mission-breaking-down-barriers.pdf>
- Trojan, F. J. (2021). “Alors, on va faire une activité”: An SFL perspective on student engagement in contextualized world language instruction. *System (Linköping)*, 98, 102483-. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102483>
- Voice 21 (2019) The Oracy Benchmarks. Voice 21. <https://voice21.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Benchmarks-report-FINAL.pdf>
- Wegerif, R. (2011). Towards a dialogic theory of how children learn to think. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 6(3), 179–190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2011.08.002>

Whittaker, R. and Parejo, I. G. (2018). Teacher Learning for European Literacy Education (Tel4ELE): genre-based pedagogy in five European countries. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 31–57. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2017-0021>

Xu, W. (2020). Reframing genre-based pedagogy in a Chinese as a Foreign Language classroom: A transdisciplinary perspective. *The Journal of Educational Research (Washington, D.C.)*, 113(6), 452–461. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2020.1855095>

Word count including reference list: 9,732

Appendix A – Coding frame

Teaching and learning cycle and dialogic teaching coding frame

Name
Dialogic repertoires
Repertoire 1 supportive culture of talk
learning power and student talk
EAL working collaboratively and combining skillsets
listening and participating
talk as process (enables) Repertoire 1 supportive culture of talk
Repertoire 2 - organising talk
Joint construction phase (shifts the balance to) learning power and student talk
small group work
teacher guided talk
EAL benefit from modelling
Repertoire 3 - types of structured talk
Purpose of talk
bridge to writing

Name
children love to talk
slowing down
barriers to slowing down
time and space to implement the T&L cycle
talk as performance
building field
Justifying ideas
talk as performance (acts as) bridge to writing
talk as performance (enables) Developing articulatory
talk as process
building understanding of field (process talk)
building vocabulary
dictogloss engagement and listening
embodied talk
learning from each other
talk as process (acts as) bridge to writing
using description
using inference
the importance of drafting
Genre pedagogy concepts
register continuum (2)
tenor
text types
Genre pedagogy phases

Name
Deconstruction phase
checking understanding
deconstruction (acts as) bridge to writing
Joint construction phase
Joint construction phase (acts as) bridge to writing
joint construction through dictogloss
mixed ability pairs
peer scaffolded talk
TLC - general
better engagement TLC
example of staged application of T and L cycle
visualising the T and L cycle is useful to the teacher