## Challenges for Dialogic Teaching Implementation

Fiona anticipated five challenges if dialogic teaching was implemented. They were: *insufficient time to cover all course contents*, *teacher and student language proficiency* particularly technical terms in law, *teacher talk skills and teaching strategies*, *educational culture*, especially in Faculty of Law in Thailand where the students were used to lecture-based teaching, and *fear of being judged by the students*. Fiona explained that student outcomes were the main priority in her view, Also, she believed that “*it is likely impossible to break the old culture*” of lecture-based teaching at the Faculty of Law as noted in the pre-intervention interview.

Fiona reported five important challenges she faced with when adopting the dialogic teaching approach. The first challenge was her *own talk skills and teaching strategies.* Through this professional development program, she realised that talk is essential. She believed that her own talk “*was too academic for some students to understand; for example, when she used some fundamental technical terms and jargons in law*. Next, Fiona found *her own language use* and *students language articulacy* challenging. In other words, there were discrepancies in her language and that of the students. This consequential caused misunderstandings and impeded teaching and learning. In the post-intervention, Fiona elaborated that “*It is like I am walking on the second floor while the students on the third. It is difficult to meet*.” Finally, *course objectives* *and* *assessment* played a role in implementing the new approach. It was a pedagogical dilemma for Fiona particularly with this group of students whose academic performance was generally low. It was difficult for her to decide whether to adopt a new dialogic pedagogy to help them develop their thinking and communicative skills while co-constructing knowledge or to stick with her own traditional teaching practice knowing that the students would have sufficient understanding of the course content to pass the exam.

## Interim Summary

1. Fiona believed that dialogic teaching was a practical and useful teaching approach as it prompted her to monitor and scrutinise her professional practice, reconceptualise classroom talk, and strengthen the relationships with her students.
2. One of the most striking differences found during the pre- and post-intervention interviews was Fiona’s appearance and descriptions of the intervention class. During the pre-intervention interview, Fiona appeared very hopeful, energetic, and highly motivated. However, during the post-intervention interview, she became remarkably drained, indifferent, and somewhat hopeless. She also repeatedly recited some descriptive words with a negative connotation when expressing her students, lecturer-student interactions, and teaching practice.
3. Fiona believed that her wait time given to the students to think and formulate their answers were insufficient throughout.
4. With dialogic teaching, Fiona believed that she was able to bridge the gap between herself and her students and strengthen their relationship. It also enabled her to build relationships with the students by successfully creating a safe, welcoming classroom climate and expressing her strong willingness to help them advance in their studies.
5. Fiona’s teaching strategies and talk practices were influenced by her priorities in students’ academic achievement and survival, and her preconceived assumption about the course.
6. The opportunities given to the students to talk declined over the course of the intervention. According to Fiona, it was largely due to the amount of course content and students’ motivation.
7. Fiona believed her teacher talk and student talk were not proportional prior to and after the dialogic teaching intervention. Although she was willing to encourage the students to engage more, she thought it was not worth spending the class time discussing some course contents if not included in the final examination.
8. For Fiona, an important improvement was students’ awareness of their role and their increased participation. The students were aware of their active learner role in class. They became more accustomed to talking more in class.
9. Although Fiona was content with the student contributions, she was concerned about their contribution being appropriate rather than the length.
10. Student initiations were frequent before and increased following the dialogic teaching intervention. This, according to Fiona, was due to a better teacher-student relationship.
11. Student nominations remained unchanged between pre- and post-intervention. and it was due to the outspoken nature of law students.
12. An important improvement was students’ awareness of their role and their increased participation. Gradually, they became more accustomed to talking more in class and were braver to share and ask questions.
13. Fiona believed that lecturer talk to student talk ratio remained imbalanced from before to after the intervention. Although she was willing to encourage the students to engage more, she thought it was not worth spending the class time discussing some course contents if they would not be included in the final examination.
14. Fiona anticipated five challenges if dialogic teaching was implemented including: *insufficient time to cover all course contents*, *teacher and student language proficiency* particularly technical terms in law, *teacher talk skills and teaching strategies*, *educational culture*, and *fear of being judged by the students*.
15. Fiona reported five important challenges she faced with when adopting the dialogic teaching approach including: *talk skills and teaching strategies*, *her own language use*, *students’ language articulacy*, *course objectives*, and *course assessment*.