 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

ОБЩАЯ ПЕДАГОГИКА, ИСТОРИЯ ПЕДАГОГИКИ И ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ/GENERAL PEDAGOGY, HISTORY OF PEDAGOGY AND EDUCATION

DOI: https://doi.org/10.60797/IRJ.2026.173.81 EDN: HSAXUX

THE DIALOGIC LEARNING TASK AS A DIDACTIC TOOL FOR OVERCOMING THE MONOLOGICITY OF THE SCHOOL TEXTBOOK

Research article

Vlasenko T.T.[1,] *, Seliverstova E.N.[2]
[1] ORCID : 0009-0009-1917-6093;
[2] ORCID : 0009-0008-7161-0021;
[1, 2] Vladimir State University named after Alexander and Nikolay Stoletovs, Vladimir, Russian Federation

* Corresponding author (vlasenkotimofei095[at]gmail.com)

Suggested: 14.09.2026; Accepted: 22.10.2026; Published: 17.11.2026

Abstract

The article analyses the potential of the dialogic learning task as a didactic tool for overcoming the monologicity of school textbook content and for organising value-semantic exchange in biology lessons. The relevance of the study stems from the persistent gap between the educational goals reflected in the Federal State Educational Standard of Basic General Education and actual educational practice, which is dominated by the reproductive and monologic nature of teaching. Drawing on an analysis of the topic *"The Environment of Human Habitation and Its Factors"* (the textbook *"Biology. Grade 9. Basic Level"* edited by V.V. Pasechnik), the authors present a model for designing a dialogic learning task as the creation of a learning situation based on embedding subject content into the context of solving life tasks that are meaningful to schoolchildren. The content of the article is intended for biology teachers, curriculum developers, and researchers engaged in the issues of dialogisation of school education.

Keywords: biology, dialogic learning task, monologicity, value-semantic exchange, school textbook.

ДИАЛОГОВОЕ УЧЕБНОЕ ЗАДАНИЕ КАК ДИДАКТИЧЕСКИЙ ИНСТРУМЕНТ ПРЕОДОЛЕНИЯ МОНОЛОГИЧНОСТИ ШКОЛЬНОГО УЧЕБНИКА

Научная статья

Власенко Т.Т.[1,] *, Селиверстова Е.Н.[2]
[1] ORCID : 0009-0009-1917-6093;
[2] ORCID : 0009-0008-7161-0021;
[1, 2] Владимирский государственный университет имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых, Владимир, Российская Федерация

* Корреспондирующий автор (vlasenkotimofei095[at]gmail.com)

Предложена: 14.09.2026; Принята: 22.10.2026; Опубликована: 17.11.2026

Аннотация

В статье анализируется потенциал диалогового учебного задания как дидактического инструмента преодоления монологичности содержания школьного учебника и организации ценностно-смыслового обмена на уроках биологии. Актуальность исследования обусловлена сохраняющимся разрывом между целями образования, отраженными в ФГОС ООО, и реальной образовательной практикой, в которой доминирует репродуктивный и монологический характер обучения. Основываясь на примере анализа темы *«Среда обитания человека и ее факторы»* (учебник *«Биология. 9 класс. Базовый уровень»* под редакцией В.В. Пасечника), представлен вариант построения диалогового учебного задания как создание учебной ситуации, основанной на включении предметного содержания в контекст решения значимых для школьников жизненных задач. Содержание статьи ориентировано на учителей биологии, методистов и исследователей, занимающихся вопросами диалогизации школьного образования.

Ключевые слова: биология, диалоговое учебное задание, монологичность, ценностно-смысловой обмен, школьный учебник.

Introduction

According to the Federal State Educational Standard of Basic General Education, studying biology at school is aimed at forming a holistic scientific picture of the world and developing the ability to choose goal-setting and meaning-making attitudes in one's actions and deeds in relation to the environment and to one's own health and that of others [10]. I.Yu. Azizova and N.D. Andreeva [1] add that one of the key tasks of biology lessons is to foster a value-based attitude towards life as the highest value, which constitutes the foundation of a humanistic worldview. Thus, biology as a school subject is capable of transforming a person's views, laying down not only a system of natural-science knowledge but also a value-based attitude towards all living things, a sense of responsibility for preserving biological diversity, and an understanding of the deep interconnection of all forms of life on Earth [8].

Despite this, school practice faces a number of problems. Along with the reduction in hours allocated to teaching biology, researchers emphasise the school textbook monologicity problem, which hinders the disclosure of the subject's educational

 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

potential [4], [7]. Monologicity manifests itself, in particular, in the fact that textbook content does not reflect the current level of scientific development [5]. Learning material is structured as a one-way transmission of ready-made knowledge rather than as a space for dialogic meaning-making. The student is placed in the position of a passive recipient, and value-semantic exchange is practically not implemented [8].

E.N. Seliverstova [9] states that personality-oriented education cannot be implemented without a transition to dialogue as the principal mode of interpersonal and intersubjective interaction at school. Within this context, as Ch. van der Veen, C. van Kruistum, and S. Michaels state, productive dialogue is not merely a method of questioning but an activity of shared thinking and communication [15]. C. Sion stresses that conversation must be drawn out of students rather than "pumped" into them [13]. Moreover, E. Matusov and J. Lemke highlight that through this verbal interaction, values are critically examined, and unique personal attitudes emerge [14]. R. Alexander [12] defines dialogue as the use of talk to stimulate students' thinking, advance their understanding, and empower them for lifelong learning, thereby enacting a dialogic stance on knowledge, learning, and social relations. I.M. Osmolovskaya [6] draws the logical consequence for instructional design: the content of education cannot be fully prescribed in textbooks; rather, it is born in the process of instruction as a result of the interaction of the personal characteristics of the subjects of the educational process.

In this regard, the design of didactic tools aimed at organising subject-subject interaction and value-semantic exchange in the course of cognitive activity acquires particular significance. Such a tool in our study is the *dialogic learning task — a specially designed learning situation in which the content of the learning material under study is embedded in the context of solving problems that are meaningful to school students and prompts them to exchange emerging judgements and to confront various personal positions.* Under conditions in which different but equally valid viewpoints coexist, each participant has the opportunity to independently *"complete"* their own understanding, gradually mastering a new mode of understanding, a new evaluative judgement, and ultimately new scientific knowledge. According to A.V. Khutorskoy [11], a learning situation acts as an environment rather than a description of the result to be obtained by students and the conditions given for finding it. Its cycle includes motivation for cognition, problematisation, the participants' own solution of the problem, each participant's presentation of their own solutions *("educational products")* for comparison with one another and with a cultural-historical analogue, followed by reflection on the result. Thus, unlike the reproductive and creative learning tasks traditionally used in instruction, the dialogic learning task stimulates diversity of thought, generating the augmentation and renewal of individual viewpoints and students' transition to a reflective cognitive position that allows them to reach the personal level of comprehending the new. Importantly, the pedagogical value of dialogic learning tasks lies in the fact that they provide conditions under which key concepts are not given in ready-made form but are *"discovered"* by students in dialogic interaction [3].

Research methods and principles

The research methods included *abstraction* (identifying the monologicity of the school textbook as an independent object of study), *analysis* and *synthesis* (identifying the didactic potential of the dialogic learning task and combining it into an integral system for organising value-semantic exchange), and *modelling* (developing and describing a five-stage approach for constructing a dialogic learning task).

The study rests on the principles of *consistency* (structured construction of the dialogic learning task as an integral learning situation), *dialogicity* (organisation of subject-subject interaction and exchange of personal meanings), *value-semantic orientation* (mastery of biological knowledge in unity with ethical, ecological, and social aspects), and *reflexivity* (personalisation of knowledge through self-reflection and comprehension of one's own position).

Main results

Proceeding from the theoretical positions presented above, let us turn to an analysis of the content of the textbook *"Biology. Grade 9. Basic Level,"* edited by V.V. Pasechnik [2]. Its advantages include, first, the visual component — an abundance of diagrams and illustrations that not only explain complex biological processes but also structure information, facilitating its perception under conditions of limited instructional time. Second, the textbook is distinguished by a clear structure of its components: each paragraph opens with a *"REMEMBER"* block (actualisation of prior knowledge) and concludes with a *"MEMORISE"* section (fixation of key concepts), which corresponds to the stages of a system-activity lesson. Third, the task apparatus includes a *"THINK!"* section with problem questions requiring the application of knowledge in a new situation, and a *"MY LABORATORY"* block with research-oriented tasks that encourage independent search and analysis of information. The *"STEPS TO SUCCESS"* section also contains guidelines on building mental maps (development of systemic thinking) and on the rules of argumentation (formation of communicative skills).

At the same time, it must be acknowledged that, on the whole, the content of the learning material is characterised by a monologic mode of presentation, which is due, in particular, to the absence of dialogic learning tasks. As an example, let us analyse the content of chapter 54 *"The Environment of Human Habitation and Its Factors"* [2], and identify a number of arguments that confirm our conclusions.

1. The classification of ecological factors is presented as an irrefutable given, without reference to the history of its formation or to existing alternative approaches. The conflict between the human desire for comfort and human responsibility for the environment is stated *("...he [man] gradually began not so much to change himself... as to change the environment significantly...")*, but *"What, in your opinion, is the measure of human responsibility?"* — the question that could precisely draw students into dialogic interaction based on the exchange of individual and evaluative judgements is not posed.

2. The *"CHECK YOURSELF"* section contains questions presupposing a single correct answer reproducing the text of the chapter: *"What is the biological nature of man?", "What is adaptation?"* [2]. The task in the *"THINK!"* section about athletes training at high altitudes also has an unambiguous answer formulated within the logic of biological scientific knowledge and does not presuppose dialogic interaction among different levels of personal meanings.

 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

3. The text states that *"...the existence of every person, especially in the city, depends entirely on a countless multitude of people who are not only unrelated but also completely unknown to him..."* [2]. However, this internally contradictory and insufficiently clear statement for school students does not become a starting point for the exchange of various opinions and evaluative judgements during the discussion of the social responsibility of the individual, the interdependence of people, and existing ethical dilemmas, and therefore the substantive precondition for the emergence of a dialogic learning task based on embedding the scientific content under study into the context of solving life tasks meaningful to students is also destroyed.

Discussion

As an alternative to the monologic construction of learning content, we propose a model for designing a dialogic learning task based on the material of the aforementioned chapter by organising a learning situation in the lesson and resolving it through a five-stage approach developed by us, comprising the stages of actualisation, fixation of the conflict, distribution of cultural role positions, organisation of a *"collision of meanings"* in dialogue, and reflection and personalisation [3]. We emphasise that this topic was not chosen at random: it contains a value conflict arising from reflection on human responsibility for nature; it addresses the personal experience of every school student; it makes it possible to model various ways of resolving a real dilemma between adaptation and transformation of the environment; and it possesses interdisciplinary potential, linking biology with ecology, geography, and social studies.

I. Actualisation. The teacher asks the class to recall what they saw, heard, and felt on their way to school. Then the teacher presents two contrasting images: a morning in a forest village and a morning in a large city during rush hour. Questions for emotional response: *"Imagine you had to live for a month in each of these places. What would be the hardest thing? In which environment do you feel more comfortable, and why? Have you ever thought that for a human being the environment includes not only nature but also the people around them?"* In the course of dialogic discussion, students realise that the environment is not an abstract concept from a textbook but something directly embedded in their lives, affecting their health, mood, and even self-perception. As a result, subject knowledge acquires personal meaning, and students develop a genuine desire to understand how humans interact with the environment and what their responsibility for it is.

II. Fixation of the Conflict. The teacher reports a paradox: modern humans are the most protected species on the planet, yet they consciously destroy their own environment. A diagram is fixed on the board: humans adapt the environment (build cities, create comfort) and at the same time destroy it (pollute, cut down forests). The conflicting question: *"Why does rational man often behave irrationally towards the environment?" The following speech supports are offered: "I believe the reason is that...", "It seems to me the problem is that…", "The greatest trap of humanity is..."*. The teacher records the assumptions without evaluating them, leading students to understand that the dilemma has not only a biological but also an ethical and economic dimension.

III. Distribution of Cultural Role Positions. The class is divided into three groups. Each receives a card describing a role based on the content of chapter 54 (see Table 1). The chosen positions reflect three ideological poles that exist in ecological discourse and are represented in public consciousness: *technocratism*, *naturalism*, and *pragmatism*. Such a distribution makes it possible to organise a genuine collision in which none of the positions is inherently *"correct,"* which enhances the dialogic characteristics of the learning task.

Table 1 - Distribution of Cultural Role Positions

DOI: https://doi.org/10.60797/IRJ.2026.173.81.1

Group	Value Position	Speech Strategy
Technocrats	Humans are the centre of progress; nature must be transformed to meet their needs.	*"Progress means controlling nature!* *Pollution is the price of comfort!"*
Naturalists	Humans are part of nature; intervention destroys the balance.	*"Nature will exist without us, but we cannot exist without it..."* *"Pollution is a crime!"*
Pragmatists	A return to natural life is impossible; balance and green technologies are needed.	*"We need a happy medium!"* *"Technologies can be allies of nature…"*

The teacher gives each group preparatory texts from chapter 54 that support their position and reminds them that the goal is not to *"win"* the argument but to understand the logic of each position and find the most balanced solution. The groups are given 5–7 minutes to prepare: reading the text, searching for arguments, and distributing roles within the group.

IV. "Collision of Meanings" in Dialogue. This stage consists of interrelated steps aimed at organising a collision of role positions. Each group speaks within a strictly allotted time, after which the other groups ask clarifying questions and put forward counterarguments.

1. The Technocrats present the *"City of the Future"*: underground roads, climate control, food delivery by drones. The price is a felled forest and concrete. *"This is progress! In caves there would have been no Pushkin and no computers."*

2. The Naturalists respond: *"Your comfort means smog, noise, and disease. The textbook says: "a significant part of diseases is linked to the pollution of the atmosphere, water, and soil!" Your comfort destroys both nature and humans."*

 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

3. The Pragmatists ask clarifying questions: *"Do you acknowledge limits to the transformation of the environment? Is it realistic to abandon resources entirely?"*

4. Open discussion. Technocrats: *"You propose giving up cars — the economy will collapse!"* Naturalists: *"And are you ready to pay with children's health? Dioxin, even in small doses, suppresses the immune system."* Pragmatists: *"Maybe we shouldn't choose but search for solutions — electric cars, waste recycling?"*

5. The outcome of the dialogic discussion is a jointly formulated conclusion: the transformation of the environment is both a power and a responsibility of humans, and the rejection of change is impossible, but uncontrolled change is destructive. At the same time, the conclusion is not fixed as the sole truth but is supplemented by an open question for further reflection: *"How can human needs be reconciled with the preservation of nature?"*, which encourages students to independently comprehend their own position.

V. Reflection and Personalisation. The teacher invites students to engage in self-reflection using the prompts below. It is emphasised that what is valued is not *"correct"* answers but sincere reflections:

1. On the roles experienced: *"The role of [...] helped me understand that... / revealed to me how... / taught me to look for..."*.

2. On the change in understanding: *"At the beginning of the lesson I thought the answer was simple: "humans must take care of nature." But the dialogue showed that..."*, *"It was difficult for me to accept the position of [...], but I understood that..."*, *"The dialogue taught me that ecology is..."*.

3. On personal conclusion: *"For me, the main conclusion is that..."*, *"The most important lesson: a human becomes rational not when they conquer nature, but when..."*.

Conclusion

Summarising the above, we emphasise that the proposed dialogic learning task serves as a tool for overcoming the monologic nature of the textbook, shifting the emphasis from the transmission of ready-made answers to the discussion of open questions and the exchange of opinions. It transforms the student's initial position as a consumer of ready-made knowledge into the position of a person who develops their own value-based attitude towards the subject knowledge under study, constructs their own understanding, and acquires personal significance, and therefore ceases to be a passive recipient in the process of cognition. Actualisation addresses the students' past experience, discussion focuses on the present, and reflection is directed towards future choices and responsibility. By embedding scientific content in the students' life situation, the dialogic learning task integrates biological content with ethical, economic, and social aspects, promoting the internalisation of value attitudes and the consolidation of unique personal meanings, thereby giving knowledge personal significance.

Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

Рецензия

Все статьи проходят рецензирование. Но рецензент или автор статьи предпочли не публиковать рецензию к этой статье в открытом доступе. Рецензия может быть предоставлена компетентным органам по запросу.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Review

All articles are peer-reviewed. But the reviewer or the author of the article chose not to publish a review of this article in the public domain. The review can be provided to the competent authorities upon request.

Список литературы / References

1. Азизова И.Ю. Современные проблемы отбора содержания уроков биологии / И.Ю. Азизова, Н.Д. Андреева // Московский педагогический журнал. — 2024. — № 3. — С. 53–70. — URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sovremennye-problemy-otbora-soderzhaniya-urokov-biologii (дата обращения: 02.09.26).

2. Пасечник В.В. Биология : 9-й класс : базовый уровень : учебник / В.В. Пасечник, А.А. Каменский, Г.Г. Швецов и др. — Москва: Просвещение, 2023. — 272 с.

3. Власенко Т.Т. Диалоговое учебное задание как дидактический инструмент для организации ценностно-смыслового обмена на уроке географии в 8-м классе / Т.Т. Власенко, Е.Н. Селиверстова. // На пути в педагогическую науку: сборник материалов студенческой научно-практической конференции; — Владимир: ВлГУ, 2026. — С. 75–85. — URL: https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=91532607 . (дата обращения: 29.08.26).

4. Власов И.С. Проблема мотивации учащихся на уроках биологии / И.С. Власов // Язык и межкультурная коммуникация : сборник статей XVIII Международной научно-практической конференции; — Астрахань: Астраханский гос. ун-т им. В.Н. Татищева, 2024. — С. 25–28. — URL: https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id-67909540 (дата обращения: 02.09.26).

5. Казакова Д.М. Анализ основных достоинств и недостатков биологического образования школьников в России / Д.М. Казакова // Молодой ученый. — 2022. — № 21 (416). — С. 441–443. — URL: https://moluch.ru/archive/416/92213 (дата обращения: 30.09.26).

6. Осмоловская И.М. Дидактика : учебное пособие / И.М. Осмоловская. — Москва: Институт стратегии развития образования РАО, 2021. — 232 с.

7. Пивоварова Л.В. Состояние проблем биологического образования в практике обучения / Л.В. Пивоварова // Международный научно-исследовательский журнал. — 2018. — № 12 (78). — С. 174–177. — URL: https://research-journal.org/archive/12-78-2018-december/sostoyanie-problem-biologicheskogo-obrazovaniya-v-praktike-obucheniya?p=119537 (дата обращения: 30.08.26).

8. Проблемы современного школьного учебника биологии в соответствии с требованиями ФГОС ООО : материалы Всероссийского научно-практического семинара с международным участием / Под ред. А.В. Сахарова, О.Б.

 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

Макаровой. — Новосибирск : Изд-во НГПУ. — 2014. — URL: https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=24889784&ysclid=mu1kafb68i169290846 (дата обращения: 28.08.26)

9. Селиверстова Е.Н. Современная дидактика: от школы знания — к школе созидания : учеб. пособие / Е.Н. Селиверстова. — Владимир: ВлГУ, 2017. — 207 с.

10. Федеральный государственный образовательный стандарт основного общего образования. — Введ. 2010-12-17. — Москва: Минобрнауки России, 2010. — 56 с.

11. Хуторской А.В. Современная дидактика : учебник для вузов / А.В. Хуторской. — Санкт-Петербург: Питер, 2001. — 544 с.

12. Alexander R. A Dialogic Teaching Companion / R. Alexander. — London: Routledge, 2020. — 240 p.

13. Sion C. Creating Conversation in Class: Student-centred Interaction / C. Sion. — London: Delta Publishing, 2001. — 95 p.

14. Matusov E. Values in dialogic pedagogy / E. Matusov, J. Lemke // Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal. — 2015. — Vol. 3. — P. 4–10. — URL: http://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/dpj1/article/view/141/79 (accessed: 30.09.26).

15. Van der Veen C. Productive Classroom Dialogue as an Activity of Shared Thinking and Communicating: A Commentary on Marsal / C. van der Veen, C. van Kruistum, S. Michaels // Mind, Culture, and Activity. — 2015. — Vol. 22. — № 4. — P. 320–325. — URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279852463_Productive_Classroom_Dialogue_as_an_Activity_of_Shared_Thinking_and_Communicating_A_Commentary_on_Marsal (accessed: 01.10.26).

Список литературы на английском языке / References in English

1. Azizova I.Yu. Sovremennie problemi otbora soderzhaniya urokov biologii [Modern problems of selecting the content of biology lessons] / I.Yu. Azizova, N.D. Andreeva // Moskovskii pedagogicheskii zhurnal [Moscow Pedagogical Journal]. — 2024. — № 3. — P. 53–70. — URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sovremennye-problemy-otbora-soderzhaniya-urokov-biologii (accessed: 02.09.26). [in Russian]

2. Pasechnik V.V. Biologiya : 9-i klass : bazovii uroven : uchebnik [Biology : Grade 9 : Basic Level : Textbook] / V.V. Pasechnik, A.A. Kamenskii, G.G. Shvetsov et al. — Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 2023. — 272 p. [in Russian]

3. Vlasenko T.T. Dialogovoe uchebnoe zadanie kak didakticheskij instrument dlya organizacii cennostno-smy'slovogo obmena na uroke geografii v 8-m klasse [The dialogic learning task as a didactic tool for organising value-semantic exchange in the 8th grade geography lesson] / T.T. Vlasenko, E.N. Seliverstova. // On the Path to Pedagogical Science : Collection of Materials of the Student Scientific and Practical Conference; — Vladimir: VlGU, 2026. — P. 75–85. — URL: https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=91532607 . (accessed: 29.08.26). [in Russian]

4. Vlasov I.S. Problema motivatsii uchashchikhsya na urokakh biologii [The problem of student motivation in biology lessons] / I.S. Vlasov // Language and Intercultural Communication: Collection of Articles of the XVIII International Scientific and Practical Conference; — Astrakhan: Astrakhan State University named after V.N. Tatishchev, 2024. — P. 25–28. — URL: https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id-67909540 (accessed: 02.09.26). [in Russian]

5. Kazakova D.M. Analiz osnovnikh dostoinstv i nedostatkov biologicheskogo obrazovaniya shkolnikov v Rossii [Analysis of the main advantages and disadvantages of biological education of schoolchildren in Russia] / D.M. Kazakova // Molodoi uchenii [Young Scientist]. — 2022. — № 21 (416). — P. 441–443. — URL: https://moluch.ru/archive/416/92213 (accessed: 30.09.26). [in Russian]

6. Osmolovskaya I.M. Didaktika : uchebnoe posobie [Didactics : Textbook] / I.M. Osmolovskaya. — Moscow: Institute of Education Development Strategy RAO, 2021. — 232 p. [in Russian]

7. Pivovarova L.V. Sostoyanie problem biologicheskogo obrazovaniya v praktike obucheniya [The state of problems of biological education in teaching practice] / L.V. Pivovarova // Mezhdunarodnii nauchno-issledovatelskii zhurnal [International Research Journal]. — 2018. — № 12 (78). — P. 174–177. — URL: https://research-journal.org/archive/12-78-2018-december/sostoyanie-problem-biologicheskogo-obrazovaniya-v-praktike-obucheniya?p=119537 (accessed: 30.08.26). [in Russian]

8. Problemi sovremennogo shkolnogo uchebnika biologii v sootvetstvii s trebovaniyami FGOS OOO : materiali Vserossiiskogo nauchno-prakticheskogo seminara s mezhdunarodnim uchastiem [Problems of the modern school biology textbook in accordance with the requirements of the Federal State Educational Standard of Basic General Education : Proceedings of the All-Russian Scientific and Practical Seminar with International Participation] / Ed. ny A.V. Saharov, O.B. Makarova. — Novosibirsk : Publishing house of NGPU. — 2014. — URL: https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=24889784&ysclid=mu1kafb68i169290846 (accessed: 28.08.26) [in Russian]

9. Seliverstova E.N. Sovremennaya didaktika: ot shkoly' znaniya — k shkole sozidaniya : ucheb. posobie [Modern Didactics: From the School of Knowledge — to the School of Creation : Textbook] / E.N. Seliverstova. — Vladimir: VlGU, 2017. — 207 p. [in Russian]

10. Federalnii gosudarstvennii obrazovatelnii standart osnovnogo obshchego obrazovaniya [Federal State Educational Standard of Basic General Education]. — Introduced 2010-12-17. — Moscow: Minobrnauki Rossii, 2010. — 56 p. [in Russian]

11. Xutorskoj A.V. Sovremennaya didaktika : uchebnik dlya vuzov [Modern Didactics : Textbook for Universities] / A.V. Xutorskoj. — Saint Petersburg: Piter, 2001. — 544 p. [in Russian]

12. Alexander R. A Dialogic Teaching Companion / R. Alexander. — London: Routledge, 2020. — 240 p.

13. Sion C. Creating Conversation in Class: Student-centred Interaction / C. Sion. — London: Delta Publishing, 2001. — 95 p.

 © Authors of the article / Authors of the article

14. Matusov E. Values in dialogic pedagogy / E. Matusov, J. Lemke // Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal. — 2015. — Vol. 3. — P. 4–10. — URL: http://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/dpj1/article/view/141/79 (accessed: 30.09.26).

15. Van der Veen C. Productive Classroom Dialogue as an Activity of Shared Thinking and Communicating: A Commentary on Marsal / C. van der Veen, C. van Kruistum, S. Michaels // Mind, Culture, and Activity. — 2015. — Vol. 22. — № 4. — P. 320–325. — URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279852463_Productive_Classroom_Dialogue_as_an_Activity_of_Shared_Thinking_and_Communicating_A_Commentary_on_Marsal (accessed: 01.10.26).