

Challenges Hindering a Supportive Culture of Dialogue in Saudi Arabia

Fayez A. Alfayez¹ Abdulmajeed K. Alshammari^{2*}

1.Educational Administration Department, King Saud University, P.O Box 2458, Riyadh 11451, Saudi Arabia

2.Educational Leadership Department, Gulf College, P.O Box 39952, Hafar Al Batin, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

This study identified challenges hindering high school administration to establish a supportive culture of dialogue within the school. A questionnaire was subsequently designed, and its validity and reliability were verified. The questionnaire was then applied to a randomly selected sample of high school principals (N=39) and teachers (N=115) in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. The researchers used various statistical methods appropriate for analyzing the collected data. Among the key findings of the study include: (1) administration of Riyadh high schools support building a supportive organizational culture of dialogue; and (2) the main challenges for them in establishing a supportive culture of dialogue were related to Organizational, Physical and Human difficulties. The study, therefore, recommended providing guidelines and assistance for creating a supportive culture of dialogue, including the provision of necessary training for the administration and teachers to enhance their abilities to build an appropriate culture of dialogue.

Keywords: Culture of dialogue, dialogic pedagogy, high schools, organizational culture, Saudi Arabia.

1. Introduction

All forms of dialogue (i.e., cultural, political, and intellectual) are essential in a knowledge-based society, especially in the educational settings. It can help disseminate various opinions to obtain a consensus. Isaacs (1993, p. 2) defined dialogue as “a discipline of collective thinking and inquiry, a process of transforming the quality of conversation and, in particular, the thinking that lies beneath it”. Dialogue is also one of the most important educational methodologies of understanding and persuasion upon which the human behavior is shaped (Howe & Abedin, 2013). It becomes especially important to enhance the culture among community members in educational institutions.

High schools are one such institution, which educate adolescents in their formative time of life. High school level of education is one of the crucial stages of the students' lives and it requires special care. Mansour, Al-Twajiri, and Al-Faqai (2000) confirmed that it is crucial to provide greater attention to this educational phase as it is the stage at which students' tendencies and desires are identified. During this period, students' personality and career trajectory are also defined. At this transformative stage, students experience changes in their lives. Al-Mufada (2007) argued that with these physical, psychological, socio-cultural changes, students become disappointed and uninterested in life if their interests and opinions are not accurately addressed.

Therefore, school principals and teachers need dialogue to build an appropriate organizational culture in the school. This study was, therefore, necessary to identify the various challenges school principals and teachers face when creating a supportive culture of dialogue within their schools. This study intended to clarify challenges the educators face when creating this positive discourse, thus allowing educational agents (i.e., the Saudi Ministry of Education) to better understand the current situation.

Those who follow what is going on in public schools (in Saudi Arabia) as social and educational institutions would notice the lack of educational dialogue practices, and thus a lack of opportunity for learners to express their opinions independently. Also, the lack of the organizational culture of dialogue which promotes and endow learners, teachers, and administrators with skills and ethics of dialogue is limited. In recent decades, schools are suggested to be learning organizations (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008), where all its members including teachers and administration staff are classified as learners. To promote learning in schools, it is important to engage students and school members in a dialogic culture.

Internationally, studies have stressed the importance of dialogue on promoting the culture of learning in schools. Schindler, Gröschner, and Seidel (2015) indicated significant improvement for students learning during their engagement in a conversation culture. They found that a teacher who participated in a dialogic training has been able to promote a culture of dialogue in the school and inside the classroom. Howe and Abedin (2013) conducted a literature review of 225 studies regarding dialogue in classrooms and found that many of the studies were most concerned about the effectiveness of the dialogue in the classrooms. They suggested that studies must focus on the school as an organization instead.

Studies from the Arab regions have emphasized the need for the culture of dialogue in schools. In Saudi Arabia for instance, Al-Harith (2003) indicated that 39.8% of students believe their teachers do not welcome their opinions and that 67% find more opportunities to express their views outside the school than inside it. Al-Hashimi (2004) confirmed that teaching and enhancing dialogue, especially the subject of Oral and Written

Expression, is not being implemented in agreement with the proper educational bases and the contemporary global trends. Also, it is often being neglected on the basis that it is not necessary and it is not needed to be learned.

The previous studies highlighted the critical role schools serve in devising strategies and establishing mechanisms to jump-start the creation of a supportive organizational culture of dialogue within the school. To achieve a supportive culture of dialogue, it is necessary to identify the challenges hindering the school administrations and teachers in performing this role. Therefore, the current study aims to identify the most prominent challenges faced by high school administrations and teachers when building a supportive Culture of Dialogue within the school and identify the statistically significant differences between participants' perceptions of the challenges of building culture of dialogue within the school related to their position and level of education.

2. Literature Review

Arend and Sunnen (2015) explained Bakhtin's concept of Dialogism as an epistemology for the human sciences and as a means to investigate human intercommunications. Webster illustrated the intent of dialogue as "seeking mutual understanding and harmony" (as cited in Yankelovich, 2001). In this sense, dialogue needs to be culture organizations must possess. Yankelovich (2001) explained that dialogue differs form of discussion which requires a rigorous discipline on the participants. Thus, when they fail to adopt the discipline, they still receive the benefits of traditional debate but miss the advantages of positive dialogue. Abdulkarim (2007) defined the culture of dialogue in schools as the general atmosphere surrounding the life of students inside the school and this culture affects students' behavior and perceptions. Isaacs (1993) argued that dialogue promote a group thinking and effective communication, and it is a major factor which makes schools learning institutions. Consequently, authority needs to support the use of dialogue in schools, so that teachers and school principals encourage each other and students to express their thoughts on the dialogue roles.

There are many forces emphasize the need for dialogue in organizations (Yankelovich, 2001). First, teams need to have shared vision and strategic planning, and this cannot be done without having planned dialogue among stakeholders. Second, innovation and initiative between the members of any organization reach its high stages when the culture of dialogue is implemented. Third, the culture of dialogue promotes trust between the members of organizations. All these forces are applied to schools as institutions of learning. The role of teachers and the schools as institution in promoting the culture of dialogue will be presented in the next section.

2.1 *Teacher's Role in Utilizing the Culture of Dialogue in Learning*

Teachers have a privileged position in the utilization of dialogue in education as they are the ones who implement the educational objectives, policies and regulations. Teachers are the most immediate members of the educational process students meet and are thus students' role models in most cases. Students imitate teachers' methods of work, behavior, and thinking. Teachers are therefore the most important source who utilize the culture of dialogue in education (Albani, 2007). This can be done by the teachers' pedagogy, as it requires teacher-student dialogue for students to acquire more knowledge. In her study in Saudi Arabia, Albani (2007) found that teachers agreed that dialogues are crucial for classroom interaction and increasing student knowledge. Her study also found students actively participated in discussions with teachers and peers, and that dialogues can enhance certain moral values (e.g., honesty, patience, forbearance, tolerance, and respect for others' opinions).

Martorana (2003) identified how student-teacher dialogues could influence the educational climate of British high schools. By analyzing 175 dialogue messages between 15 high school students and their teachers in the 2001/2002 academic year, the author found that exchanging dialogue messages in the classroom helped strengthen student-teacher relationships. The dialogue messages in classrooms also assisted students in expressing their genuine feelings to teachers which contributed to developing students' writing skills.

The lack of teachers' awareness regarding the importance of the culture of dialogue is one of the educational issues. Key findings of Farris's (2003) study included discovering the lack of teachers' awareness concerning the importance of educational dialogue, which therefore weakened its application in the classroom. Also, Smith (2005) identified the value and impact of dialogue in classrooms, especially how it can promote learning and facilitate learner reflections. The study found that students dialogues within classrooms are challenged by issues like the lack of discourse skills. Furthermore, teachers who encouraged students to participate in classroom dialogues were able to enhance students' learning experiences. Lastly, the study found that students dialogues within classrooms created an appropriate and positive environment for students' reflection.

Therefore, there was a need to investigate the challenges of creating the positive culture of dialogue. Al-Duaij (2007) identified factors enhancing dialogue among students and provide suggestions for how teachers can increase supportive dialogue among students in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. He also found that extra-curricular dialogue and discussion workshops increase students' confidence in expressing their opinions and that dialogue generates various social, psychological, and educational benefits for the students. However, despite these results,

the author noted that there are no appropriate places to hold the extra-curricular to provide supportive dialogue in schools. Also, Al-Duaij (2007) concluded that teachers can utilize dialogue in education by: 1) accustoming of students to give their opinion; 2) leveraging their role in bridging the various perspectives and connecting concepts; 3) preparing a temporally, spatially, and objectively appropriate environment for dialogue; 4) identifying the desired topics and objectives of creating dialogue with students; 5) providing opportunities for learners to express their opinion freely; and 6) encouraging learners to demonstrate the ethics of dialogue.

2.2 *The Role of school Leaders in Utilizing the Culture of Dialogue*

Schools are the official public educational institutions that present their output to the labor market and government professionals. Therefore, schools reflect the conditions of the society. Schools leaders can lead the society toward the development when they function optimally by providing disciplines, curriculum, activities, and services to meet the need of the market and the society (Al-Faifi, 2007; Al-fawzan, 2006; Al-Bakr, 2005). Also, they can increase awareness by holding workshops to facilitate active discourse about educational dialogues (Yalgen, 2004). Albani (2007) emphasized the role of schools in accustoming generations to the ethics of dialogue and the relationship between this ethics and the enhancement of moral values. Thus, it is important for school leaders and teachers to be knowledgeable about dialogue characteristics.

Al-Obied (2009) outlined the characteristics of dialogue that schools' leaders need to enhance to improve students and teachers' ability of using dialogue. He mentioned that practitioners need to agree on the dialogic promises, adhere to the dialogue topic, use terms that are ethically and professionally appropriate, avoid losing concentration during speech, keep eye contact with others and facing them without fear, concentrate on the points of agreement rather than those of differences, and finally identify the points of agreement and disagreement before the end of the conversation.

In Saudi Arabia, the Educational Ministry support schools to create culture of dialogue. Al-Rwais and Al-Naji (2007) discussed the Saudi Ministry of Education's efforts in promoting dialogue through educational curricula. They determined how realistically these efforts were implemented by analyzing the educational standards, curriculum, and activities. The researchers found that all the analyzed documents demonstrate interests in increasing and enhancing the culture of dialogue. Furthermore, the analyzed documents showed the emphasis on mastering social, dialogic, and reasoning skills.

3. **Research Questions**

The study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- (1) What are the most prominent challenges faced by high schools' teachers and principals when building culture of dialogue within the school?
- (2) Are there significant differences between the respondents' views about the challenges of building culture of dialogue within the school related to their position and educational level?

4. **Methodology**

In this study, the researchers used a descriptive survey approach to achieve the purpose of the study. The survey research helped the researchers to collect and analyze quantitative data about the sample's characteristics, behaviors, and perceptions (Leedy & Ormrod, 2016) regarding the issue studied. Ethical approval for this study was obtained from King Saud University and informed consent was obtained from Riyadh School District to distribute the questionnaire and collect data necessary from high schools' teachers and principals in 2016. Participation was voluntary, and no personal information was collected.

4.1 *Sample*

The sample of this study was randomly selected from 50 high schools in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. There were 10 randomly selected teachers from each school and the school principal were invited to participate in this study. The participants in this study were 115 (74.7%) teachers and 39 (25.3%) high school principals with the approximate response rate of 28%. Information concerning the participants' level of education is shown in Table 1.

4.2 *The Study Instrument*

The researchers developed a questionnaire to collect the study data regarding challenges that teachers and school principals might face when creating culture of dialogue. The questionnaire was designed based on the previous literature related to the current study. The survey consists two sections. The first section is about the demographic information of the survey sample (level of education and position). The second section contains the questionnaire 31 primary phrases. These phrases are categorized into three dimensions. The first dimension is about the human challenges that might emerge when creating the culture of dialogue, and it consists 13 phrases. The second dimension is about the physical challenges, and it includes 9 phrases. The third dimension is about

the organizational difficulties which consists 9 phrases. Respondents were asked to rank their answer from 1-4 on a Likert Scale. The response is based on the respondent's degree of agreement, with One indicates low agreement and Four very high agreement. The low in agreement reveals a challenge.

4.3 *Tool Validity and Reliability*

Regarding the face validity, the questionnaire was submitted to several experienced referees from the Faculty of Education college at the University of King Saud, as well as specialists from the Ministry of Education to ensure that the contents of the questionnaire measure what intends to be measure. The referees' recommendations were applied to the questionnaire. After verifying the survey face validity, it was field-applied on the sample data. Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to identify the questionnaire's internal validity by calculating the correlation coefficient between the degree of each of the questionnaire phrases and the whole degree of the dimension to which it belongs.

Values of the correlation coefficient between each phrase and its dimension were positive and statistically significant at a significance level of (0.01). This indicates the validity of the phrases' internal consistency within their dimensions. Also, Cronbach's Alpha was used to measure the reliability of the questionnaire. Generally, the whole questionnaire' coefficient is high (0.946), which indicates the questionnaire was highly reliable (see Table 2).

4.4 *Data Analysis*

Inferential statistics are applied to address the study's first question. To identify the challenges faced by high school teachers and principals when creating the culture of dialogue means and Standard Deviation (SD) were used. The low score of the agreement indicates challenge of participants. Also, to identify any significant differences between the study's variables (Position and Level of Education), T-test for independent-sample and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were applied. The data analysis is reported per each question, in the next section.

5. **Findings**

5.1 *The First Question*

Per to the participants' responses, the most prominent challenges among the dimensions of the questionnaire were related to the Organizational Dimension. The general Mean of the Organizational difficulties is 2.18 and 0.546 Standard Deviation. The second and third most prominent challenges are related to the Physical and Human challenges (See Table. 3). Notice that the low score of the agreement indicates the challenging dimension and item. These dimensions will be presented from the highest to least challenging.

First, the results revealed the most permanent challenges were related to the Organizational dimension with a mean of (2.18 ± 0.546) . The participants have a moderate agreement on Four of this dimension phrases (see Table 4). These phrases are linked to the educational activities. The findings revealed that educational activities do not support the culture of dialogue in the school.

These results are consistent with that of Al-Rwais and Al-Naji (2007), which referred to the lack of subjects enhancing dialogue. Moreover, decisions made on schools are challenging to create the culture of dialogue. The challenge is how these decisions are being issued without any discourse of staff and students. Also, these decisions do not support the culture of dialogue. Furthermore, decisions made from the higher level (the ministry of education) are being challenged to create the culture of dialogue in the school. Teachers, school principals, students, and parents need to be involved in dialogic meetings to present their opinions on decisions that affect them. High schools' principals and teachers also reported challenges related to students and teachers' performance evaluation. This indicates a need for including dialogue practices on their evaluation standards. Also, the primary goals of teachers-administrations meetings are challenging. These meetings should enhance the culture of dialogue and exchange views on urgent issues within the school.

Second, the Findings revealed the second most challenges were related to the Physical dimension with a mean of (2.21 ± 0.726) . The means and Standard Deviations of the dimension phrases presented in Table 5. The most Physical difficulties were related to the budget provided to enhance and support the culture of dialogue. Sufficient facilities, teachers' training, and the classroom environment were among the challenges that prevent the creation of the culture of dialogue. The results indicated that budgets and appropriate spaces for holding dialogic activities are missing in high schools. These results are consistent with the results of Al-Duaij (2007), which indicated the lack of appropriate places could hold extra-circular dialogue and discussion panels within the school.

Lastly, the Human dimension is revealed to be the least challenging among the Physical and the Organizational dimensions. The overall mean score of this dimension was (2.59 ± 0.819) . The respondents highly agree on most phrases of this dimension, which is an indication of having less Human challenges. However, the most challenges that being identified according to this dimension were related to teachers'

knowledge and contribution of the culture of dialogue in the school (see Table 6). Thus, it is an indication that teachers need to be trained about the dialogic practices.

These findings are supported by the findings of Schindler et al. (2015), they found that a teacher who participated in a dialogic training has been able to promote a culture of dialogue in the school and inside the classroom. Also, these findings are consistent with the results of Smith's study (2005), which showed that there are challenges facing students dialogues within the classroom, including the lack of the arts, ethics, and skills of dialogue.

5.2 *The Second Question*

Are there any statistically significant differences between the culture of dialogue challenges and; participants level of education, and positions they hold? The findings will be analysed accordingly.

First, to determine whether there are any statistically significant differences between the respondents' responses due to the level of education variable, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied (see Table 7). This initial analysis is used to investigate differences between three or more groups. The findings of the analysis revealed no significant differences ($p < .05$) on the Physical Dimension. However, there were significant differences on the Human and Organizational dimensions at the (0.05) significant level. Therefore, post-test (Scheffe') was needed to investigate the difference between the groups. Scheffe' Test was used to determine the differences between these two dimensions and the respondents' level of education; Doctorate, Master's, Bachelor, and other. (See Table 8)

Table 8 shows the Scheffe' Test results which determined the differences between the Level of Education groups on the human and organizational dimensions. The results show that educators who hold a bachelor's degree scored significantly ($p < .05$) higher than who hold Master and Other qualifications. This is true for both the Human and the Organizational challenges, which means that Teachers and school principals who hold bachelor degrees report less Human and Organizational challenges to adopt the culture of dialogue in their schools. Thus, educators who hold other and master's degree reported more in Human and Organizational challenges.

Second, to identify whether there are statistically significant differences between the respondents' responses per the position variable, T-test for the independent sample was used. The results of T-test as shown in Table 9 revealed that there is a significant difference ($p < .05$) between school principals and teachers on the Physical Dimension. It is an indicator that school principals were concerned less about the Physical challenges when implementing the culture of dialogue than teaching staff. However, the findings of T-test showed no significant differences ($p < .05$) on the Human and Organizational challenges related to respondents' position.

6. **Conclusion**

The Findings of the study indicate Organizational, Physical, and Human challenges faced by high school principals and teachers. First, the most permanent challenges were related to Organizational dimension. School principals and teachers are facing organizational difficulties preventing them from building a supportive culture of dialogue. Most of the challenges were related to the educational activities and decision making. Teachers and school principals need to be trained on how to create the positive culture of dialogue. Also, they should be able to transfer their knowledge to students through open two side discussion. As the educational system in Saudi Arabia is centralized, there is a need to engage stakeholders in decision making. The culture of dialogue should be supported from the high level of authority to help schools create such a positive culture. To ensure high quality of policies implementations, decision makers need to promote dialogic sessions to engage everyone in the decision making.

Second, Physical and Human challenges were found in this study. The most challenges in the Physical dimension were related to budget and technologies provided. Teachers and school principals in this study reported difficulties of having the appropriate budget that supports the educational dialogic activities and to train teachers to perform these activities. Furthermore, the findings related to the Human Dimension revealed a lack of teachers' knowledge to create the supportive culture of dialogue in the schools. The results also indicated that interaction between students is one of the challenges that prevent creating culture of dialogue in schools.

Third, the findings indicated significant differences between respondents view related to their educational level and position. High school principals and teachers who hold less other and master's degrees reported high Human and Organizational challenges. This means that they face challenges preventing the implementation of the culture of dialogue related to staff, students, and decision makers. Also, the findings indicated that teachers were significantly facing high Physical challenges than school principals. As they have more interaction with the physical environment of the school and the classroom, teachers need more help to overcome these problems.

Lastly, if educational agencies (e.g. Education Ministry) want to promote culture of dialogue in schools, they must provide; 1) training for teachers and school principals to strengthen their skills in creating positive dialogue in schools, 2) engage stakeholders in decision making including school principals, teachers, parents,

and students, 3) sufficient budget for schools to hold dialogue activities, 4) supportive curriculum to implement educational dialogue activities, 5) sufficient school facilities including technologies that support the dialogue activities, and 6) conduct future studies to evaluate the current state of the schools in term of using dialogue.

References

- Abdulkarim, R. (2007, April). Promotion of the Culture of Dialogue in the Educational Institutions. Refinement of the Culture of Dialogue in the Educational Institutions in Gulf States, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.
- Al-Bakr, F. (2005). *My School a Closed Box* (1st ed.). Al-Riyadh: Al-Rushd Library.
- Albani, R. K. (2007). Culture of Dialogue among Students of Secondary Education in Riyadh And Its Role in Promoting Some Ethical Values (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University, Saudi Arabia.
- Al-Duaij, M. (2007). Factors of Developing Extra-Curricular Dialogue and Discussion among Students of Secondary Education in Riyadh from the Viewpoint of Teachers (Unpublished Master's Thesis). King Saud University, Saudi Arabia.
- Al-Faifi, M. Y. (2007). Dialogue: Its Principles and Ethics and How to Raise our Children on It. Medinah: Dar Al-Khudari.
- Al-Fawzan, M. (2006). Education: its Fundamentals, Concepts, Function, Nature, Dimensions and Development. Riyadh: Al-Khrijji House.
- Al-Harith, H. (2003). Why does Youth Resort to Rejection, Rebellion and Violence, File of Knowledge, Culture of Dialogue and Culture of Violence. Knowledge Journal, 101, 28–38.
- Al-Hashimi, A. E. A. (2004). Standard of Measuring the Oral Expression of Students of Secondary Education and University. Magazine of Reading and Knowledge, 35, 130–159.
- Al-Mufada, O. (2007). Psychology of Age Stages, Development from pregnancy to Ageing and Senility. Riyadh: Dar Taibah.
- Al-Obied, I. (2009). The Culture of Dialogue and Its Importance for Students of Education College, and its Relationship with Academic Achievement (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Al-Qassim University, Saudi Arabia.
- Al-Rwais, A., & Al-Naji A. (2007, April). Culture of Dialogue in School Curricula in K.S.A. Refinement of the Culture of Dialogue in the Educational Institutions in Gulf States, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.
- Arend, B., & Sunnen, P. (2015, November). Dialogic Classroom Talk-Rethinking 'Messy' Classroom Interaction. Paper presented at the EAPRIL Conference 2015: Educating the generation of tomorrow, Leuven, Belgium.
- Farris, P. (2003). The process of response: An examination of how middle school literacy teachers utilize dialogue journals (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Northern Illinois University, USA.
- Howe, C., & Abedin, M. (2013). Classroom dialogue: A systematic review across four decades of research. Cambridge Journal of Education, 43(3), 325–356. doi: 10.1080/0305764X.2013.786024
- Isaacs, W. N. (1993). Taking flight: Dialogue, collective thinking, and organizational learning. Organizational dynamics, 22(2), 24–39. doi: 10.1016/0090-2616(93)90051-2
- Leedy, P., & Ormrod, J. (2016). Practical Research: Planning and Design. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Mansour, A., Al-Twajjri, M. A., & Al-Faqai, A. M. (2000). Educational Psychology (3rd ed.). Riyadh: Obeikan Library.
- Martorana, B. J. (2003). Invitations to Dialogue; The Role of a Letter Exchange in a High School English Classroom (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Hofstra University, USA.
- Schindler, A. K., Gröschner, A., & Seidel, T. (2015). Teaching Science Effectively: A Case Study on Student Verbal Engagement in Classroom Dialogue. Orbis scholae, 9(2), 9–34. doi: 10.14712/23363177.2015.78
- Smith, S. K. (2005). The Value of Dialogue: Teachers Who Encourage Art Dialogue in the Classroom, Enhance the Educational Experience for Students by Creating an Environment for Reflection. School Arts: The Art Education Journal for Teachers, 104(5), 41.
- Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. Teaching and teacher education, 24(1), 80–91. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.004
- Yalgen, M. (2004). Our Education Book Series (17): Educating Generations on Ethics of Discussion, Dialogue and Scientific Debate. Riyadh: Dar Alam Al Kutub.
- Yankelovich, D. (2001). The magic of dialogue: Transforming conflict into cooperation. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Dr. Fayeز Alfayeز is an assistant professor at the department of Educational Leadership in King Saud University, KSA. Before he became an assistant professor, he worked as a teacher in elementary and high schools for ten years (1998 - 2007). After that he earned his Master's from KSU and the PhD in educational Leadership from Saint Louis University.

Dr. Abdulmajeed Alshammari is an assistant professor at Gulf Colleges, Saudi Arabia. Alshammari graduated from Saint Louis University in Spring 2017 majoring in Educational Leadership. He has been working as a science teacher since 2010. Alshammari worked as Research Assistant at SLU during his PhD study. He earned his Master's in Educational Leadership from Yarmouk University, Jordan.

Table 1. Distribution of Participants based on Level of Education

Level of Education	Frequency	Percentage
Doctorate	3	1.9
Master's	24	15.6
Bachelor	123	79.9
Other	4	2.6
Total	154	100

Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient of the Tool

Questionnaire Dimensions	# of Phrases	Reliability
The human difficulties' dimension	13	0.9258
The physical difficulties' dimension	9	0.9167
The organizational difficulties' dimension	9	0.8622
The Whole Questionnaire	31	0.9460

Table 3. Challenges to Build Culture of Dialogue by Dimension

Dimension	Mean	SD
Organizational Challenges	2.18	0.546
Physical Challenges	2.21	0.726
Human Challenges	2.59	0.575

Table 4. Responses to the Organizational Dimension

Organizational Challenges Dimension Phrases	Mean	SD
A major goal of the teachers-administrations meetings is to enhance the culture of dialogue and exchange views on urgent issues within the school	2.63	0.840
The terms commonly used among all parties inside the school are positive and encouraging	2.50	0.794
Evaluation of the students' performance and achievement includes the culture of dialogue and discussion with the students	2.42	0.899
Evaluating teachers' performance depends on dialogue and discussing their strengths and weaknesses	2.30	0.825
The official manner of the school administration includes procedures that enhance the culture and skills of students-teachers dialogue	2.24	0.793
The school adopts ministerial policies and regulations that help to build supportive organizational culture of dialogue within the school	2.11	0.719
Decisions issued by decision-makers are interested in creating a culture of dialogue supporting dialogue within the school	1.95	0.680
Decisions issued by the administration are discussed before adhering to its implications	1.73	0.856
There are educational activities which serve primarily for teaching dialogue and its skills within the school	1.71	0.693
Overall	2.18	0.546

Table 5. Responses to the Physical Dimension

Physical Challenges Dimension Phrases	Mean	SD
The school has learning resources that help promote the culture of dialogue and debate between the students	2.62	1.100
The content of curriculum contributes to consolidate the culture of dialogue among students	2.56	1.126
Teachers pedagogy strengthen the culture of dialogue within school	2.44	0.704
There are conference rooms equipped with appropriate technologies for teachers-administration meetings enabling all to discuss, intervene and debate appropriately	2.26	1.089
The classroom environment helps the students to listen well and speak fluently during the dialogue inside the class	2.25	0.881
The school facilities are helpful for holding discussions and seminars	2.10	0.899
There are modern technologies that can be used in debates and discussions both in and out of the school	2.01	0.882
The school is provided with sufficient budget that can be used to train teachers in dialogue skills	1.87	0.891
There is appropriate budget for holding dialogue activities and workshops to enhance the culture of dialogue within the school	1.79	0.732
Overall	2.21	0.726

Table 6. Responses to the Human Dimension

Human Challenges Dimension Phrases	Mean	SD
Problems within the school are solved through dialogue and understanding between the parties involved	2.94	0.721
Many teachers who are able to practice dialogue within the school	2.92	0.821
The school administration uses persuasion through dialogue when dealing with teachers	2.88	0.783
The school administration is able to impact others through dialogue	2.81	0.750
The administration has the necessary dialogue skills	2.73	0.827
Some negative behaviors were modified through dialogue	2.70	0.715
The culture of dialogue in the school appears in various situations and events inside the school	2.69	0.717
There is a range of contributions by the administration in enhancing the culture of dialogue	2.62	0.811
The psychological social environment supports dialogue within the school	2.44	0.792
There is a range of contributions by teachers in enhancing the culture of dialogue	2.37	0.800
Teachers contributes to root the culture and skills of dialogue of the students	2.28	0.812
Dialogue is the salient feature of the culture of interaction between students	2.19	0.871
Teachers of the school have enough knowledge from the training courses on dialogue, its arts and skills	2.05	0.819
Overall	2.59	0.575

Table 7. Differences According to the Participants' Level of Education

Dimension	Source of Variance	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	F Value	Sig.
Human Challenges	Between groups	3.550	3	1.183	3.773	**0.012
	Within groups	47.040	150	0.314		
	Total	50.590	153			
Physical Challenges	Between groups	3.368	3	1.123	2.182	0.093
	Within groups	77.178	150	0.515		
	Total	80.546	153			
Organizational Challenges	Between groups	2.627	3	0.876	3.053	**0.030
	Within groups	43.013	150	0.287		
	Total	45.640	153			

*Statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance

Table 8. Scheffe' Test Results for the differences between Level of Education Groups

Dimension	Qualification	N	Mean	Doctorate	Master's	Bachelor	other
Human Challenges	Doctorate	3	2.15	-			
	Master's	24	2.40		-		
	Bachelor	123	2.65		*	-	*
	Other	4	1.96				-
Organizational Challenges	Doctorate	3	2.37	-			
	Master's	24	1.95		-		
	Bachelor	123	2.23		*	-	*
	other	4	1.69				-

*Statistically significant differences at 0.05 level of significance or less

Table 9. Results of the T-test for Independent Sample due to Position Variable

Dimension	Position	N	Average	S. Deviation	T Value	Sig.
Human Challenges	Teacher	115	2.60	0.602	0.431	0.667
	Principal	39	2.55	0.492		
Physical Challenges	Teacher	115	2.11	0.727	2.991-	**0.003
	Principal	39	2.50	0.644		
Organizational Challenges	Teacher	115	2.16	0.578	0.883-	0.378
	Principal	39	2.25	0.439		

**Significant differences at a level of significance of 0.01 or less