

**Integrating Instructional Scaffolding Interaction
Cycle into Dialogic Teaching to Enhance EFL
Listening and Speaking Skills Among
Faculty of Education Sophomores**

Prepared by

Dr. Heba Elsayed Abdelsalam Elghotmy
Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Methods of
Teaching English
Faculty of Education, Menoufia University, Egypt.
Heba.elghotmy@gmail.com

Blind Reviewed Journal

Abstract:

The current research investigates the effectiveness of a program based on integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching in developing Faculty of Education sophomores' EFL listening and speaking skills. The participants of the research comprised seventy-six students. They were drawn randomly from second year students enrolled in the Faculty of Education, Menoufia university. The participants were divided into two groups; experimental (38) and control (38). The research adopted the quasi-experimental pre-posttest design. The experimental group received instruction based on integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching, while the control group received regular instruction. The instruments included EFL listening and speaking skills pre-posttests and a rubric for scoring the speaking test. The findings revealed that using a program based on integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching positively affected Faculty of Education sophomores' EFL listening and speaking skills.

Keywords: Instructional scaffolding interaction cycle, dialogic teaching, EFL listening and speaking skills, Faculty of Education sophomores.

المخلص:

تبحث الدراسة الحالية في فعالية برنامج قائم على دمج دورة تفاعل السقالات التعليمية التفاعلية في التدريس الحواري لتطوير مهارات الاستماع والتحدث لطلاب الفرقة الثانية بكلية التربية. يتألف المشاركون في الدراسة من ستة وسبعين طالبًا تم اختيارهم عشوائيًا من الطلاب المقيدون بالفرقة الثانية بكلية التربية جامعة المنوفية. تم تقسيم العينة إلى مجموعتين: التجريبية (٣٨) والضابطة (٣٨) طالب. تلقت المجموعة التجريبية تدريس يستند إلى دمج دورة السقالات التعليمية التفاعلية في التدريس الحواري، بينما تلقت المجموعة الضابطة التدريس بالطريقة المعتادة اعتمدت الدراسة على التصميم شبه التجريبي. تضمنت الأدوات اختبار مهارات الاستماع والتحدث باللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية بإعداد اختبار تم تطبيقه قبلًا وبعديا على عينة الدراسة. أظهرت النتائج أن استخدام برنامج يعتمد على دمج دورة السقالات التعليمية التفاعلية في التدريس الحواري أثر بشكل إيجابي على تنمية مهارات الاستماع والتحدث لدى الطلاب في كلية التربية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: دورة السقالات التعليمية التفاعلية، التدريس الحواري، مهارات الاستماع والتحدث باللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، طلاب كلية التربية.

1.1 Introduction:

Language is a particular procedure by which students disseminate their thinking and awareness to people around them (Hattie & Yates, 2013). It is the channel through which perceptions and abilities are acquired and weighed, social connections and identities are shaped, and gradually more profound and more difficult disciplinary comprehension is established as time progresses (DiCerbo, Anstrom, Baker, & Rivera, 2014). Researchers agreed that listening and speaking play an important role in EFL learning (Harmer, 2007; Nunan, 2001). Therefore, oral development is imperative for the achievement of students learning English. With the absence of oral development, students will not be able to perform successfully in academics (Scarcella, 2003). Teachers must ensure that lessons are language rich, relevant to students' learning and socio-cultural context (Duff & Kobayashi, 2010). Teachers cannot satisfy learners' educational demands unless they address their social needs and delve into their personal lives (Douglas, 2000; Duff, 2010).

The paradigm shift from traditional language teaching to communicative language teaching has resulted in several significant changes in second language education (Jacobs & Farrell, 2001). Hall and Verplaetse (2000) affirm that sociocultural principles support the position that language development is linked to participation with others. They state that "teachers and students collaborate in discourse to construct intellectual and practical activities that affect both the form and content of the target language as well as the processes and consequences of human growth" (p. 10).

Dialogue teaching makes the best use of talk for teaching and learning. Meaning develops from the context between the speaker's utterance and the listener's interpretation (Alexander, 2020; Kim & Wilkinson, 2019). Through dialogue, teachers can engage with their students' developing ideas helping them to overcome misunderstanding (Baffy, 2018; Boyd & Markarian, 2015). Students' learning and thinking are influenced by the quality of whole-class interactions and group discussions. When students learn to think together, classroom discussion becomes an essential tool for blooming new ideas (Mercer & Howe, 2012; Mercer & Littleton, 2007). From a sociocultural point of view, the teacher needs to provide the

appropriate scaffolding to make concepts and communicative practices salient to learners. Hence, the teacher must master the basic skills of teaching to facilitate the students' learning and development.

The essence of dialogical teaching is scaffolding. Rose (2006) describes the learning sequence as follows: a teacher preparing students for a task, a student completing a learning task, and the teacher elaborating on what the student has learned. The major mission of students in each scaffolded interaction cycle in the classroom is to answer teacher questions (Rose, 2007, p.8). Rose (2017) adds that some progressive theorists argue that students should commence this cycle rather than the teacher who must first encourage the students to do so. Rose (2007) also stated that the teacher is the one who has power in the classroom in both instructional and regulatory fields; the teacher interacts with the students by asking questions, to which the students respond. Students may ask questions, voice their thoughts, or explain their experiences, but it is normally the teacher's task to assess students' responses (Rose, 2007).

Gibbons (2007) places the interaction between instructors and students at the core of the learning process, emphasizing the significance of dialogue in learning from a socio-cultural perspective. Classroom interaction helps to build both understanding and knowledge. Martin and Rose (2005) believe that learning involves the successful completion of learning tasks in the context of scaffolding. Scaffolding interaction cycle is used to describe the micro-interactions that occur between teachers and students as they acquire information and abilities. This cycle is used to define a series of educational activities that include the following phases: Focus - Task - Feedback. Integrating instructional scaffolding into dialogic teaching helps to prepare students for effective communication enhancing their interactive usage of language content and patterns. It means that teachers can facilitate the students' learning and assist them to develop new understanding, new concepts, and new abilities (Hammonds & Gibbons, 2001).

1.2 Background of the problem:

First, the researcher observed, while teaching some courses that most students are poor communicators. They have difficulty in listening or

speaking actively or comprehendingly. The researcher observed that there are some weaknesses in the students' EFL listening and speaking skills, students find difficulty to communicate in English with one another or listen to and comprehend what they listen to. They are unable to express themselves, their thoughts and ideas accurately and fluently either. Moreover, some studies emphasized students' lack of some EFL listening and speaking skills (Ahmed, 2019; Anwer, 2002; El Karfa, 2007; El Sakka, 2016; Rabab'ah, 2016).

To document the problem, a pilot study was conducted by the researcher to find out the weakness of EFL listening and speaking skills on the part of Faculty of Education sophomores. Thirty students at Faculty of Education Menoufia University were tested on listening and speaking skills. The test was divided into two sections (listening and speaking). The listening section included listening to conversations and choosing the correct answer from (a, b, or c), listening to mini dialogues and answering questions that checked listening for gist, listening for details, listening for inference, listening for prediction and listening for guessing the meaning of unfamiliar words and phrases. The speaking section included dialogues and picture description that attempted to check some speaking skills (fluency, accuracy and comprehension skills). The pilot study's findings indicated that 80% of students could not get the main idea correctly, 85% of them could not get the details or infer from stated ideas. Most of them (80%) could not express themselves accurately or fluently. So, the pilot study indicated that there is lack in the EFL listening and speaking skills among the Faculty of Education sophomores.

1.3. Statement of the problem

There were weaknesses in EFL listening and speaking skills among Faculty of Education sophomores as they are poor listeners and speakers, they cannot communicate in English, they cannot listen effectively for gist, for details, for inference, for predicting or for guessing the meaning of unfamiliar words. They cannot understand what they are listening to or use the language to express themselves fluently and accurately either. Accordingly, the current research aimed at developing EFL listening and speaking skills among Faculty of Education sophomores through using a

program based on scaffolding through integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching.

1.4 Questions of the research:

The current research aims to provide answers to the following questions:

- 1) What is the effectiveness of integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching- based program effective in developing listening skills of EFL Faculty of Education sophomores (listening for gist, listening for details, inferring meaning, predicting content, and detecting signposts) ?
- 2) What is the effectiveness of integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching -based program effective in developing speaking skills of EFL Faculty of Education sophomores (fluency, accuracy, and interaction)?

1.5 Hypotheses of the research:

The following hypotheses were formulated as follows:

- 1) There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group on listening skills (listening for gist, listening for details, inferring meaning, predicting content, and detecting signposts) pre-posttest in favor of the posttest.
- 2) There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group on speaking skills (fluency, accuracy, and interaction) pre-posttest in favor of the posttest.

1.6 Aim of the research:

The current research aimed at developing sophomores' some EFL listening and speaking skills including listening (listening for gist, listening for details, inferring meaning, predicting content, and detecting signposts) and speaking: (fluency – accuracy - interaction) through integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching-based program.

1.7 Significance of the research:

The present research is significant as it could help:

- 1) Faculty students: as it helps them in enhancing their listening and speaking skills and enable them to listen and speak accurately, fluently and comprehendingly.
- 2) Teachers: in paying more attention to integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching- based program to help students develop listening and speaking skills.
- 3) Curriculum designers: in incorporating integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching-based activities in preparing and designing courses/ programs for developing EFL listening and speaking skills.

1.8 Delimitations of the research:

The current research is delimited to:

- 1) Only 76 EFL Faculty of Education sophomores, Menoufia University.
- 2) Some listening skills including listening for gist, listening for details, inferring meaning, predicting content, and detecting signposts.
- 3) Some speaking skills including accuracy, fluency and interaction.
- 4) The second semester of the academic year 2021/2022.

1.9 Definition of terms:

Dialogic teaching

Dialogue teaching points out how the quality, dynamics and content of the conversation help the teacher. Conversation in the classroom is distinguished by the encounter of various voices, which are explored, compared, and encountered in conversation (Akkakoson, 2016). For such conversations to take place, students need to learn how to listen, explain, and contribute to each other (Howe, Hennessy, Mercer, Vrikki, &

Wheatley, 2019; Mercer, Hennessy, & Warwick, 2019; Mercer & Littleton, 2007). A prerequisite for dialogue teaching is mastery of a variety of techniques for using language as a learning tool by the teacher (Alexander, 2017; Mercer & Littleton, 2007).

Dialogic teaching has operationally defined as an educational approach that exploits the power of talk to foster students' thinking, learning, and understanding. It requires teachers to engage in conversation and can use a variety of settings strategically. This necessitates teachers to employ diverse classroom activities and interactions to fulfill the learning outcomes of their students where questions are used to aid thinking, and students are invited to elaborate, to reason, and defend what they claim.

Instructional scaffolding

Scaffolding refers to the process through which the teacher assists learners in completing tasks or activities that are beyond their capacities (Mercer & Littleton, 2007). Scaffolding is a temporary aid provided to students during the learning process, with the goal of leading to student independence (Bigdeli & Rahimi, 2015). It is the process by which a teacher adds support for students to learn and improve task mastery. Teachers gain this through students' prior experience and knowledge as they learn new skills (Yawiloeng, 2021). Scaffolding in this study refers to the temporary but necessary nature of supportive interaction in which beginners are trained to develop new skills, concepts, or higher levels.

Scaffolding interaction cycle:

The scaffolding interaction cycle is a series of interactions between teachers and students that includes three phases: Focus, Task, and Feedback (Rose & Acevedo, 2006; Yawiloeng, 2021). This cycle necessitates that learners should always be properly prepared to complete each task satisfactorily before they are asked to do so. Once learners have successfully performed a task, they are cognitively prepared for the next phase, which examines their activities (Rose and Acevedo, 2006).

A learning task, according to Rose (2018), is at the heart of educational activities. Assignments can only be completed by students. However, most learning tasks are assigned by a teacher (verbally or in writing). For example, the teacher may give instructions or pose questions to the students,

to which the students must respond. Focus is the first cycle that defines the task. Task is the second scaffolding cycle which is not only questions that elicit responses from students, but also consistently prepares all students to answer successfully. Finally, the feedback cycle is not simply evaluating or commenting on responses, but also constantly expanding shared knowledge in which responses are always confirmed, while responses that are not adequately framed in discourse are not considered. According to Nardacchione and Peconio (2022); Yawiloeng (2021), tasks are designed and assigned by focusing on the lesson or learner's knowledge (focus), the task phase is central, and it includes identifying elements in the lesson (tasks). Following completion of the task, the instructor assesses it by either approving or disapproving. In classroom discourse, the scaffolding interaction cycle provides a pedagogical interaction that demonstrates the relationship between teachers and students in developing an understanding of information and abilities.

Integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching

Hartmann, Angersbach, and Rummel (2015) state that social interaction necessitates dialogue, which serves as a stimulant for knowledge acquisition. Dialogue happens as part of the active learning process not just between learners and teachers, but also amongst students themselves, typically in group or pair settings. Personal learning is enabled through social interaction when the learner integrates new knowledge into previous experiences, develops new attitudes, reconsiders misinterpreted information, and analyses what is significant (Bada, 2015).

If learners are given ideal settings for language usage and encouraged to take advantage of these possibilities, their intrinsic learning talents will be awakened, and language will emerge rather than be learnt. Integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching allows teachers to explore developing language as well as learners to focus on language (Pacheco, Daniel, & Pray, 2017). This integration also allows language learners to strengthen their communication abilities through interaction (Reznitskaya, 2012; Yu-Fen, 2015). Integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching is a concept used to

describe the way Faculty of Education students feel secure enough to take risks to interact with teacher and peers and enhance their listening and speaking skills through performing dialogic tasks intersected with scaffolding phases.

EFL listening skills:

Listening is one of the basic components of personal communication skills, and it involves the active process of understanding the speaker's messages. A listener must be impartial and non-judgmental, especially at conversation's beginning. According to Pourhosein & Ahmadi (2011); Yu (2006) ,the process of listening comprehension focuses on phonemes, words, grammatical structures, language units, and audience expectations, situation, context, and prior knowledge. Chang & Read (2006); Yang (2014) stated that a listener receives verbal information, creates meaning from it, understands and responds. Listening is a complex explanatory process that applies to what the listener already hears and already knows (Chang & Millett, 2014; Pourhosein & Ahmadi, 2011). According to Chang & Read, 2006; Yang, 2014; Yu, 2006, listening is an active and important mental skill. It helps us grasp the world around us. The operational definition refers to Faculty of Education sophomores' ability to understand a listening text concentrating on phonemes, sounds, words and structures making use of background knowledge and the context.

EFL speaking skills:

Speaking is an interactive process of meaning-making that involves producing, receiving, and processing of information. The setting, the participants, and the aim of the communication all influence the purpose of the speech. Speaking implies expressing one's thoughts and feelings in English (Davis, Timpe-Laughlin, Gu, & Ockey, 2018). Speaking is a productive skill that requires utilizing language and body language to engage listeners and determine if they grasp what is being said (Wen-Chi Vivian, Jun Scott Chen, & Jie Chi, 2017). Speaking is a way for learners to interact with others to attain certain goals of expressing thoughts, intentions, hopes, and perspectives (Lin & Mubarak, 2021). The term is operationally defined as the ability of Faculty of Education sophomores to express their intentions and thoughts, convey their opinions using verbal and

non-verbal language in an accurate and understandable manner and speak freely about a variety of topics.

Make errors when speaking eloquently.

2. Review of Literature

EFL Listening and Speaking

Speaking and listening are interrelated processes. The speaking process requires at least one listener. Speaking involves expressing meaning with a code and listening entails comprehending the meaning with the help of this code. Research stated that effective academic listening and speaking skills are a requirement to be able to function at all levels (Jie & Ying, 2010; Ma, 2010; Newton & Nation, 2008). Brill, Gerrits, and Visser (2021); Jie and Ying (2010) examine the significance of foreign language listening comprehension in English learning and argued that it should be the first skill developed in language learning.

It is the responsibility of language teachers to help students develop language by presenting them with rich interactions to practice the language through using speaking and listening activities. It is also important that these interactions be presented at the student's proficiency level (Ma, 2010; Qiu & Xu, 2022). To illustrate, participants would have only partial information available to finish the task, but they would have opportunities to generate meaningful negotiation (Brunfaut & Révész, 2015; Wang, Abdullah, & Leong, 2022). Additional interactions could include having students speak to each other while participating in group activities. In all, there are certain requirements to acquiring a second language, such as using an academic setting to teach formal language instruction, offering opportunities to interact in the target language outside of the schoolroom, use effective pedagogical strategies and methodologies which can make learning the language easier for the students, and incorporating the strands of language acquisition, which include listening, and speaking (Al-Hawamleh, Alazemi, & Al-Jamal, 2022; Davis et al., 2018; Pourhosein & Ahmadi, 2011).

Listening is always an important part of communication because it helps language learners gain input and express other language skills (Movva,

Alapati, Veliventi, & Maithreyi, 2022). Listening, as a key skill in language for its vital role in language acquisition and learning, has been a cornerstone of many theories (Bril et al., 2021; Qiu & Xu, 2022). The main criteria to consider when designing listening aids are contextual, personal, as well as the socio-linguistic and linguistic form of speech signal and the purpose of instruction (Brunfaut & Révész, 2015; Movva et al., 2022). Paterson (2022) defines speaking as a two-way process in which two or more people interact with each other in order to maintain social relations. It is a form of communication as well as speech. Ahmed (2019); Paterson (2022) state that speaking is the person's ability to express himself/ herself orally, fluently, and accurately and with correct pronunciation in a given context.

Fluency describes the level of proficiency at which the learner produces oral language easily. Thus, the speaker's language has a sustained speech and devoid of communication breakdown. Fluent speech is characterized by fewer pauses, repetitions, hesitations and a shorter total amount of silence (Chang & Millett, 2014; Safdari & Fathi, 2020). To increase fluency, Abdulaal, Alenazi, Tajuddin, and Hamidi (2022); Ibatova, Korkiya, Shcherbatykh, Vagabov, and Salimullina (2022) proved that teachers of English should encourage pupils to use English outside the classroom in every circumstance. This can be achieved through communicating with their friends and teachers; dialoging with pupils of other cultures; and conversing with anybody that is comfortable with the language.

Accuracy is the extent of how students' speech fits what people are actually saying when using target language. The focus on accuracy is the production of error-free utterances regardless of the level of language used. In other words, a more target-like performance may arise from the use of controlled relatively simple forms in the hope of avoiding errors (Ibatova et al., 2022). Accuracy refers to the ability to produce grammatically correct sentences. According to Abdulaal et al. (2022), accuracy is concerned with two issues; the first one refers to how much the speaker's message is in line with the information he/ she wants to convey, which leads speakers to monitor their utterances to ensure that they match their intentions. The second concern is the choice of formal aspects of the language such as vocabulary, grammatical morphemes, and so on.

According to Bigdeli and Rahimi (2015), the learner's opportunity to interact with more fluent speaker learners need to practice speaking in different situations. Team teaching and group teaching, besides paired and small group activities can increase meaningful, interesting interaction. An obstacle that learners encounter while attempting to speak is the interactive nature of most communication. Conversations are collaborative processes in which the participants engage in a process of meaning negotiation. As a result, the problem of what to say for learners is frequently constrained by conventions of how to say something, when to speak, and other discourse constraints (Abdulaal et al., 2022; Bigdeli & Rahimi, 2015; Ibatova et al., 2022; Safdari & Fathi, 2020).

Dialogic teaching

According to Alexander (2017, 2018, 2020); Mercer and Littleton (2007), dialogue teaching is the most effective use of dialogue for teaching and learning. Dialogue teaching is more than just the teacher's presentation; it is an ongoing conversation between the teacher and the student. Teachers can use dialogue to demonstrate students' perspectives, engage in the development of their ideas, and help clear up misunderstandings. Teachers can explain ideas, clarify the intent and purpose of activities, model language usage, and help students understand new ways of describing events by engaging students in dialogue. Substantial empirical evidence suggests that engaging learners in classroom dialogue improves their learning. Recent research has found that classes with a more conversational approach had higher learning results than classrooms in which teachers speak more (Alexander, 2020; Hennessy & Davies, 2020; Resnick, Asterhan, Clarke, & Schantz, 2018). The more students are participating orally in the classroom discussion the more they are getting better learning outcomes (Bignell, 2019; Reznitskaya & Wilkinson, 2015).

1.3 Dialogic Teaching Theoretical Background

Dialogic teaching approach has an excellent theoretical background. Recently, Kim and Wilkinson (2019) summarize the key theoretical evidence that led to dialogic teaching approach as follows:

1.3.1 Sociocultural Theory

Dialogic teaching approach is derived from Vygotsky (1978) socio - cultural theory, which he argues that there was a definite link between speaking and mind. All human knowledge is social, having been acquired through previous social participation (Wells, 2000). This claim was documented by Mahn and John-Steiner (2012) through the development of speech as a means of communication between children and those around them.

1.3.2 Dialogic Theory

Dialogic teaching theory was influenced by not only Vygotsky (1978), but also by Bhakti (1981) who contrasts between authoritative and dialogical speech patterns. The primary goal is to compel and mediate real knowledge, as well as to assure its rebuilding. Authoritative genre seeks to persuade the listener to embrace the speaker's point of view. The Dialogic genre welcomes a wide range of perspectives and ideas and attempts to provoke thought. Mortimer and Scott (2003) developed a taxonomy of four different communication approaches based on Bakhtin's idea of speech genres:

The first type of speech genre is non-interactive authoritative where teachers provide learners with a consistent pattern of content that has been carefully studied and given to them for acquisition. The second one is interactive authoritative where speakers switch, teacher asks questions, and the pupils respond. The teacher determines whether or not the answer is correct. The third type is non-interactive dialogic in which only one speaker talks, summarizes, compares different opinions, and provokes thought. The last type is interactive dialogic where both the teacher and the student offer their points of view. Its goal is to assist diverse speakers in expressing their thoughts, which may then be examined to compare their points, sources of change, and causes of distraction. Knowledge is not fixed, but rather emerges from interactions between teachers and pupils.

Lukitasari (2020); Redjeki and Muhajir (2022) considered essential situations in which students could confidently express themselves and confirm their voices.: (a) learners are given the opportunity to speak, (b) they express their opinions, (c) they do so in their own words, and (d) they eventually attract the interest and attention of others. Matusov (2009) argues that education is intrinsically dialogic since students' meaning-making is

constantly unexpected and determined, and the instructor can never fully create or control it. As a result, Matusov offers ways to increase classroom discourse by: (a) recognising the instructor as a co-learner with the students, (b) accepting knowledge as continually changing, and (c) Basic information-seeking queries are used to generate instructions.

2.1 Indicators of Dialogic Teaching

Various researchers in their investigations, employed various indicators of dialogic teaching (Fernández Fernández, 2020; García-Carrión, López de Aguilera, Padrós, & Ramis-Salas, 2020; Jocuns, 2021; Lukitasari, 2020; Lyle, 2008; Phillipson & Wegerif, 2019; Rojas-Drummond et al., 2016; Sedláček & Sedova, 2017). Recently, Hennessy et al. (2016) presented a complete set of indicators to describe dialogic teaching as follows:

2.1.1 Repertoires of Teaching Talk

Language, dialogue, and communication have been the focus of education over the last few decades. Research suggests that dialogue plays an important role in classroom learning and knowledge formation (Hennessy & Davies, 2020; Jocuns, 2021). Many teachers have learned how dialogue works in the classroom setting and what its consequences are. The achievement of student learning through dialogue contributes to the quality of classroom discourse (Komalasari, 2013; Morita, 2000; Strobelberger, 2012).

Discourse is also referred to as transactional and interactional, where transactional discourse mainly involves the exchange of information, as well as examples of the use of language in shaping and contending social relationships and identities and express the speaker's attitude to subject or narrator (Siumarlata, 2017). A skilled language user develops the knowledge and skills to handle different types and purposes of discourse according to his needs. This includes knowledge of language, discourse, speech traditions, socio-cultural norms, and other specific areas of knowledge (Priyatmojo, 2014).

Talk as transactional focuses on what is being said or done. Participants are more focused on message and self-understanding. While, exchange greetings, and engage in small talk are examples of Talk as interactional

discourse. Interactive individuals want to be part of social situations and enjoy those interactions with each other through informal or formal exchanges depending on the situations. Interactional discourse is best taught by giving examples embedded in natural dialogues.

Another important aspect of conversation is providing feedback. This includes responding to a conversational partner with expressions of interest, such as "It's fun," "Yes," "Really," and the speaker's desire to continue. To practice providing feedback in this way, students can check out dialogs that exclude feedback expressions to practice using them. Another technique is training beginners of using conversation starters and narratives about personal experiences.

Thornbury and Meddings (2001), stated that If teachers consider language to be an emerging phenomenon, then learning it is a collectively structured and socially motivating process, based on the user's concerns, interests, desires, and needs. Also, the role of the teacher in language learning is scaffolding these emerging processes, and the teacher's authority is derived from the ability to manage and facilitate social processes.

2.1.2 Teachers' Open Questions

Dialogic teaching utilizes questions that are essentially open and varied (García-Carrión et al., 2020; Jocuns, 2021) . In teaching dialogue, questions play a different role: They should either assist students in developing new knowledge (Alexander, 2017) or promote meaningful research that provides new knowledge (McCormick & Donato, 2000). Questions serve as scaffolding; they assist students recognize and widen their ideas, as well as provide appropriate areas of proximal development for them. Teachers employ questions to get the learners to think in a new way about teaching content that they would not have used without their help. In dialogic teaching, preference is given to real questions, or at least one answer (open-end questions). Dialogic teaching theory regards open-ended questions with high cognitive demands that lead to analysis, evaluation, or construction as invaluable for the development of students' thinking (Phillipson & Wegerif, 2019).

2.1.3 Uptake

One of various types of feedback is uptake. According to Chin (2006, 2007), four types of teacher responses to students' answers can be distinguished: (a) the teacher obtains the correct answer, verifies it, and then continues by speaking or asking further questions; (b) the teacher accepts the correct answer and asks follow-up questions to illustrate the prior ideas; (c) the teacher accepts the incorrect response and corrects the student; and (d) the teacher accepts the incorrect answer and asks a slightly revised question or guide. According to Chin (2006), the second and fourth replies, are relevant to dialogic teaching. These responses are uptake since they expanded on what learners had stated by asking follow-up questions or giving a new stimulus. The main feature of the teacher uptake is that it is related to the reactions of the students. According to Fu and Nassaji (2016), teachers ideologically put pressure on students by giving them with uptake to support students' answers that are incomplete or specific, or that there is insufficient evidence or examples (Hentasmaka & Cahyono, 2021).

2.1.4 Using Reasoning to Elaborate Student Thoughts

The goal of dialogic teaching is to increase students' speaking abilities, where students' words should be lengthier. Pimentel and McNeill (2013) classify student answers by combining length and cognitive level criteria. This categorization divides student words into four categories: (a) no response - the student does not respond when asked, (b) word/phrase, (c) thorough thinking - the answer is written as a complete sentence (d) thinking and reasoning - The response depicts a full idea that involves reason or logic. Webb et al. (2014) noted that there may be high cognitive processes that emerge in student words when students explain their own ideas or concepts from their classmates. Hennessy et al. (2016) Rational discourse took only those answers that were obvious. These answers may include any of the following examples of logic: interpretation, justification, presentation of an argument or counter-argument, similarity, categorization, distinctions, and use of evidence.

2.2 Principles of Dialogic Teaching

According to Alexander (2020), dialogue teaching entails the following principles:

- a. The entire class (or all classroom groups) participates in the class talk. Learning tasks need to be directed to all students to participate in joint learning.
- b. Students feel the support of the teacher and peers in expressing their ideas. They do not worry about entering classroom communication, giving the wrong answer, or being teased by peers for the wrong answer.
- c. All participants listen to one another, share their ideas, and ponder the ideas of their peers. Any person can be in the position of the person who is asking or answering a question.
- d. Participants share and compare different perspectives working towards a logical position.
- e. Conversation moves forward, personal responses are built on each other, and what is said is explained. Classroom talk considers its previous stages; A comprehensive inquiry is created about the educational content taught.

Scaffolding and its theoretical basis

Scaffolding is widely acknowledged to have a significant role in many fields of knowledge and in a variety of educational environments, including classroom and small group interactions (Sarmiento-Campos. et al., 2022). According to Nardacchione and Peconio (2022); Pacheco et al. (2017), scaffolding assigns responsibility for task completion to the learners. When such assistance is no longer required, it may gradually fade away. The disappearance of assistance, which permits the learner to accept responsibility for his or her own learning, is one of the key theoretical elements of scaffolding.

Scaffolding's theoretical foundation is related to Vygotsky's Zone of Approximal Development (ZPD), which posits that instructors may function as "scaffolds" as they assist students toward making progress independently and that learners can be educated within their ZPD for intellectual growth. Teachers might then model the skill and progressively remove the scaffolds

as the kid achieves mastery of the skill (Gudina & Wakuma, 2022; Hammonds & Gibbons, 2001). Scaffolding, from this perspective, may be defined as providing crucial supports to facilitate the acquisition of ideas and skills.

Integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching to enhance EFL Listening and speaking skills

Integrating scaffolding into dialogic teaching allows students to share ideas with their peers and support or reject each other's ideas in order to establish common knowledge (Baxter & Williams, 2010). This integration enables students to use their knowledge and change their plans in response to feedback, resulting in improved results. Students encourage and motivate one another by connecting new knowledge to previous topics (Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2014). According to Baxter and Williams (2010), During the whole-class discussion, the teacher uses questions to elicit feedback from students and encourages them to consider alternative solutions.

Dialogue is the primary medium in scaffolding that enables teachers to assess learners' learning status and provide them with relevant support for providing competent participatory models, including appropriate use and the development of interactive practise frameworks critical to learning (Rojas-Drummond, Torreblanca, Pedraza, Vélez, & Guzmán, 2013). Recent research has shown that dialogic interactions between teachers and students play an important role in student learning, development, and reasoning (Hennessy & Davies, 2020; Jocuns, 2021; Rapanta et al., 2021; Šedřová, Šalamounová, Švařiček, & Sedláček, 2020). By integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching, students can develop ideas that are unlikely to be their own while still recognising them as products of their own thinking.

Language acts as a tool of mediation which allows external activities to be transformed into mental ones. Integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching and led to greater engagement and participation. The teacher, instead of imparting knowledge to learners in a decontextualized fashion, tries to build a learning community in which both teacher and learner can learn together through various opportunities for

genuine and authentic dialogue which is a vital part of productive scaffolding.

Scaffolding and dialogic teaching must occur concurrently in order to develop learners' creative thinking and is especially beneficial for learners who require extra support (Gudina & Wakuma, 2022; Rojas-Drummond et al., 2013). Teachers provide such support through dialogue, in which the instructor prepares students for tasks and then follows up with elaborations including the three core scaffolding cycle phases: Focus - Task - Feedback (Martin & Rose, 2005; Rose, 2006, 2018; Rose & Acevedo, 2006).

While the goal of integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching is to mediate students' learning, its features vary depending on the context. In designing EFL listening and speaking activities, there are major tents that need to be addressed; 1) encourage students' contributions to dialogue at the idea level rather than the word level; 2) be skilled in using students' ideas and connecting these ideas to new knowledge; 3) keep the dialogue focused and on track; 4) provide clear instructions to students; and 5) provide positive feedback on student responses.

3. Method

3.1. Participants of the research:

The participants of the research consisted of (76) students. They were drawn randomly from second year Faculty of Education, Menoufia University, during the second semester of the 2021-2022 academic year. They are all Egyptians and most of them belong to the same social and economic background. The participants represented two groups: experimental and control. To make sure the two groups were equivalent in their entry level in listening and speaking skills, pre-testing statistics took place, and the results are shown in the following table (1)

Table (1) The Experimental and the Control Groups' Equivalence before Treatment in EFL Listening and Speaking skills

Skills	Group	N	Mean	St. Deviation	t-value	d.f	sig
Listening Skills	Control	38	10.08	2.23	0.051	74	Not Significant
	Experimental	38	10.05	2.27			
Speaking Skills	Control	38	9.45	2.33	0.911	74	Not Significant
	Experimental	38	8.97	2.20			

The previous table clearly illustrates that the calculated "t" values were not significant, indicating that there were no statistically significance differences between the mean scores of both groups. This demonstrates that the two groups (experimental and control) were equal prior to the programme intervention.

3.2. Design of the research:

The researcher reviewed the literature and research variables' relevant studies using the analytical descriptive method. The researcher also adopted the pre-posttest quasi-experimental design for examining how EFL Listening and speaking skills could be developed via integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching-based program.

3.3. Instruments of the research:

Instruments of the current research included an EFL listening and speaking skills pre-posttest with a rubric for grading students' oral skills. These instruments are presented in detail as follows:

3.3.1. The EFL listening and speaking skills pre-posttest:

The EFL listening and speaking skills test was prepared to be used to evaluate students' EFL listening and speaking skills. It was used as a pre-test to determine the level of the research participants in EFL listening and

speaking skills and to prove that both groups were equivalent in terms of EFL listening and speaking skills. Furthermore, it was used as a post-test to investigate the effectiveness of using the proposed program to identify any possible progress and differences in the EFL listening and speaking skills of both groups (See Appendix A).

Description of the EFL Listening and speaking Skills Test

The EFL listening skills and speaking test consisted of two parts; part (A) The EFL listening skills test that was designed to measure students' listening skills (listening for gist, listening for details, inferring meaning, predicting content, and detecting signposts). The second part includes the EFL speaking skills test that was prepared to be used to evaluate students' EFL speaking skills. Student's speaking performance was judged using a rubric (See appendix B). Three raters assessed the students using the rubric. The average mark of the three totals was used in statistics.

Validity of the EFL listening and Speaking Skills Test

The test was validated by the jury members. The jury members judged the test to have high validity. In the light of the jury members' suggestions, few modifications were suggested, such as modifying some sentences in terms of words selected to be clearer for the students, recognizing the questions to be more plausible and clearer for students. Their modifications and suggestions were considered. Thus, the test was valid.

Reliability of the EFL listening and Speaking Skills Test

To measure the reliability of the test, it was administrated to a (23) sophomores other than those participating in the experimentation. Then, it was re-administrated to the same group after two weeks.

Table (2) Cronbach's Alpha for EFL Listening and Speaking skills

Skills	Cronbach's Alpha
Speaking skills	0.832
Listening skills	0.819

The alpha coefficient for the speaking skills is 0.832, and for listening skills is 0.819 suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency. (Note that a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered “acceptable” in most social science research situations.) This means the correlation coefficient is relatively high. Therefore, the EFL listening and speaking skills test was considered a reliable one.

3.5. Integrating Instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into Dialogic teaching-based program

At the beginning of the program, the aims and/ or objectives, importance, and procedures of the program were presented to the experimental group as well as the importance of listening and speaking skills. They were also informed about the role of the teacher and the role of the students. After the orientation session, the remaining instructional sessions were introduced to the participants. Each lesson was devoted to developing one or more sub skills of listening and speaking skills.

Objectives of the program

This program aimed at developing Faculty of Education sophomores' EFL listening and speaking skills (See appendix C). This aim was sub-divided into the following objectives:

1. Listen for gist.
2. Listen to identify the details.
3. Listen to make inference.
4. predict content.
5. Listen to guess the meaning of difficult words.
6. Detect signposts

7. Speak spontaneously and naturally.
8. Speak confidently without hesitation, remarkable pauses and repetition.
9. Express their ideas intelligibly and reasonably in different topics.
10. Express their ideas in complete and clear sentences.
11. Produce accurate sounds.
12. Produce appropriate intonation.
13. Use language that is understandable and appropriate for the situation.
14. Use grammatical structures correctly.
15. Respond in a way that shows comprehension of what has been heard.
16. Exchange information.
17. Respond to different situations appropriately.
18. Perform basic communication functions effectively.

Procedures of integrating Instructional Scaffolding Interaction Cycle into Dialogic Teaching:

In the context of foreign language teaching and learning, the scaffolding interaction cycle phases were incorporated into the dialogue teaching stages as follows:

The first Scaffolding cycle phase "focus" concentrated on activities that are planned and assigned based on the learner's knowledge. This phase is interwoven with the first stage of dialogue teaching " Set it up stage " in which the teacher prepares a topic connected to the students' life and interests through the following academic interactions:

- a. Linking to prior knowledge, in which the teachers connect previous student experiences, knowledge, or inquiry to present work. The dialogic interaction by the teacher is clearly based on previous student experiences. Teachers draw on students' experiences both inside and outside of the classroom to identify new learning issue inside current mental schemas.
- b. Promoting Questioning and interpretation, in which the instructor asks students what they know about a topic, their views, or future actions, and encourages them to offer detailed explanations. Teachers frequently ask and urge pupils to elaborate.

- c. Appropriating and recasting, in which the instructor repeats the students' thoughts and incorporates them into the scaffolded discourse of the teacher. Students are encouraged to make their thoughts known during a whole-class discussion. However, the many ideas presented by different students were dispersed across the classroom. When teachers accept students' ideas and include them into their discourse, this is referred to as appropriation. To enhance student knowledge, appropriation is frequently followed by revoicing, or in other words, recasting or restating where teachers restated students' thoughts and expand on their speech in following elaborations.

The second scaffolding interaction cycle phase "Task" is critical and comprises the moves of defining dialogic discourse elements. This cycle is more than simply a question that stimulates replies from students; it also educates all pupils to answer correctly on a consistent basis. This cycle phase is intertwined with the second, third, and fourth dialogic teaching stages that can be described as follows:

In the second stage of dialogic teaching "Let it run", the instructor gives opportunities for listening and speaking with a range of fascinating activities that focus on issues of interest to the students; topics to which they can relate and are eager to express thoughts and ideas.

When pupils are working, the instructor moves around the room to ensure that they are on track and to check whether they require assistance when working in pairs or groups. The mistakes and instances that occur are noted by the teacher and can be used for the language focus part of the session. The teacher listens and notes errors or instances where pupils required to explain themselves using a different or more sophisticated language. Some learners may struggle to create inquiries, lack basic vocabulary, or require specific expressions and idioms to improve their communication skills.

The third stage of dialogic teaching "Round it off" is the language focus stage, which focuses on form, meaning, pronunciation, and so on. As appropriate, teachers utilize their notes to emphasize, explain, discuss, adapt, and expand on some of the pertinent words. The teacher goes through the emerged language as a great opportunity for language work. In the

fourth stage of dialogic teaching “Recycle”, students create another dialogic discourse using the right language and expressions. The previous stages of dialogic teaching were interwoven with the second phase of scaffolded interaction cycle through the following classroom pedagogic exchanges:

- a. Modeling, in which the teacher gives examples for students to imitate in order to help them apply suitable knowledge and skills in new settings.
- b. Summarizing is a technique in which the teacher summarises the important aspects of the topic. Teachers require students to summarise the content of the whole class discussion to ensure that students comprehend the task's aim and the primary principles underpinning the task.
- c. Think aloud, in which teachers encourage students to voice their ideas and reflect on their learning. Students absorb their concepts when they practise thinking aloud. This method is frequently used to assist students in becoming more self-aware of their learning.
- d. Encouraging success anticipation by increasing pupils' belief in success. Building a sense of belonging, confidence, and applauding students for their hard work raises their expectations of success.
- e. Creating social spaces in which teachers provide opportunity for students to exchange ideas in front of the entire class or in small groups emphasizing the necessity of functioning as a team.

The Third scaffolding interaction cycle phase “Feedback” where the teacher evaluates by either affirming or rejecting (Evaluate), to direct learner activity or behavior. The feedback cycle is more than just the responses that are evaluated or commented on; it is also the constantly expanding shared knowledge in which responses are always confirmed, while responses that are not adequately prepared in discourse are frequently denied or ignored. The fifth stage of dialogic teaching “Evaluation” where the teacher has a discussion with the students about how they find the experience, if they Would they like to try this kind of activity, was this lesson different from usual? The students were asked for suggestions if they have any. This cycle phase integrates with the fifth stage of dialogic teaching through the following classroom pedagogic exchanges:

- a. Contrast situations, in which the teacher compares and contrasts multiple students' conversations. Contrasting situations assist students identify (a) information dimensions that they would overlook if only one example is offered to them and (b) general principles and essential elements that determine the result of their dialogic interactions.
- b. Peer review, in which teachers employ students from adjoining classes to assess group dialogic interactions. During the peer review session, each group is tasked with delivering input to a specific group. Peer review sessions provide two functions: (a) to enable students reflect on their own developed discourse while offering feedback to their classmates, and (b) to widen students' knowledge integration frontiers through discourse peer critique.

Program Activities

During the sessions, the following activities were assigned to the students to help them practice and master the skills required:

- Teacher anecdote.
- Preference ranking.
- Interview
- Speed, share and compare.
- Help Wanted.
- Gap Filling.
- Jeopardy
- Listen and complete orally.
- Human web.
- Press conference.
- QR Code.
- Negotiating criteria.
- Let's talk.
- Listen and respond.

Implementation of the experiment:

The researcher presented continual rewards to students due to their attendance and working. At the beginning of each session, the researcher used to set specific, attainable and available objectives to students to increase their motivation. Verbal persuasion was also introduced to students

as a source of strengthening their oral communication skills. The researcher used some activities, tasks and games, which were presented through a variety of instructional aids.

Results and Discussion

Part one: Results

SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, version 18) was used to analyze the data. The current research's findings are provided in light of the research hypotheses. To investigate the significance of differences, t- value were calculated for the difference in mean scores between the two groups, as shown in the table below:

Results related to the first hypothesis:

The following table (3) clearly shows that calculated "t" value (16.872) surpasses the tabulated "t" value at 74 degrees of freedom and a significance level of "0.01," indicating that the difference in mean scores between the two groups in overall listening skills was statistically significant. The eta squared value (η^2) and effect size (d) are calculated to investigate the educational importance of the data, and the value (eta squared) is 0.79, indicating that the effect size is substantial as it exceeds 0.14. In the light of this result, it can be stated that 79% of the difference in students' total listening skills scores can be attributable to the intervention given to the experimental group. As a result, the first hypothesis is accepted.

Table (3): The calculated value "t" of the difference in listening skills post-test mean scores between the two groups

Skills	t-test	D.f	Sig	η^2	D
Overall listening skills	16.872	74	at (0.01)	0.79	3.92
Listening for gist	7.822	74	at (0.01)	0.45	1.82
Listening for details	8.361	74	at (0.01)	0.49	1.94
Inferring meaning	10.39	74	at (0.01)	0.59	2.42
Predicting content	10.001	74	at (0.01)	0.57	2.33
Detecting Signposts	9.631	74	at (0.01)	0.56	2.24

Results related to the second hypothesis:

The following table (4) clearly shows that calculated "t" value of overall speaking skills (16.578) surpasses the tabulated "t" value at 74 degrees of freedom and a significance level of "0.01," indicating that the difference in mean scores between the two groups in overall speaking skills was statistically significant. The eta squared value (η^2) and effect size (d) are calculated to investigate the educational importance of the data, and the value (eta squared) is 0.79, indicating that the effect size is substantial as it exceeds 0.14. In the light of this result, it can be stated that 79% of the difference in students' total speaking skills scores can be attributable to the intervention given to the experimental group. As a result, the second hypothesis was accepted.

Table (4): The calculated value "t" of the difference in speaking skills post-test mean scores between the two groups

Skills	t-test	D.f	Sig	η^2	D
Overall speaking skills	16.578	74	at (0.01)	0.79	3.85
Fluency	12.326	74	at (0.01)	0.67	2.87
Accuracy	14.457	74	at (0.01)	0.74	3.36
Interaction	13.023	74	at (0.01)	0.70	3.03

Part Two: Discussion

The current research was designed to investigate integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching - based program for developing oral communication skills among Faculty of Education sophomores. Results of the current research revealed that integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching - based program is effective in developing listening and speaking skills. Findings of the current research are due to the following:

- a. The program activities are interesting and are relevant to engage students in the activity. As a result, learning becomes more meaningful, sparks students' interest and help them become more involved in the learning process.
- b. The researcher uses verbal persuasion feedback in the form of positive statements before, during, and after performing activities to help learners gain confidence.
- c. Integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching gives all students more opportunities to use English communicatively to foster positive attitudes toward learning English.
- d. Connecting to students' prior knowledge helps students recall relevant information and triggers their critical thinking. Using students' unique learning experiences can reduce their cognitive load by retaining relevant information in their working memory.
- e. Modeling gives examples for students to follow in order to accomplish targeted learning outcomes. Teachers assist students grasp tasks by clarifying vocabulary, explaining sentences, and reformulating their discourse into more acceptable dialogic interactions.
- f. Thinking aloud encourages pupils to think more thoroughly by speaking out about their comprehension of the question. This causes cognitive dissonance and prompts pupils to reflect on their learning. Additionally, group conversations might assist students in making their mental models apparent. Making a social environment for group interaction allows students to mix distinct individual thoughts and produce coherent and integrated knowledge cooperatively.
- g. The instructional activities focused on understanding and accomplishing very interesting and motivating tasks using authentic language related to students' interest. Working in groups created conversations, discussions and learning opportunities that helped in developing listening and speaking skills.
- h. The activities and the tasks were student-centered that allowed students to participate as active learners working in groups, pairs and as individual in order to get the targeted skills and assess each other's progress than being only recipient of knowledge.

- i. Setting the goal of each activity and giving clear instructions helped students to be aware of what they are going to do and doing it effectively.
- j. Providing feedback played a crucial role in developing listening and speaking skills as it helped students take corrective actions about their responses in order to improve the targeted skills and reach an acceptable level of performance.
- k. Connecting students with their own personal life and experience helped to promote and enhance their performance and build their abilities and confidence in using English in real life situations focusing more on listening and speaking.

5.2. Conclusions:

Based on the findings of the research, integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching-based program has proved to be effective in developing students' listening and speaking skills. Integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching maximises the full affordances of dialogic teaching for fostering students' knowledge construction, metacognition skills, and scientific reasoning (Garcia-Mila et al., 2021). Integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching promote idea-sharing and self-reflection. This integration helps teachers to provide timely feedback; and connecting new tasks to prior knowledge of students encouraging them to form arguments, ask questions, and develop Faculty of Education sophomores' EFL listening and speaking skills (Rapanta et al., 2021).

Instructional scaffolding interaction cycle is integrated with dialogic teaching to provide a supportive learning environment for students. In the framework of dialogic teaching, teachers must scaffold student learning (Puente et al., 2013a). This integration is valid and plays a significant function as the ultimate purpose of scaffolding is to outsource responsibility for learning to students, they must offer enough scaffolding to students while also recognising and encouraging their active engagement in learning. In conclusion, integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching was effective in developing Faculty of Education sophomores' EFL listening and speaking skills.

5.3. Recommendations:

Based on the findings and conclusions of the current research, the following recommendations are presented:

1. EFL listening and speaking skills should be given more attention in our EFL classes; more time and efforts should be exerted to develop them.
2. More opportunities should be given to students to participate in the activities which help in developing EFL listening and speaking skills.
3. More consideration should be given to the development of the methods of teaching listening and speaking skills to governmental secondary school students as well as other stages.

5.4. Suggestions for further research:

In the light of the present research results, the following suggestions are provided:

1. Integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching to develop EFL reading and writing skills among Faculty of Education Students.
2. Integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching to enhance Secondary stage students' EFL listening and speaking skills.
3. Integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching to develop faculty of Education students' motivation towards learning EFL.
4. Integrating instructional scaffolding interaction cycle into dialogic teaching in teaching grammar to secondary stage students.

References

- Abdulaal, M. A. A. D., Alenazi, M. H., Tajuddin, A. J. A., & Hamidi, B. (2022). Dynamic vs. diagnostic assessment: impacts on EFL learners' speaking fluency and accuracy, learning anxiety, and cognitive load. *Language Testing in Asia*, 12(1). doi:10.1186/s40468-022-00179-0
- Ahmed, S. (2019). Using Drama Techniques for Developing EFL Speaking Skills and Reducing Speaking Anxiety among Secondary Stage Students. *Faculty of Education Journal, Assuit University*, 35(11).
- Akkakoson, S. (2016). Speaking Anxiety in English Conversation Classrooms Among Thai Students. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 13, 63-82. doi:10.32890/mjli2016.13.1.4
- Al-Hawamleh, M. S., Alazemi, A. F., & Al-Jamal, D. A. H. (2022). Digital portfolio and self-regulation in speaking tasks. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 7(1). doi:10.1186/s40862-022-00141-w
- Alexander, R. J. (2017). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (5th ed.). Cambridge: Dialogos.
- Alexander, R. J. (2018). Developing dialogic teaching: Genesis, process, trial *Research Papers in Education*, 33(5), 561–598.
- Alexander, R. J. (2020). *A dialogic teaching companion*. London: Routledge.
- Anwer, I. (2002). The effectiveness of a suggested program in oral acquisition, aural comprehension and oral performance. *Studies in curricula and teaching methods, Cairo*(83).
- Bada, S. O. (2015). Constructivism learning theory: A paradigm for teaching and learning. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 5(1), 66-70.
- Baffy, M. (2018). Constructed dialogue as a resource for promoting students' socialization to written academic discourse in an EAP class. *Linguistics and Education*, 46, 33-42. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2018.06.001>
- Baxter, J., A., & Williams, S., R. (2010). Social and analytic scaffolding in middle school mathematics: managing the dilemma of telling. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 13, 7-26.

- Bigdeli, R., & Rahimi, A. (2015). Impact of scaffolding on complexity and accuracy of Iranian EFL learners' narrative writing. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 5, 143. doi:10.18844/gjflt.v5i2.188
- Bignell, C. (2019). Promoting NQT linguistic awareness of dialogic teaching practices: a dialogic model of professional development. *Literacy*, 53(3), 150-159. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12163>
- Boyd, M. P., & Markarian, W. C. (2015). Dialogic teaching and dialogic stance: Moving beyond interactional form. *Research in the Teaching English*, 49, 272–296.
- Bril, M., Gerrits, A., & Visser, M. (2021). THE EFFECTS OF LINGUISTIC AND COGNITIVE FACTORS ON THE L2 PROCESSING OF ORAL INPUT: A SELF-PACED LISTENING EXPERIMENT. *International Journal of Listening*. doi:10.1080/10904018.2021.1992281
- Brunfaut, T., & Révész, A. (2015). The Role of Task and Listener Characteristics in Second Language Listening. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(1), 141-168. doi:10.1002/tesq.168
- Chang, A., & Read, J. (2006). The Effects of Listening Support on the Listening Performance of EFL Learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(2), 375-397. doi:10.2307/40264527
- Chang, A. C., & Millett, S. (2014). The effect of extensive listening on developing L2 listening fluency: some hard evidence. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 68(1), 31-40.
- Chin, C. (2006). Classroom interaction in science: Teacher questioning and feedback to students' responses. *International Journal of Science Education*, 28(11), 1315 –1346.
- Chin, C. (2007). Teacher questioning in science classrooms: Approaches that stimulate productive thinking. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 44(6), 815-843. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20171>
- Davis, L., Timpe-Laughlin, V., Gu, N., & Ockey, G. (2018). Face-to-Face Speaking Assessment in the Digital Age: Interactive Speaking Tasks Online. In M. Davis, M. Norris, E. Malone, H. McKay, & A. Son (Eds.), *Useful Assessment and Evaluation in Language Education* (pp. 115-130): Georgetown University Press.

- DiCerbo, P. A., Anstrom, K. A., Baker, L. L., & Rivera, C. (2014). A Review of the Literature on Teaching Academic English to English Language Learners. *Review of Educational Research*, 84(3), 446-482. doi:10.3102/0034654314532695
- Douglas, A. (2000). Learning as participation in social practices: Interpreting student perspectives on learning. *Changing English*, 7(2), 153-165.
- Duff, P. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 169-192.
- Duff, P., & Kobayashi, M. (Eds.). (2010). *The intersection of social, cognitive, and cultural processes in language learning: a second language socialization approach*: Oxford University Press.
- El Karfa, A. (2007). Open classroom communication and the learning of citizenship values. *English Teaching forum*(4), 38-42.
- El Sakka, S. (2016). Self-Regulated Strategy Instruction for Developing Speaking Proficiency and Reducing Speaking Anxiety of Egyptian University Students. *English Language Teaching*, 9, 22. doi:10.5539/elt.v9n12p22
- Fernández Fernández, R. (2020). Using Dialogic Talks in EFL Primary Teacher Education: An Experience. *Revista Nebrija de Linguística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de Lenguas*, 14. doi:10.26378/rnlael1429367
- Fu, T., & Nassaji, H. (2016). Corrective feedback, learner uptake, and feedback perception in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6, 159-181. doi:10.14746/ssl.t.2016.6.1.8
- García-Carrión, R., López de Aguilera, G., Padrós, M., & Ramis-Salas, M. (2020). Implications for Social Impact of Dialogic Teaching and Learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00140
- García-Mila, M., Miralda-Banda, A., Luna, J., Remesal, A., Castells Gómez, N., & Medina, S. (2021). Change in Classroom Dialogicity to Promote Cultural Literacy across Educational Levels. *Sustainability*, 13, 6410. doi:10.3390/su13116410

- Gudina, N., & Wakuma, M. (2022). EFL instructors' scaffolding strategies use in writing classrooms: The case of Wollega University. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 12, 222-238. doi:10.18844/gjflt.v12i4.6804
- Hall, J. K., & Verplaetse, L. S. (2000). *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*.
- Hammonds, J., & Gibbons, P. (Eds.). (2001). *What is scaffolding*: Newtown: Primary English Teaching Association (PETA).
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (Vol. 4th ed). London: Longman.
- Hartmann, C., Angersbach, J., & Rummel, N. (2015). *Social interaction, constructivism and their application within (CS) CL theories*.
- Hattie, J., & Yates, G. C. R. (2013). Visible learning and the science of how we learn. *Visible Learning and the Science of How We Learn*, 1-349. doi:10.4324/9781315885025
- Hennessy, S., & Davies, M. (Eds.). (2020). *Teacher professional development to support classroom dialogue: Challenges and promises*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hennessy, S., Rojas-Drummond, S., Higham, R., Márquez, A., Maine, F., Ríos, R., . . . Barrera, M. (2016). Developing a coding scheme for analysing classroom dialogue across educational contexts. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 9, 16-44. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2015.12.001>
- Hentasmaka, D., & Cahyono, B. (2021). Peer Feedback Uptakes and Outcomes across EFL Students' Proficiency Levels: A Study at Tertiary Education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14, 271-286. doi:10.29333/iji.2021.14316a
- Howe, C., Hennessy, S., Mercer, N., Vrikki, M., & Wheatley, L. (2019). Teacher-student dialogue during classroom teaching: Does it really impact on student outcomes? *Journal Learning Science*, 28(4-5), 462-512. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2019.1573730>
- Ibatova, A. Z., Korkiya, E. D., Shcherbatykh, L. N., Vagabov, M., & Salimullina, E. V. (2022). English Culture and Russian EFL Learners' Speaking: Effectiveness of Using English Cultural-Oriented Materials on Fluency and Accuracy. *International Journal*

- of Society, Culture and Language*, 10(2), 72-81.
doi:10.22034/ijscsl.2022.541737.2436
- Jacobs, G. M., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2001). *Paradigm Shift: Understanding and Implementing Change in Second Language Education*.
- Jie, Y., & Ying, C. (2010, 17-19 Sept. 2010). *An empirical study of the effect of self-regulated learning in network environment on EFL students' listening and speaking ability*. Paper presented at the 2010 International Conference on Educational and Information Technology.
- Jocuns, k. (2021). Dialogic Teaching as a Way to Promote Students' English Language Use in EFL classroom. *PASAA*, 62.
- 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.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2019.02.003>
- Komalasari, F. (2013). *Review of the Functions of Language (Discourse Analysis)* (Vol. Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Mataram University).
- Lin, C., & Mubarak, H. (2021). Learning Analytics for Investigating the Mind Map-Guided AI Chatbot Approach in an EFL Flipped Speaking Classroom. *Educational Technology & Society*, 24(4), 16-35. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48629242>
- Lukitasari, D. (2020). Postcolonial theories on promoting world english in efl speaking classes. *Elite English and Literature Journal*, 7, 13.
doi:10.24252/elite.v7i1a2
- Lyle, S. (2008). Dialogic Teaching: Discussing Theoretical Contexts and Reviewing Evidence from Classroom Practice. *Language and Education*, 22, 222 — 240. doi:10.2167/le778.0
- Ma, L. (2010, 22-24 June 2010). *A study on the effect of college English autonomous listening and speaking learning under the network environment on the learners' listening and speaking ability*. Paper presented at the 2010 2nd International Conference on Education Technology and Computer.
- Mackiewicz, J., & Thompson, I. K. (2014). Instruction, Cognitive Scaffolding, and Motivational Scaffolding in Writing Center Tutoring. *Composition Studies*, 42, 54-78.

- Mahn, H., & John-Steiner, V. (2012). Vygotsky and Sociocultural Approaches to Teaching and Learning. In *Handbook of Psychology, Second Edition*.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (Eds.). (2005). *Designing literacy pedagogy: Scaffolding asymmetries*: London: Equinox.
- McCormick, D. E., & Donato, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Teacher questions as scaffolded assistance in and ESL classroom*: Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Mercer, N., Hennessy, S., & Warwick, P. (2019). Dialogue, thinking together and digital technology in the classroom: Some educational implications of a continuing line of inquiry. *Int J Educ R*(97), 187–199.
- Mercer, N., & Howe, C. (2012). Explaining the dialogic processes of teaching and learning: The value and potential of sociocultural theory. *Learning Cultural Society International*, 1(1), 12–21. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.10.1016/j.lcsi.2012.03.001>
- Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach* (Vol. Abingdon, New York: Routledge).
- Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 279-310.
- Mortimer, E., & Scott, P. (2003). *Meaning Making in Secondary Science Classroom*: Open University Press.
- Movva, S., Alapati, P. R., Veliventi, P., & Maithreyi, G. (2022). The Effect of Pre, While, and Post Listening Activities on Developing EFL Students' Listening Skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(8), 1500-1507. doi:10.17507/tpls.1208.05
- Nardacchione, G., & Peconio, G. (2022). Peer Tutoring and Scaffolding Principle for Inclusive Teaching. *Elementa. Intersections between Philosophy, Epistemology and Empirical Perspectives*, 1. doi:10.7358/elem-2021-0102-nape
- Newton, J., & Nation, I. (2008). Listening. In *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking* (pp. 37-58): Routledge.
- Nunan, D. (2001). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Pacheco, M., Daniel, S., & Pray, L. (2017). Scaffolding Practice: Supporting Emerging Bilinguals' Academic Language Use in Two Classroom Communities. *Language Arts, 95*(2), 63-76. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44809940>
- Paterson, R. (2022). Prompting Metacognitive Reflection to Facilitate Speaking Improvements in Learners of English as a Foreign Language. *English Teaching and Learning, 46*(2), 157-177. doi:10.1007/s42321-021-00086-2
- Phillipson, N., & Wegerif, R. (2019). The Thinking Together Approach to Dialogic Teaching. In *Deeper Learning, Dialogic Learning, and Critical Thinking* (pp. 32-47): Routledge.
- Pimentel, S. D., & McNeill, K. L. (2013). Conducting talk in secondary science classrooms: Investigating instructional moves and teachers' beliefs. *Science Education, 97*(3), 367-394.
- Pourhosein, A., & Ahmadi, M. (2011). A Study of Factors Affecting EFL Learners' English Listening Comprehension and the Strategies for Improvement. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*. doi:10.4304/jltr.2.5.977-988
- Priyatmojo, A. (2014). Teaching transactional and interpersonal conversation: A classroom action research. *9*, 9-16. doi:10.15294/lc.v9i1.3215
- Qiu, X., & Xu, J. (2022). "Listening should be done communicatively": Do task-supported language teaching and post-task self-reflection facilitate the development of L2 listening proficiency? *System, 109*. doi:10.1016/j.system.2022.102897
- Rabab'ah, G. (2016). The Effect of Communication Strategy Training on the Development of EFL Learners' Strategic Competence and Oral Communicative Ability. *J Psycholinguist Res, 45*(3), 625-651. doi:10.1007/s10936-015-9365-3
- Rapanta, C., Gonçalves, C., Pereira, J., Cascalheira, D., Gil, B., Morais, R., . . . Macagno, F. (2021). Multicultural classroom discourse dataset on teachers' and students' dialogic empathy. *Data in Brief, 39*, 107518. doi:10.1016/j.dib.2021.107518

- Redjeki, I., & Muhajir, R. (2022). Supporting Students' Self-Directed Learning in EFL Speaking Classroom by Using Cake Application. *Journal of English Language Learning*, 6, 212-219. doi:10.31949/jell.v6i2.3421
- Resnick, L., Asterhan, C., Clarke, S., & Schantz, F. (2018). Next Generation Research in Dialogic Learning. In *The Wiley Handbook of Teaching and Learning* (pp. 323-338).
- Reznitskaya, A. (2012). DIALOGIC TEACHING: Rethinking Language Use During Literature Discussions. *The Reading Teacher*, 65(7), 446-456. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41853053>
- Reznitskaya, A., & Wilkinson, I. (2015). Positively Transforming Classroom Practice Through Dialogic Teaching. In *Positive Psychology in Practice* (pp. 279-296).
- Rojas-Drummond, S., Maine, F., Alarcón, M., Trigo, A., Barrera Olmedo, M., Mazón, N., . . . Hofmann, R. (2016). Dialogic literacy: Talking, reading and writing among primary school children. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 12. doi:10.1016/j.lcsi.2016.09.005
- Rojas-Drummond, S., Torreblanca, O., Pedraza, H., Vélez, M., & Guzmán, K. (2013). 'Dialogic scaffolding': Enhancing learning and understanding in collaborative contexts. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 2(1), 11-21. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2012.12.003>
- Rose, D. (2006). Scaffolding the English curriculum for indigenous secondary students: Final report for NSW 7-10 English Syllabus. *Aboriginal Support Pilot Project. Sydney: Office of the Board of Studies.*
- Rose, D. (2018). Evaluating the Task of Language Learning. In B. Miller, P. McCardle, & V. Connelly (Eds.), *Writing Development in Struggling Learners* (Vol. 35, pp. 161-181): Brill.
- Rose, D., & Acevedo, C. (2006). Closing the gap and accelerating learning in the Middle Years of Schooling *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 14(2), 32-45.
- Safdari, M., & Fathi, J. (2020). Investigating the role of dynamic assessment on speaking accuracy and fluency of pre-intermediate EFL learners. *Cogent Education*, 7(1). doi:10.1080/2331186X.2020.1818924

- Sarmiento-Campos., Lázaro-Guillermo, J., Silvera-Alarcón, E., Cuellar-Quispe, S., Huamán-Romaní, Y., Apaza, O., & Sorkheh, A. (2022). The Effectiveness of Scaffolding Method on EFL Learners' Speaking Achievement. *Education Research International*, 2022. doi:10.1155/2022/3514892
- Scarcella, R. (2003). *Academic English: A conceptual framework*. Retrieved from The University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute.:
- Sedláček, M., & Sedova, K. (2017). How many are talking? The role of collectivity in dialogic teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 85, 99-108. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2017.07.001
- Šed'ová, K., Šalamounová, Z., Švaříček, R., & Sedláček, M. (2020). Elements of Dialogic Teaching and How to Get Them into Classrooms. In *Getting Dialogic Teaching into Classrooms: Making Change Possible* (pp. 17-36). Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- Siumarlata, V. (2017). Analysis of interactional and transactional language used by the english lecturers in learning process at english department of fkip uki toraja. *Jurnal KIP*, VI(2), 1497-1519.
- Strobelberger, K. (2012). *Classroom discourse in EFL teaching: A cross-cultural perspective*: Herstellung: Diplomica Verlag GmbH, Hamburg.
- Thornbury, S., & Meddings, L. (2001). Roaring in the Chimney (or: What Coursebooks are Good For). *Modern English Teacher*, 10(3).
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Wang, J., Abdullah, R., & Leong, L. M. (2022). Studies of Teaching and Learning English-Speaking Skills: A Review and Bibliometric Analysis. *Frontiers in Education*, 7. doi:10.3389/educ.2022.880990
- Webb, N., Franke, M., Ing, M., Wong, J., Fernandez, C., Shin, N., & Turrou, A. (2014). Engaging with others' mathematical ideas: Interrelationships among student participation, teachers' instructional practices, and learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 63, 79–93. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2013.02.001
- Wells, G. (Ed.) (2000). *Dialogic inquiry in education: Building on the legacy of Vygotsky*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Wen-Chi Vivian, W., Jun Scott Chen, H., & Jie Chi, Y. (2017). Creating an Online Learning Community in a Flipped Classroom to Enhance EFL Learners' Oral Proficiency. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 20(2), 142-157. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/90002170>
- Yang, H. (2014). The Effects of Advance Organizers and Subtitles on EFL Learners' Listening Comprehension Skills. *CALICO Journal*, 31(3), 345-373. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/calicojournal.31.3.345>
- Yawiloeng, R. (2021). Peer Scaffolding During EFL Reading Activities: A Sociocultural Perspective. *English Language Teaching*, 14, 44-54. doi:10.5539/elt.v14n12p44
- Yu-Fen, Y. (2015). Automatic Scaffolding and Measurement of Concept Mapping for EFL Students to Write Summaries. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 18(4), 273-286. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.18.4.273>
- Yu, S. (2006). *Listening and speaking skill development in a taiwanese tertiary efl context: Manipulating power-in-interaction for participation*. (Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics). University of Adelaide, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.