

**DIALOGIC INQUIRY: A METHOD FOR IMPROVING EFL
LEARNERS' ORAL COMMUNICATIVE PROFICIENCY
AND COMMUNICATION WILLINGNESS**

Nurzada Naubetbaeva

PhD student of KarSU named after Berdakh

n.naubetbaeva@gmail.com

Annotation. The goal of the current study was to find out how much dialogic inquiry affects EFL learners' oral communication ability and willingness to communicate. Thirty female EFL students in an English language and translation program participated in the study context. The study's findings showed a significant improvement in the students' oral comprehension abilities and levels of willingness to communicate through the use of ten topics spread over ten cycles, an oral comprehension test with an analytical rubric for analysis, a willingness to communicate questionnaire, and an observation form. The study concludes with some recommendations and conclusions that may be useful for future research.

Keywords: EFL students, communicative skills, dialogic education, and readiness to communicate

Language is an inter subjective social system that we use to organize and create social reality, which is represented as language products in language classrooms. This has been thoroughly verified. To put it another way, knowledge is seen as a multifaceted conversational act in which people should be fully engaged to build it collaboratively rather than as a monologist possession, and language can be considered as a dialogic activity. The constructivist epistemological interpretation of learning, which holds that people use their schemata to learn and create new understandings, is consistent with this ontological premise. By offering instructional ideas and techniques that enable students to frequently participate in dialogic learning, such constructivist viewpoints can be fully utilized in language classrooms. Caughlan et al[1;212-246]. The study's objective was to investigate how the idea of dialogic teaching relates to students' actual interaction, engagement, and linguistic creation in the speaking classroom, taking into account prior research. Dialogic education has expanded over the past forty years in a variety of contexts, cultures, and age groups [2;140]. It was suggested as a substitute for monological approaches based on the idea that dialogical meaning-making enables students to reach higher cognitive levels[3;21].

There is disagreement over the definition of dialogic teaching, according to Alexander[4;561-598]. However, the accumulation of various viewpoints is made possible by the capacity to control the power of speech. It could be used as a

qualification to indicate a unique spoken word pedagogy that is based on widely accepted discourse, evidence, and presumptions. Dialogic education, which creates a path of study into equitable researcher-practitioner interaction in deconstructing classroom practice, has recently stimulated language education science and practice. It helped shift the understanding of people and cognitive components, including more general aspects of the learning process, from a focus on prior knowledge's mental schemata to an emphasis on conversation, inter-subjectivity, and culture as essential for learning and growth. Additionally, dialogic teaching has a strong foundation in Vygotsky's theory of cognitive development, which laid the foundation for language education as we know it today and placed social interaction at the center of the learning and development processes. Because of his contributions, language education research has changed from emphasizing students' cognitive development as an intra-mental activity to viewing it from a sociocultural perspective as an inter-mental activity. This fundamental Vygotskian idea gave rise to our present understanding of language as the most important tool for learning, thinking, and growth that takes place on the social and cognitive levels. To put it another way, according to the dialogic turn, language is both a cultural (which encourages inter-mental activity) and a psychological (which encourages intra-mental activity) tool that helps students inter-think (think and create meaning together) and attain higher mental functions that are essential to cognitive. Believing in such an interactive concept of dialogue allows us to emphasize that attempts to simply draw learners' attention to the structure of speech will train them to generate (rather than process) specific functional forms of dialogue, and the entire academic process will diverge to concentrate on syntactic strategies for achieving communicative outcomes[5;75]. According to Ammar & Hassan , engaging in a collaborative discourse about a specific issue with a different individual while speaking a foreign language corresponds to the interpersonal category of "language-speaking." In terms of the concept's applicability, the different challenges related to factors impacting the application of dialogic concepts in an everyday school context, such as the responsibilities of both teachers and students, as well as the predetermined objectives and content[6;46-82].

In the curriculum, are emphasized by Lefstein . He emphasizes that rather than ignoring these tensions, they must be worked through to be resolved. Unless they are compelled and inspired to do so, students typically do not participate in high-quality dialogue[7;190-214].

They require assistance from people who are receptive to their initiatives and who use speech to ensure reciprocity and provide continuity.

Additionally, they gain from teacher-guided participation, which enables them to share knowledge[8;58-74]. Similar to this, while it is widely acknowledged that

dialogic teaching should incorporate a range of teaching and learning talk patterns and approaches, authorities who support dialogic teaching often describe classroom discourse in terms of superficial elements like open-ended questions and anticipated answers, which is a narrow understanding of dialogic teaching as discourse functions. When educators embrace a dialogic instructional posture, teachers should view dialogue as a structural construct that will support effective teaching and foster classroom oracy[9;61-97]. Alexander listed five principles for dialogic education in order to accomplish its objectives. It ought to be cooperative, mutual, encouraging, cumulative, and intentional. In order to be collective, teachers and students should work together on learning tasks, either as a class or as a group, as opposed to working alone. Teachers and students can listen to each other, exchange ideas, and look at various perspectives[10;60]. Students can freely express their opinions in supportive classroom activities without worrying about being embarrassed by “wrong” answers, and they help each other come to common understandings. In dialogic teaching, knowledge and concept accumulation are crucial. Students are able to relate their concepts to rational lines of research and thought as a result. Alexander’s definition and the previously discussed illustrative framework are very helpful in comprehending the idea of dialogic education. They subtly suggest a number of methods, such as whole class, group, pair, and individual work, to encourage engagement in the classroom. Consequently, the dialogic position in the classroom ought to improve student engagement and learning through conversational turns. This supports the idea that kids must practice discourse skills like thinking, negotiating, and narrating as they are learning to speak. The Common European Framework (CEFR) states that the five objectives of language evaluation are mediation, translation, and interpretation; oral and written communication; reading comprehension; and listening comprehension. In this sense, developing oral proficiency in a foreign language through creative dialogue that encourages teamwork in problem-solving is thought to be essential and the acquisition of abilities. In such a cooperative, participatory discussion, speakers may deepen their understanding of a topic or broaden their own knowledge. Following that, the parties will unavoidably make an effort to comprehend one another, come to an agreement, and use language as a tool to mediate ideas. According to van der Wilt et al, oral communicative competence is the most comprehensive, intricate, and multidimensional of these talents[11;793-807]. The first language-based skill that kids acquire is oral language, which is also necessary for classroom discussion. It implies knowledge of syntax, morphology, and phonology, as well as the sociolinguistic competence that allows one to use language satisfactorily and successfully[12;40-43]. Since many people, particularly sociocultural supporters, view oral communicative skills as a crucial mediator for self-regulation, learning, ownership, empowerment, and thinking, investigating students’ oral communicative competence can enhance the

quality of classroom dialogue and learning. Students' oral proficiency is positively correlated with social acceptance and participation. In accordance with the research of Schiefelbusch & Pickar [13;80-87] and Celce-Murcia [14;41-57], we refer to a speaker's capacity to successfully and responsibly converse in social settings using a combination of knowledge, abilities, and attitudes as oral communicative competence. Therefore, it is insufficient to concentrate only on the systematic and formal aspects of language use, such as grammar and pronunciation. Similarly, scholars have highlighted the significance of the speaker's willingness to support the process of dialogue. Everybody speaks in a different way. While some people speak more, others speak less. While some are merely responding to what is presented, others are open to conversing. Talk is always an essential part of relationships and interpersonal communication. Increasing learners' willingness to communicate (WTC) is therefore essential since it is a requirement for the development of communicative skills and has a major influence on language learning in general.

REFERENCES:

1. Caughlan, S., Juzwik, M. M., Borsheim-Black, C., Kelly, S., & Fine, J. G. (2013). English teacher candidates developing dialogically organized instructional practices. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 212-246.
2. 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, 140.
3. Littleton, K., & Howe, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Educational dialogues: Understanding and promoting productive interaction*. London and New York: Routledge.
4. Alexander, R. J. (2018). Developing dialogic teaching: genesis, process. *Research Papers in Education*, 33(5), 561-598
5. Long, M. (2014). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 75p
6. Ammar, A., & Hassan, R. (2017). Talking it through: Collaborative dialogue and second language learning. *Language Learning*, 68(1), 46-82.
7. Lefstein, A. (2010). More helpful as problem than solution: Some implications of situating dialogue in classrooms. In K. Littleton & C. Howe (Eds.), *Educational dialogues: Understanding and promoting productive interaction* pp. 190-214, London and New York: Routledge.
8. Rogoff, B. (2008). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided participation and apprenticeship. In P. Murphy, K. Hall, & J. Soler (Eds.), *Pedagogy and practice: Culture and identities* pp. 58-74, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore: Sage.
9. Al-Khresheh, M. H. (2021). Reconceptualising the elements of effective

English language teaching through the lens of pandemic induced online teaching: An exploratory study of Jordanian EFL teachers' perceptions. *Asian EFL Journal*, 28(2.3), 61-97

10. Alexander, R. J. (2017). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (5th ed.). York, UK: Dialogos, 60 p

11. van der Wilt, F., van der Veen, C., van Kruistum, C., & van Oers, B. (2018). Popular, rejected, neglected, controversial, or average: Do young children of different sociometric groups differ in their level of oral communicative competence? *Social Development*, 27(4), 793-807.

12. Li, L. (2020). *Dialogic reading with Mandarin-speaking children: effects on expressive vocabulary and narrative competence* (Doctoral dissertation, Memorial University of Newfoundland). Retrieved from <https://research.library.mun.ca/14517/>,40-43pp

13 Schiefelbush, R. L., & Pickar, J. (Eds.). (1984). *The acquisition of communicative competence*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press, 80-87pp

14. Celce-Murcia, M. (2008). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E.A. Soler & P.S. Jordà, *Intercultural language use and language learning* pp. 41-57. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.