

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-348-4-17>

**TYPOLOGY OF COMMUNICATIVE MEANS
OF VERBALIZATION OF THE FACILITATIVE
COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGY “INTERACTIVE SCAFFOLDING”**

**ТИПОЛОГІЯ КОМУНІКАТИВНИХ ЗАСОБІВ ВЕРБАЛІЗАЦІЇ
ФАСИЛІТАТИВНОЇ КОМУНІКАТИВНОЇ СТРАТЕГІЇ
«ІНТЕРАКТИВНИЙ СКАФФОЛДІНГ»**

Кnyazeva M. O.

*Master Student at the Department of
Germanic Languages, Foreign Literature
and their Teaching Methodology
Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian
State University
Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine*

Князева М. О.

*магістрантка кафедри германських мов,
зарубіжної літератури та методик
їхнього навчання
Центральноукраїнський державний
університет
імені Володимира Винниченка
м. Кропивницький, Україна*

Scaffolding as a communicative strategy has been in the focus of research by mainly foreign scholars: attempts have been made to define scaffolding (Belland, 2014; Gibbons, 2002; Hamidi, 2018; Walqui, 2006), and to establish its typology according to various criteria (Engin, 2014; Safdari, 2021; San Martin, 2018); key features of scaffolding have been identified (van de Pol, 2010); specific ways of using scaffolding for teaching reading comprehension (Johnson, 2019; Liu, 2018), speaking (Goh, 2017), writing (Kamil, 2017) have been depicted. In Ukraine, a few papers have examined scaffolding from a didactic perspective: in teaching ESP (English for special purposes) (Kulish, 2021), and in inclusive educational practices (Павлюх, 2022). Despite the growing body of evidence that scaffolding contributes greatly to high quality teacher – student verbal interactions in the classroom, little attention has been devoted to the communicative and linguistic features of interactional scaffolding means and their typology.

Given that, **the topicality** of this study is defined by the need of a deeper exploration of communicative and language means of teacher classroom talk that facilitate understanding and subject-knowledge transfer, by the necessity to describe the communicative and language means that make high-quality teacher classroom talk.

The **aim** of the current study is to identify and depict the communicative and language means of actualization of the *facilitative communicative strategy* (FCS) “Interactive Scaffolding” in the US teachers’ classroom talk.

The object of the study consists of samples of the US teachers' classroom talk at the lessons of English Language Arts. The **research focus** of the study is *the inventory of means of verbalization of the FCS* "interactive scaffolding" in the US teachers' classroom talk through pragmalinguistic analysis of speech samples in transcripts of video fragments of lessons uploaded at the Teaching Channel website [<https://www.teachingchannel.com>].

In dialogic interaction, the key functional unit is considered to be a *talk move* (hereinafter is TM), consisting of one or more speech acts in the speaker's turn the choice of which is defined by the dominant purpose of discourse development that unfold interaction, and move communication to achieve the aim commonly accepted by the interlocutors [2, p. 153].

We used the classification of high-frequency interactional scaffolding talk moves suggested by Erika Johnson [3, p. 352] with minor modifications. In our corpus, the following means of verbalizing the FCS "interactive scaffolding" are singled out, as presented in descending order of frequency in our observational material:

1) questioning that includes one or more speech acts-questions (quesitives) of the teacher, that is, statements that prompt the student to inform the speaker of something that requires clarification. The quesitive is considered to be one of the most frequent speech acts in the teacher's speech, e.g.: T (=teacher) : Do you think that 's appropriate? S (=student): *No.* T : *No. _ Okay. Why not though? Can you say why?* S: *It's not very serious and it's a serious matter* [10].

Prototypical for the teacher's discourse in the classroom are the so-called elicitation questions, with the help of which the teacher "leads" the student to the correct answer, e.g.: T : *What is their purpose here ? Rachel?* S: *To inform you about their security system.* T: Just to inform? What is their main purpose? What do they really want to do as the author? S: *To persuade you to buy it?* T: *Yes, exactly!* [11].

2) the next most recurrent TM is implicit/explicit assessment of correctness/incorrectness of students' actions (implicit / explicit feeding back) in the learning process, or implicit/explicit feedback, in other words, the teacher's verbal reaction to the correctness or incorrectness of the students' educational actions. The expressions of explicit feedback contain evaluative words, e.g. *good, excellent, awesome*, etc.: T: *In what kind of situations and where would we use that standard formal language?* S: *If you're writing to the Queen.* T: Good, ok! Excellent example! [10]. In the case of implicit feedback, the teacher does not use evaluatives, but usually simply repeats the correct answer or its part with a falling tone, thereby confirming the correctness of the student's answer, e.g.: S: *He 's quoting someone else . So, does it still count as him employing imagery?* T: He 's just employing somebody else's imagery [8].

3) instructing (or instruction-giving) as the next most recurring TM in our corpus of empiric material covers the teacher's instructions, the purpose of which is "to provide the addressee with directives to perform appropriate, usual, desired/wanted actions (linguistic, mental or physical) by means of recommendatory or imperative types of influence on the addressee" [1, p. 27], e.g.: T : *Pass this out that everybody here , please . Right now, this will be guided. That means that I am showing you. I am helping you to do this first part right now and for this, you're going to need a template* [7].

4) explanation (explaining) is another TM in our corpus that consists of a statement/set of statements by the teacher contributing to/aiming at understanding the essence, reasons, context, and principles of a certain phenomenon, e.g.: T: *Okay, so descriptive detail, huh. One of the standards that we're really working on here, Common Core Number Three, is that you use relevant descriptive details. OK? An effective description presents a clear picture or image to your reader* [5];

5) modeling is one more TM in our observation material that represents the display of an aspect/phenomenon of discourse which students are supposed reproduce in their own speech: "<...> the teacher exhibits an aspect of discourse that students are expected that employ" [4, p. 26], e.g.: T: *So you can start by saying something like "In O'Connor she," and then we've got an active verb, what are some of our good verbs? Implies. Presents. Brings out. So we've got a good verb. Then you're going to say what that is. You can also use something more specific here. "In Old Man, Marquez writes." So implicit in your question is a quote from the text, and then you have what he writes, and then you form your question after that. If you're not using a specific quote you can also use a paraphrase* [9].

6) hinting as a TM draws students' attention to the content and linguistic means that contain the "right answer", by indicating/noting, rereading, repeating key text information to answer the teacher's question [3, p. 252], e.g.: T: *Definition: this is the reason why an author writes a text. And there are three big ones we're going to talk about – to persuade, to inform or to... Why do we watch TV and movies? S: *to entertain.* T: *Very good! Gold star for you* [11].*

7) highlighting as a TM, aims at drawing students' attention to another student's statement/comment, a statement in the text or a text fragment being discussed, in order to facilitate understanding for all students (to make comments or text accessible to everyone) [3, p. 252], e.g.: T : *Mia says , 'I love gallery walk because I get that criticize '. We're _not criticizing, Mia, we're critiquing. We're gonna frame our critiques with "I notice" and "I..."* [6].

So, pragmalinguistic analysis employed in this research helped single out the following talk moves of interactive scaffolding in the US teachers' classroom speech during the lesson: questioning, explicit or implicit feedback,

instruction, explanation, modeling, hinting and highlighting. These means show a tendency to cluster: teachers often combine means of verbalizing scaffolding within the same turn.

Bibliography:

1. Мовленнєві жанри на уроках української мови в ліцеї (рівень стандарту): практичний посібник. / Голуб Н.Б., Новосьолова В.І., Галаєвська Л.В. Київ: КОНВІ ПРИНТ, 2020. 128 с.

2. Селіванова О. О. Методологічні проблеми дослідження діалогу. *Одеський лінгвістичний вісник*. 2013. Вип. 1. С. 144–158. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/oliniv_2013_1_16

3. Johnson E. M. Choosing and Using Interactional Scaffolds: How Teachers' Moment-to-Moment Supports Can Generate and Sustain Emergent Bilinguals' Engagement with Challenging English Texts. *Research in the Teaching of English*. 2019), 53. P. 245–270.

4. Wei L., Murphy P. K., Firetto C. M. How can teachers facilitate productive small-group talk?: An integrated taxonomy of teacher discourse moves. *The Elementary School Journal*. 2018, 118(4). P. 578–609. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1086/697531>

5. Exploring Imagery Through Beowulf. URL: <https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/descriptive-details-sensory-language>

6. The Great Migration: Analyzing Point of View. URL:

<https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/analyzing-stakeholders-nea>

7. Getting Ready to Write: Citing Textual Evidence. URL: <https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/teaching-about-textual-evidence>

8. Multiple Ways of Experiencing a Text. URL: <https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/literacy-analysis-lesson>

9. Pinwheel Discussions: Texts in Conversation with Sarah Brown Wessling. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GLiR00AyjfM>

10. Reading Formal and Informal Texts. URL: <https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/formal-and-informal-texts>

11. Understanding Author's Purpose. URL: <https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/authors-purpose-lesson-plan>