



The Role of Scaffolding in L2 Learners' Dialogic Reflections

Tuğçe TEMİR^{a*}, Hatice ERGÜL^b

a* Instructor, University of Aeronautical Association (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2077-288X>) * ttemir@thk.edu.tr

b Asst. Prof. Dr., Hacettepe University (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0494-432X>)

Research Article

Received: 21.06.2021

Revised: 26.11.2021

Accepted: 20.12.2021

ABSTRACT

This article examines (1) the role of scaffolding and (2) scaffolding patterns that emerged in L2 learners' dialogic reflections on their spoken performances. Dialogic reflection has recently become a vital concept in teacher development studies (Mann & Walsh, 2017), however, the role of dialogic reflection on learner empowerment has not been investigated. In this study, the term "dialogic reflection" is used to define 24 tertiary level L2 learners' reflections on their spoken performances after they conduct six different paired speaking tasks which last 17 hours in total. The present study observes these dialogic reflections of the students under the scope of Sociocultural Theory, which posits human mental functioning as a mediated process that occurred with the help of others (Ratner, 2002). The data is gathered from these reflection sessions, and it is analyzed through sociocultural discourse analysis (Mercer, 2004). Thanks to microanalysis of the data, the findings show that learners use scaffolding to be able to establish mutual understanding between each other (Musiol & Trognon, 1999) in terms of word search, grammatical correction and content development, and they used three different patters to reach their aim; asking for help, intentional intervention, and showing joint effort.

Keywords: scaffolding, sociocultural theory, dialogic reflection, oral performance, collaborative task.

İkinci Yabancı Dil Öğrencilerinin Sözlü Performanslarından Sonra Birlikte Yaptıkları Yansıma Konuşmalarında Birbirlerini Desteklemelerinin Rolü

Öz

Bu makale ikinci yabancı dil öğrencilerinin kendi konuşma performansları üzerine yaptıkları yansıtıcı diyaloglarda görülen birbirlerini desteklemenin rolünü ve birbirlerini desteklerken ortaya çıkan desenleri incelemektedir. Literatür incelendiğinde birlikte yapılan yansıtıcı konuşmanın daha çok öğretmen eğitiminde kullanıldığı gözlenmektedir (Mann & Walsh, 2017). Fakat bu çalışmamızda birlikte yansıma kelimesi ikinci dil öğrenen 24 öğrencinin 17 saatlik performansları üzerine yaptıkları konuşmalar olarak kullanılmıştır. Bu çalışma, öğrencilerin yansıtıcı konuşmalarını sosyokültürel teori bağlamında insanın zihinsel işleyişini başkalarının yardımıyla gerçekleştirmesine olanak sağlamasını esas olarak incelemektedir. Veriler öğrencilerin yapmış olduğu yansıtıcı konuşma toplantılarından alınmış ve sosyokültürel söylem analizi yoluyla incelenmiştir (Mercer, 2004). Verilerin mikro analizi sayesinde, bulgular, birlikte yansıma oturumlarında birbirlerini desteklemenin rolünü ve öğrencilerin birbirlerini desteklerken netür desenler ortaya çıktığını göstermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: yönlendirici destek, sosyokültürel teori, diyalojik yansıma, sözlü performans, işbirlikçi görev.

To cite this article in APA Style:

Temir, T., & Ergül, H. (2022). The role of scaffolding in L2 learners' dialogic reflections area. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 11(3), 485-498. <https://doi.org/10.14686/buefad.954650>

1 | INTRODUCTION

Throughout the late 20th century, language teaching witnessed changing winds and shifting sands times (Brown, 2007) which has led to an understanding of L2 learning as a dynamic, complex, non-linear, and socially situated process. With the advent of this new insight, engaging in meaningful conversations and negotiation of meaning in interaction has become a vital component of the language learning process (Long, 1991; Swain, 2006, 2007; Swain and Deters, 2007; Pica, 1984; Vygotsky, 1978).

Sociocultural theory (henceforth SCT) underpins this type of learning claiming the importance of the use of language that is regarded as a tool for understanding the processes of human mental development (Vygotsky, 1978). Moreover, SCT forms an intricately interwoven tapestry in learning as it includes some vital assets of learning such as mediation, scaffolding, interaction, and reflection, all of which are used to promote individual agency (Swain & Lapkin, 2001; Swain & Deters, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978).

Among those, there has been a long-standing interest in implementing collaboration in different parts of learning since it includes mediation and scaffolding (Donato & McCormick, 1994; Karimi & Jalilvand, 2014; Swain, 2006). These studies underscore the importance of scaffolding between teacher-student or student-student in a teaching/learning setting. Under the scope of SCT, the researchers created some activities and tasks in which learners were supposed to do the task together with their peers by scaffolding each other. The aim of these activities or tasks is to create an environment which gives the learners opportunities to regulate themselves or their peers through conversation, which may result in internalization through which cognitive developments and improved version of previous saying can occur (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Lesser, 2004, Swain & Deters, 2007).

Acknowledging the importance of these studies, in this study, it is also aimed to explore the role of scaffolding between L2 learners, but its focus is not on the task, but it is about the reflections of the peers done after they conduct the task. Mann and Walsh (2013) proposed and used the term dialogic reflection for pre or in-service teacher trainings. However, in this study, the term was adopted and adapted for the L2 learners, and it was combined with SCT to see its role in these reflection sessions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Dialogic reflection is an intra- or interpersonal reflection in which learning is mediated by using language (Mann & Walsh, 2017). Dialogic reflection has been widely used in understanding and improving teacher education. In dialogic reflection, to shed light on their teaching, teachers are required to reflect on their implementations and teaching practices by the help of language, which shapes their thoughts (Vygotsky, 1978). These dialogic reflections are teacher-led which means that teachers have an opportunity to reflect on their own practices themselves, or it could be done in a collaborative process, which leads them to talk to their partners/peers, to co-contract the meaning of what, why and how they have done. Dialogic reflection and language have a robust connection as the second one mediates any learning process. Moreover, Mann and Walsh (2017) proposed that deploying dialogic reflection among teachers is a necessity to promote deep understanding of their practice (Mann & Walsh, 2017). Thus, if the term dialogic reflection could be used to make meaning of practices and to result in significant improvement in learning, it could be used, in this study, to refer to the students' reflections which are done to make meaning of their own production. Based on this perspective, as it includes interaction, collaboration, mediation, scaffolding and language, sociocultural theory is a perfect fit to extend its aspects. Thus, it is of vital importance to define the related principles of SCT to understand the rationale behind dialogic reflection.

Mediation is one of the most crucial principles of SCT, which is directly about the relationship between human beings and their world around (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007). It is accepted as a process of everyone's development in which everything and everyone can be tools and artifacts such as language, logic, strategies, people, etc. They all improve individual's mental functioning and show a robust relationship between each individual and the society (Tomasello, 1999; Mitchell, Myles & Marsden, 2013). Simply put, mediation shows a set of preferences that people might use to do anything. A cliché example is given from the real world; people might use their hands to dig in the land, but they prefer using shovels, which mediates this process to help and support them (Thorne, 2003, 2009). According to SCT, there are some ways of mediation, one of which is regulation; object, other, and self-regulation (Lantolf & Poehner in VanPatten & Williams, 2015). It is observed that there is a transition from other to self-regulation which is the ultimate aim of mediation (Werstch, 1979). Under this paper's scope, other-

regulation attracts more attention as it is directly related to scaffolding. Other-regulation is giving assistance to someone who needs help to regulate their behavior or mental functioning and scaffolding is a metaphor used to refer to that support or assistance that a caregiver gives to a child (Wood & Bruner & Ross, 1976). Bruner (1978) explained five stages that could be applied while a caregiver scaffolds a child. It starts with simplifying a task for the child and goes on with helping the child to concentrate on a task, showing a model of how to do a task, expanding the scope of urgent situations and lastly assisting him or her to see progress. After observing caregiver and child situations, its implementation was extended to educational settings in which teacher-student or expert-novice interaction was given priority. Under this scope, Lidz (1991) agreed on the use of scaffolding principles with Bruner's (1978) stages. Based on these stages, Lidz (1991) proposed scaffolding mechanisms, which could be used to observe or evaluate any mediated situation; teacher to student or peer to peer.

L2 studies on scaffolding initially started to observe teacher-student interaction in which how mediation takes place or how teachers and students benefit from this mediational process were analyzed (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; van Lier, 1996). Then some researchers explored scaffolding between peers to analyze its effects and impacts on the learners (Donato, 1994; Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Ohta, 1995). These studies indicated that learners benefit from mutual scaffolding in that they could support their peers while they are conducting a task, and they also could be more aware of their own progress in the language. The role of scaffolding between peers is also examined in this study. However, it differs from other studies in that the peers reflect on the task dialogically, so learners' aim is not completing a task, but reflecting on it to evaluate, to regulate and to improve themselves. Moreover, they use L1, which is accepted as a symbolic tool to regulate the mental functioning (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007) during their reflection sessions.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study aims to explore (1) the role of scaffolding in L2 learners' dialogic reflections of their spoken performances and (2) the types of patterns students use while scaffolding. With this aim in mind, the following questions are addressed in the study.

1. What is the role of scaffolding in L2 learners' dialogic reflections of their spoken performances?
2. What patterns do the learners use while they are scaffolding their peers in dialogic reflection sessions?

2 | METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

24 participants took place in this study. The participants are preparatory class students at a foundation university in Turkey. The administration of the university selected the class randomly. The students are enrolled in various departments including engineering, business, management, etc. At the time when data collection started, the participants' language proficiency level was B1 (according to CEFR). Data collection took 12 weeks in total. It should be noted that the participants had 25 hours of English classes per week during the data collection process.

INSTRUMENTS

The instruments used in this study include 6 different speaking tasks, which were conducted during English classes. The tasks were selected by the researchers prior to data collection. The tasks were selected based on three criteria: (1) providing a *meaningful* context for students to communicate in English, and (2) including situations that students are *familiar* with, and (3) being *interesting* for the students. The aim of the tasks is to make the learners understand the context, the purpose, the duration of the task as well as providing some key languages to them. After making the learners familiar with the theme, the task requirements are given to them by explaining each step.

Before implementing the tasks, the learners are asked to choose a partner for pair-work. Then, each pair is assigned with a task, which presents a meaningful situation and procedures about what to do and how to do. These pairs are given a few minutes for preparation. After the preparation, the pairs do the first task and record their conversation. As soon as they complete their task, they listen to the recording of their first task and reflect on their conversation dialogically. The dialogic reflection sessions are also audio-recorded. Moreover, these audio-

recordings of dialogic reflection sessions are orthographically transcribed and analysed to be able to answer the research questions.

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Data collection procedure started with the second term when the learners' readiness was enough to be able to be aware of their own performances and reflect on them. They were informed about the procedure of how they would do the task and how they could organize their reflection sessions. However, no tutorial about how to reflect was provided. Below is the table, which shows the tasks, reflection sessions and weeks.

Table 1. Data Collection Procedure

Weeks	Tasks	Duration	Reflection Sessions	Duration
Week 1	Informing about the procedure and getting permission for the study			
Week 2	Task 1	54 minutes	Dialogic reflection-1	98 minutes
Week 4	Task 2	62 minutes	Dialogic reflection-2	100 minutes
Week 6	Task 3	56 minutes	Dialogic reflection-3	110 minutes
Week 8	Task 4	70 minutes	Dialogic reflection-4	106 minutes
Week 10	Task 5	80 minutes	Dialogic reflection-5	103 minutes
Week 12	Task 6	75 minutes	Dialogic reflection-6	115 minutes

As it is shown in the Table 1, after receiving an approval from the learners and giving information about the process to the learners, the first task was distributed to the class in which they record their performance about it and then the learners use these recordings as stimulated recall to reflect on their performance with their peer dialogically. After receiving all the recordings of six different tasks, researchers transcribed them to analyse.

DATA ANALYSIS

The qualitative data was analysed by using MAXQDA, a software program in which the data could be stored and categorised. Moreover, as a methodology for the analysis, sociocultural discourse analysis (henceforth SCDA), proposed by Mercer (2004) was applied to analyze the use of language used during social thinking mode. SCDA, which is one of the microanalysis methods, is a perfect fit for the present study in that it is used both in analyzing the intellectual thinking between people, and it also puts emphasis on how the development occurs in social context and over time (Johnson & Mercer, 2019).

RESEARCH ETHICS

The ethical committee of the institution approved the study and then the researchers informed the participants about the study and the participants gave their consent via signing a consent form. Their names are kept anonymous.

3 | FINDINGS

In this current study, tertiary level L2 learners conduct 6 different speaking tasks and after operationalization of each, they use their recordings as stimulated recall which is a session in which learners are given their recordings to stimulate and recall their thoughts or performances (Gass & Mackey, 2000), and while listening to them, they reflect on their performances dialogically. The data was analysed through SCDA (Mercer, 2004) to figure out the role of scaffolding between peers and what patterns they use to support each other.

WHAT IS THE ROLE OF SCAFFOLDING IN DIALOGIC REFLECTIONS OF THE LEARNERS' SPOKEN PERFORMANCES?

This section presents an analysis of extracts to highlight the role of scaffolding in learners' dialogic reflections. There are 113 extracts, in which learners scaffold each other. All the extracts were analyzed to be able to answer the research question. However, in this part we will give three sample extracts, which can indicate the role of

scaffolding. Moreover, those extracts indicate that although the aim of scaffolding is similar in all extracts, the actions carried out through scaffolding vary. Extract 1 below indicates two learners, who have similar language proficiency levels, talking about the task and about how to improve it jointly.

Extract 1

- 1 A: Bak, bu advertisement önemli. Ne diyelim? Board mu?
Look, this advertisement is important. What can we say here? Board?
- 2 B: Board diyelim OK o. Table da diyebiliriz.
Say "board" it is OK. We can say "table" too.
- 3 A: Ne? Tabela mı?
What? Table?
- 4 B: Evet table. Bir dakika.
Yes table. Just a second.
- 5 A: Signboard (high intonation)
- 6 B: Başka yok mu ya anlamı?
Is there any other meaning of it?
- 7 A: Signboard iyi ya. (writing) imza tahtası gibi.
Signboard is OK. It is like signing board.
- 8 B: Aynen.
Agree.

In line 1, A initiates the conversation by stating the importance of one of the topics in their task, which is about “advertisement”. Then, he requests help from his peer asking a word and offering one possible word as “board”. In line 2, B accepts his suggestion initially, then and suggests an alternative word “table”. In line 3, A requests a clarification of the word. In line 5, A offers a new word “signboard” with a high intonation. This continues with B’s question about whether there are any other meanings of the word. In line 7, A goes on with pivoting (Jefferson, 1984) to use that word by saying “it is OK” and adds further explanation of the word. The interaction ends with B’s agreement. They have a problem to find a word, which fits in the task, and they could construct it together. It is not a bold claim to say that if there is a peer-to-peer support, it can be easier for them to regulate themselves and finalize what they need.

In addition to this, in this first extract, learners use scaffolding to establish mutual understanding between them. We use establishing mutual understanding in the meaning of “the result of a negotiation process aimed at bringing the interlocutors to a joint and precise representation of their intentions of meaning and the interpretations they make of these intentions” (Musiol & Trognon 1999: 223). While the learners help each other to find a word, they are asking questions or making suggestions, and their aim is to agree on something through negotiation of meaning.

Considering the first extract, it is noticed that the learners support each other to find a solution to the problem together. It can be thought as building a house together by putting a brick one by one. A starts the conversation by asking a word, and through lines 1 to 7, they look for an appropriate word, and finally it is A who found what he needed, and B agrees with A and they could establish mutual understanding.

Extract 2 below shows another example of scaffolding emerged during reflections. It is similar to the first one in that the students are trying to establish mutual understanding by figuring out how to say something in English. However, it differs in terms of the action they took while they are supporting each other. While in the first extract speaker 1 (S1) questions how to say a word by asking questions to speaker 2 (S2), in the second extract initiation starts with making suggestions to improve the grammatical structure of the task.

Extract 2

- 1 A: We will give 3 lokma for 3 lokmas prize diyelim. 3 lokma, 2 lokma
Lets say we will give 3 donut for 3 donuts. 3 donut, 2 donut's
- 2 A: fiyatına 3 lokma.
prize 3 donut.
- 3 B: Aynen, bunu diyelim. Nasıl diyeceksin?
Agree, lets say this. How will you say it?
- 4 A: Ben derim.
I can say.(stops for a few seconds)
- 5 B: We will give
- 6 A: 2 paid 3 take. Yok tam Turkish oldu.
No it is just Turkish.
- 7 B: Two prize. pay ne demek? Ödemek.
What does "pay" mean? Pay.
- 8 A: Öde.
Pay.
- 9 B: 2 paid 3 take
- 10 A: Aaa! OK OK. Çok iyi.
Ohh! OK OK. Very good.

Lines 1 and 2 start with an effort of A to revise and improve the task by adding new content to it. In line 3, B agrees with A to add the new content and questions how to phrase that sentence. In line 4, A asserts that he can say it but then pauses for a few seconds. Then in line 5, B attempts to formulate the sentence, but he does not finish it. In line 6, A offers a candidate translation for what they want to say, however, he argues that it sounds like a Turkish saying. In line 7, B attempts to formulate another candidate translation "two prize", but then he stops for checking the meaning of the verb "pay". In line 8, A confirms the meaning of the verb 'pay'. In line 9, B formulates the sentence in English as "2 paid 3 take". In line 10, A displays his agreement with the suggested translation with an exclamation and an explicit statement saying that "it is very good".

Below is the third extract showing scaffolding between peers. It displays another way of reaching mutual understanding.

Extract 3

- 1 A: Bak şey demedin bazıları uzaktan geliyor o yüzden
Look, you didn't say some are coming from distant places,so say
- 2 A: park sıkıntımız oluyor de.
there is park problem.
- 3 B: Hıhıh. Tamam. Bazısı uzaktan bazısı yakın mı?
Himm. OK. Some from distance some from nearby, right?
- 4 A: Yaa işte uzaktan geliyor araba kullanmak zorunda.
Huh, they are coming from distant places. They are to use cars.
- 5 A: Have to kullanalım orada

Use have to there.

6 B: Tamam.

OK.

In extract 3, A initiates the conversation in lines 1 and 2 by highlighting a missing point in their task and recommends that his pair should add this point about the parking problem as some people are coming from distant places. In line 3, B accepts this suggestion, and he tries to clarify the point by asking a question. Then, in lines 4, A clarifies his point by explaining that as “*they are coming from distant places. They are to use cars.*” In line 5, A switches his focus from the meaning to the form and states that they should use “*have to*” in this context. The extract ends with B who accepts his peer’s suggestions.

In this extract, from the first line to the last, A is the one who scaffold his peer in terms of the content of the task. Thus, it is seen that their aim is to negotiate on the content of the task. Moreover, signs such as “*Humm, OK*” in line 3 or “*OK*” in the last line shows that B could build mutual understanding with his peer.

To conclude this research question, it is seen that learners use scaffolding to establish mutual understanding about their task. However, the actions, they are taking while creating a common sense in-between themselves, are varying. While the first extract indicates the need for help in a word search, the second one shows the assistance in grammatical structures, and the third one necessitates scaffolding in content development. The common point in all of them is to reach negotiation. This negotiation process might facilitate learning potentials, which was defined by Hellermann and Pekarek Doehler (2010) as “learning potentials include grammatical structures, lexical items, as well as methods for turn construction, the sequential order of turns, and recipient design work” (p. 27). As dialogic reflections of learners include talking about the content of the task, grammatical issues, word choices, their opinions, etc., these might have an impact on their learning potential for the future tasks, which may end up with regulation and internalization.

WHAT PATTERNS DO THE LEARNERS USE WHILE THEY ARE SCAFFOLDING THEIR PEERS IN DIALOGIC REFLECTION SESSIONS?

Through the analysis of the first question, we explained the role of scaffolding emerged during dialogic reflections of the learners. After figuring out the role of scaffolding, our aim in the second question is to find out what kind of patterns the learners use to be able to scaffold each other.

The analysis of the data displays that while learners scaffold each other during reflections, they use some patterns to scaffold themselves or their peers. The table below shows the distribution of these patterns.

Table 2. Scaffolding Patterns

Scaffolding Patterns Emerged During Dialogic Reflections of L2 Learners	
Asking for help	41
Intentionality	37
Joint effort	35

The analysis of the data indicates that out of 113 extracts, the most common type of scaffolding emerges via one of the speakers’ initiations of the interaction by asking for help. It is observed that in some of them, one of the learners directly asks for help (in 30 extracts) and in the rest of them (in 11 extracts), they show that they need approval to be able to be sure about something. Below are the sample extracts, which identifies the situation.

Extract 4

- 1 A: Sport support, spor desteği nasıl diyebilirim orada?
How can I say sport support there?
- 2 B: Provide facilities diyebilirsin sanki. Daha iyi olabilirdi.
You can say I think. It could be better.
- 3 A: Support dedim ne demeliydim?
I said support. What should I say?
- 4 B: Provide sport facility
- 5 A: Hıh, tamam
Hıh, OK.

In line 1, A needs help because he has hesitations in word choice he used in the task, so he directly asks it to his partner. In line 2, B helps him by suggesting the collocation “provide facilities”. After A asks the same question one more time in line 3, B provides a clear assistance by saying ‘provide sport facility’. It is after this assistance that A says ‘Hıh, OK’, which displays that he accepts the suggestion, and they could reach an agreement.

One more example about requesting help from peer is given in the extract below. However, it differs from the previous one since the second speaker needs guidance in getting approval.

Extract 5

- 1 A: can be recycling doğru bir cümle mi oluyor?
Is it a correct sentence?
- 2 B: Ne demişsin?
What did you say?
- 3 A: Our products can be recycling.
- 4 B: Our products *can be recycled*.
- 5 A: *Recycled*
- 6 B: Aynen aynen
Yes yes

This extract again starts with requesting help from his peer. In line 1, A formulates a phrase, and he explicitly checks for confirmation by asking whether it is correct or not. Then, in line 2, B questions the whole sentence. In line 3, A produces the full sentence “*Our products can be recycling*”. In line 4, A corrects B’s sentence, as “*Our products can be recycled*”. In line 5, A displays that he notices the correction and highlights the word “*recycled*” by repeating it. The conversation ends with B’s turn which shows alignment with A’s correction.

To conclude the first scaffolding pattern, we might suggest that learners are willing to request help or assistance from their peers in terms of language forms and structures in their reflections.

The most second common pattern taken from the analysis of the scaffolding extracts is intentionality. Intentionality is a term used to show the conscious attempt to influence one’s actions. Lidz (1991) first used the term to indicate the mediational functioning between a caregiver and a child. Then it was used to show peer-to-peer intentional actions during conducting a task (Guerrero & Villamil, 2000). It may also be applied to peers’ conscious actions, and in this study, it is adapted for the peers who intentionally intervene the conversation to assist their peers. Below is a sample extract in which one of the peers intentionally repeats his peer’s sentence to show his/her mistake and correct him.

Extract 6

- 1 A: Başta dedin ki I have a one question dedin. I have a demelisin.
First you said said. You should say
- 2 B: Aynen. A one, ikisi de bir demek doğru.
Agree. A and one, both of them is one, right.

In line 1, A repeats what his peer said prior to the extract. Then, he explicitly corrects the grammatical mistake made in B's sentence. In line 2, B first agrees with A and then displays his understanding by explaining the reason for the grammatical mistake. This extract gives us intentional action taken by A. He notices an incorrect usage of a grammatical form, and he offers a correction. Moreover, by agreeing with A, B is the one who accepts his mistake by saying "Agree", which shows that they could reach the same understanding about the topic, and he could internalize the usage by doing metatalk about it.

Below is another type of intentionality, which is about the content of the task. A would like his peer to make addition to the task.

Extract 7

- 1 A: Aaa şey desene ben bunları söylüyorum, sen de Lucifer British
Him let's say the thing. I am saying these, you say Lucifer
- 2 A: konuşuyor de Tom var birde. (laughing)
speaks British, so does Tom.
- 3 B: Aynen. (laughing)
Agree.

In lines 1 and 2, A would like to scaffold his peer in terms of the content of the task, and he gives some examples related to the topic. In line 3, it is seen that they could establish mutual understanding as B agrees with A. In these kinds of samples, it is observed that although peers' language levels are assumed to be the same, one of the peers might be more eager to intervene the conversation to support their peer in terms of language use, content development, task improvement, etc. This enthusiasm ends with intentional support given to the peer.

Another frequent pattern of scaffolding is *joint effort*, which is peers' effort shown in the reflections to revise and improve it together or regulate their behaviours jointly. Below there is an extract in which co-construction of the task is demonstrated.

Extract 8

- 1 A: Bir dur. Burada konuya hemen girmişiz, üstünde konuşalım.
Just a sec. We just started the topic, let's talk about it.
- 2 B: Fikir ayrılığımız var diyelim.
We say we have a disagreement.
- 3 A: Olur. Birimizin ikna olması lazım bir de ikna etmeye çalışmak gerek
OK. One of us must be convinced, and we try to convince.
- 4 A: Sen gerçi biraz ikna oldun gibi.
You indeed seemed to be convinced.
- 5 B: Evet.
Yes.
- 6 A: Burada biraz daha konuşmamız lazım. Ne konuşabiliriz orada?

- Here we have to speak more. What can we talk about?*
- 7 B: Diyelim ki İngilizce aksanını tercih ediyorum diyeyim for talk.
We can say that I prefer British accent for talk
- 8 B: Konuşmak için American tercih ediyorum diyeyim
I say I prefer American accent to speak
- 9 A: American unutma bak American. Oraya not al.
American, don't forget American. Note it down there.
- 10 B: Tamam devam edelim.
OK, let's go on.
- 11 A: Hayır dur. Burada konuşalım biraz. For example diye açıklayalım
No stop. Speak here more. We explain saying for example
- 12 B: Ne olsun?
Like what?
- 13 A: Australian, Turkish, British gibi say.
Count them like Australian, Turkish, British.

Line 1 starts with A who makes reflection about the beginning of the task, and he suggests talking more about the topic. In line 2, B puts forward to add something and line 3 goes on with A's acceptance of that issue. After throwbacks to the task in line 4 and 5, line 6 continues with A who would like to talk more. B in line 8 adds something for his part, and A tries to regulate him about that topic by saying "*American, don't forget American. Note it down there.*". A accepts it, and he wants to go on with listening to their task, but A stops him to add more things to the content. In line 12, B shows that he has no more idea by asking what else they can add to his peer, who suggests some more accents that could be mentioned in the task. The conversation continues a bit more, but a short part of it was cut to be commented here. This extract shows that learners can contribute to each other and co-assist each other to construct something together.

One more sample is given below to indicate peers' joint effort while they are scaffolding each other in terms of language use.

Extract 9

- 1 A: Regularly come here
- 2 B: Can come regularly
- 3 A: According to this time table
- 4 B: People will come regularly böyle diyelim.
We can say it like this
- 5 A: Tamam. O da olur.
All right. That is OK too.

Extract 9 starts with A's effort to formulate a sentence. In line 2, B corrects A's first formulation as 'can come regularly'. In line 3, A utters the beginning of the sentence and B finishes the sentence by changing 'can' in B's suggestion to "will", and says, "let's put it like this?". In line 5, A displays his agreement. This extract is a clear evidence of displaying how peers co-construct meaning through scaffolding each other.

This data indicates that learners could support each other even if their levels are almost the same and through scaffolding, they establish mutual understanding. Moreover, there are patterns that are used by learners while

scaffolding. They might directly request help from their peers, one of them intentionally assists his/her peer, or they might co-construct the meaning or understanding together.

4 | DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

The present study sets out to explore the role of scaffolding and to find out patterns of scaffolding emerged in L2 learners' dialogic reflections on six different speaking tasks. After examining 17 hours of data to detect the scaffolding sequences and categorizing them in MAXQDA, 113 extracts were identified and then analyzed through SCDA (Mercer, 2004). There are many studies, which illustrated that peer scaffolding plays a crucial role in co-constructing, revising, and improving a task (Carson & Nelson, 1994; Guerrero & Villamil, 1994, 2000; Nelson & Murphy, 1992a, Villamil & Guerrero, 1996), and this study is thought to contribute to the other studies in terms of using dialogic reflection with learners to make them get benefited from scaffolding to regulate their own learning.

The analysis of this current study shows that the role of scaffolding is to provide guidance to each other in terms of finding target vocabulary items (extract 1), correcting grammatical structures, and expanding the content of the task (extract 3). Moreover, the findings display that while the learners are using scaffolding in these roles, their aim is to build mutual understanding between themselves in reflection sessions. Previously Van de Pol, Volman, and Beishuizen (2010) suggested that learners could be active enough in teacher-student interaction to establish mutual understanding with their teacher. In addition to this study, we now could propose that learners scaffold their peers to make meaning of what they said and to build mutual understanding to be able to regulate themselves or their peers, which may end up with internalization.

We have also found out that there are some patterns in learners' interaction where they support each other. Parallel to the studies in which peer scaffolding is used to ask for clarification (Stanley, 1992), giving information (McGroarty & Zhu, 1997), using languaging (Guerrero & Villamil's, 1994; 2000; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1996), providing linguistic knowledge (Swain & Lapkin, 2001), this current study indicates three different patterns L2 learners use while reflecting on their task. The most frequent of them (36% of the data) is asking for help (shown in extract 4 and 5), which shows us that speaker 1 could request help or ask for something from speaker 2 who provides scaffolding. As SCT posits the need for learning something and regulating oneself start in a society first (Vygotsky, 1978). A learner who needs help is required to use a tool for this or to ask it to someone. It might be an object like internet, books, and dictionaries or to a person who was previously accepted to be a more knowledgeable other, an expert or teacher (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007). However, more recently, it has been seen that no power relationship is prerequisite to ask for help or support. The second common pattern is intentionality (shown in extracts 6 and 7), first used by Lidz (1991) to show conscious assistance given by a caregiver to a child. The data show that in 33% of the extracts, learners intentionally support their partners. They use intentionality with highlighting something they notice during their partners' talk (extract 6) or with showing willingness to regulate their partners' behavior (extract 7). This shows that learners are capable of constructing something together with their peer despite no prior knowledge about how to do so. Other-regulation is a sine-qua-non term of this pattern as some learners might show tendency to regulate their friends. Moreover, since a shift from other-regulation to self-regulation is a known fact (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007), this regulatory behavior can be seen as a step to self-regulation. Finally, yet importantly, L2 learners in our study use joint effort, which can be defined as co-construction of something, as a tool to scaffold each other. In the 31% of the extracts, peers are observed to construct their thoughts, performances, or task jointly (shown in extracts 8 and 9). This final pattern withdrawn from the data indicates us that learners can be engaged deeply in their performances to reflect on it and while reflecting it helps them support and regulate each other.

All in all, learners use scaffolding while they are reflecting on their performances within some patterns, all of which help them regulate their behaviors. These findings may give the teachers an opportunity to form pairs in their classes to give the learners a place to support each other and to establish an understanding with each other. Moreover, as there are more studies on peer scaffolding nowadays, there might be further studies in which the focus might be an integration of student and teacher scaffolding to analyze their impacts on learners.

STATEMENTS OF PUBLICATION ETHICS

This study is based on the first author's PhD thesis (in progress). Thus, ethical approval was taken for the thesis, and this article's data was used from the same study.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author has no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the Zone of Proximal Development. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 465-483.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching principles of language learning and teaching*. Pearson Education.
- Bruner, J. (1978). The role of dialogue in language acquisition. In S. R. J. Jarvella & W. J. M. Levelt (Eds.), *The child's conception of language* (pp. 214-256). New York: Max-Plank-Institut for Psycholinguistic.
- De Guerrero, M. C. M., & Villamil, O. S. (1994). Social-cognitive dimensions of interaction in L2 peer revision. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 484-496.
- De Guerrero, M., & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84 (1), 51-68.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp.33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Donato, R., & McCormick, D. (1994). A sociocultural perspective on language learning strategies: The role of mediation. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 453-464. <https://doi.org/10.2307/328584>
- Jefferson, G. (1984). On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp.191-222). Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, M., & Mercer, N. (2019). Using sociocultural discourse analysis to analyze professional discourse. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 21, 267-277.
- Hellermann, J., & Simona Pekarek Doehler, H. (2010) On the contingent nature of language-learning tasks. *Classroom Discourse*, 1:1, 25-45.
- Karimi L., & Jalilvand M. (2014). The Effect of Peer and Teacher Scaffolding on the Reading Comprehension of EFL Learners in Asymmetrical and Symmetrical Groups. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)* 5(4), Winter 2014, Ser. 73/4.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2005). Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning Research in E. Hinkel, *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 355-365). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second language*. Equinox.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2007). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.
- Lesser, M. J. (2004). Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 55-81.
- Lidz, C. S. (1991). Practitioner's guide to dynamic assessment. New York: Guilford Press Long, M. H. (1991) Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, D. Coste, R. Ginsberg, and C. Kramsch (eds) *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspectives* (p.39-52). John Benjamins.
- Mann, S. & Walsh, S. (2017). *Reflective Practice in English Language Teaching*. Routledge.
- McGroarty, M. E., & Zhu, W. (1997). Triangulation in classroom research: A study of peer revision. *Language Learning*, 47, 1-43.
- Mercer, N. (2004). Sociocultural discourse analysis: Analyzing classroom talk as a social mode of thinking. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 137-168. <https://doi.org/10.1558/japl.v1i2.137>
- Mitchell, R., Myles, F., & Marsden, E. (2013). *Second language learning theories* (3rd Ed.). Routledge.
- Musiol, M., & A. Trognon (1999) Echec de la communication et réussite de la conversation en interaction pathologique. *Verbum XXI.2*: 207-232.

- Nelson, G., & Murphy J. (1992). An L2 writing group: Task and social dimensions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1 (3), 171-193.
- Ohta, A. (1995). Applying sociocultural theory to an analysis of learner discourse: Learner-learner collaborative interaction in the zone of proximal development. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 93–121.
- Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second- language-learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44, 493-527.
- Ratner, C. (2002). *Cultural psychology: Theory and method*. Kluwer/Plenum.
- Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(3), 217-233.
- Swain, M. (2006). Linguaging, agency, and collaboration in advanced second language learning. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contributions of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95–108). London, England: Continuum.
- Swain, M. (2007). Talking-it-through: Linguaging as a source of learning. Plenary paper presented at the Social and Cognitive Aspects of Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference, University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Swain, M., & Deter, P. (2007). New Mainstream SLA theory: Expanded and Enriched. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, Focus Issue.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 99–118). London, England: Longman.
- Thorne, S. L. (2003). Artifacts and cultures-of-use in intercultural communication. *Language Learning and Technology*, 7, 38-67.
- Thorne, S. L. (2009). ‘Community’, Semiotic Flows, and Mediated Contribution to Activity. *Language Teaching*, 42, 81-94.
- Tomasello, M. (1999). *The cultural origins of human cognition*. Harvard University Press.
- Van de Pol, J., & Volman M. & Beishuizen J. (2010) Scaffolding in Teacher-Student Interaction: A Decade of Research. *Educ Psychol Rev*, 22:271–296.
- Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy, and authenticity*. Longman.
- VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (2015). *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction*. Routledge.
- Villamil, O. S., & Guerrero, M. C. M. de. (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 491–514.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1979). From social interaction to higher psychological processes: A clarification and application of Vygotsky's theory. *Human Development*, 22(1), 1 22. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000272425>
- Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem-solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17, 89–100.