JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

Journal of Language Education and Research, 2024, 10 (2), 577-601

Research Article

Enhancing English Conversational Skills in Dogme ELT Approach: A Self-Regulation Perspective

Muhammed Fatih Gökmen*

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 12.06.2024

Revised form: 12.06.2024

Accepted: 25.09.2024

Doi: 10.31464/jlere.1500164

Keywords:

dogme ELT
English conversational skills
self-regulation

ABSTRACT

Conversational skills in EFL contexts have perennially posed challenges for learners and teachers. This action research aimed to ameliorate the conversational skills of 72 first-grade ELT students within the 'Speaking skills' course by intervening with the principles of Dogme ELT. Inspired by self-regulation phrases, the methodology involved self-reports to analyse student needs, reflective journals to monitor their progress, and open-ended questionnaires to receive feedback on the intervention. The content analysis revealed conspicuous development in participants' conversational proficiency and self-confidence, consequently overcoming linguistic and schooling obstacles. As for the pillars of Dogme ELT, the findings suggest that the paucity of conversational practice could be compensated with extensive in-class speaking practice, leading to more linguistic gains through the coverage of linguistic points emerging from interactions. Technological tools integrated into interactions could effectively equip students with increased linguistic exposure. As per the research findings, educational implications and research suggestions were also elucidated.

Acknowledgements I owe thanks to the participants for their efforts in contributing to this study by also developing themselves. I also feel very grateful for my colleague's check on the content analysis.

Statement of Publication Ethics The ethics committee approval for the current study has been obtained: Ethics Committee of Siirt University, 01.02.2024, and 6346.

Authors' Contribution Rate There is a single author in this study.

Conflict of Interest There is no conflict of interest.

Reference Gökmen, M. F. (2024). Enhancing English conversational skills in Dogme ELT approach: A self-regulation perspective. *Journal of Language Education and Research, 10* (2), 577-601.

*Asst. Prof., ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0868-7623, Siirt University, Department of Foreign Language Education, mehmedfatih1907@gmail.com

ISSN: 2149-5602

Introduction

In the realm of English language education, particularly within English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, the instruction and development of conversational skills present a formidable challenge for educators to teach, learners to develop themselves, and researchers to find treatments to problems that learners could experience while engaging in a conversation in English. As an experienced learner, non-native teacher, and interested researcher, I found this enduring problem to be a confluence of seven interrelated factors. Firstly, prevalent national language examinations in the researcher's educational context predominantly emphasise assessments of reading comprehension, lexical mastery, and grammatical proficiency, downplaying conversational competence as a focal point of instructional attention. As a secondary reason, instructors, often outputs of the same examination system, generally perceive themselves as inefficacious in delivering instruction in English; thereby, learners are deprived of meaningful exposure to the language, hindering their conversational development (Coşkun, 2017). Regarding the tertiary reason, an overreliance on prescribed textbooks among language practitioners may lead to pedagogical practices prioritising rote learning over engaging in conversations, thus impeding learners' communicative fluency (Sayed, 2016; Tosun & Cinkara, 2019). Fourthly, as apprentices of observation, teachers heavily adopt the same grammar-translation method as they were taught to prepare their students for the aforementioned exams instead of the suggested communicative curriculum by the Ministry of National Education (Uysal, 2012). As for the fifth reason, cultural predispositions, particularly prevalent in Turkish educational settings, contribute to student reticence in verbal communication due to cultural norms valuing modesty and restraint. The penultimate yet the most defining factor underscores the nuanced complexities of spoken language, including variations in speech styles, linguistic ambiguities such as clustered phrases or clauses, the prevalence of fillers and hesitations, rate of delivery, prosodic elements, reduced grammatical forms, and redundancy, which collectively pose significant challenges for learners endeavouring for conversational proficiency (Brown & Lee, 2015). Finally, the broader EFL context further exacerbates the paucity of opportunities for learners to engage in authentic English communication outside the classroom, thereby impeding their ability to apply language skills to real-life situations. To wrap up, the intricate interplay of these multifaceted factors highlights the significant place of cultivating conversational competence in EFL settings, entailing appropriate pedagogical approaches and interventions to address this enduring pedagogical challenge.

The classroom setting in the broader EFL environment is the primary arena for language learners to engage in English conversation. However, the flow of speaking activities in the classroom has also been criticised because those speaking tasks dominantly involve students' answering teachers' transactional inquiries for factual and predictable information, which has limited efficacy in enhancing conversational proficiency within EFL contexts (Chappell, 2013). This type of classroom 'talk as transaction', categorised as one form of other interaction types as 'talk as performance'

and 'talks as interaction' (Richards, 2008), has incited a shift in focus within both the present study and classroom settings towards a more interactional discourse in the form of 'talk as interaction'. This shift prioritises discourse as a socio-cultural function for exchanging ideas, thoughts, feelings, and experiences through dialogic practice (Freire, 1998) to achieve self-regulated learners who can plan, monitor, and evaluate their affective, cognitive, and behavioural processes (Zimmerman, 2002). Drawing upon the suggestions of Richards (2008) and Willis (1992) about the complexity and subtleness of 'talk as interaction', the researcher as a learner and teacher hypothesised that conversational practice characterised by natural, interpersonal, and meaningful interaction, deprived of intervening acts of the teacher, and under-reliance on textbooks could enrich students' command of English in conversational skills, thus enabling students to express their thoughts, emotions, and experiences freely (Thornbury & Slade, 2006). A thorough perusal of language teaching methodologies (Gökmen, 2020) and akin literature review has resulted in embracing and applying the 'Dogme ELT' or 'teaching unplugged' approach in the speaking course (Meddings & Thornbury, 2009). The subsequent sections provide information regarding the intervention along with the underpinning theoretical framework, delineate the research methodology of the study, present the findings of the data analysis, discuss these findings with the extant literature, and culminate in a conclusion encompassing a summary of the key insights, educational implications, and recommendations for further research.

Literature Review

Dogme ELT

Conventional language teaching methods can be divided into learner-, content-, linguistic-, and learning-based curricular approaches (Christison & Murray, 2021). Among these categorisations, learner-based curricular approaches are preferable among ELT student teachers (Gökmen, 2023). Based on these preferences, Dogme ELT can be defined as a learner-based language teaching approach in the 21st-century post-methods era (Nguyen & Phu, 2020) as it involves under-reliance on language teaching materials and instead stipulates creating optimal conditions for more interactions in the classrooms and instructs on the linguistic forms emerging from these interactions with the aid of available contextual particularities. It is predicated on earlier grand theoretical approaches such as communicative approaches, emergentism, ecological approach, sociocultural theory, critical theory, humanistic theory, interactionist theory, and flow theory (Meddings & Thornbury, 2009). Out of these theories, the first and foremost theory behind administrating such a study is deemed to be the flow theory (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Following the principles of the flow theory that necessitates the learning tasks to be meaningful, helpful, and enjoyable to learners, learners in Dogme ELT are advised to engage in conversations about personal topics.

On the grounds of the practical implications of the above theoretical backgrounds, applying Dogme ELT principles is a move away from triadic PPP and controlled-guided-free activities towards a more interactional approach in the framework of focus on form coalescing the comprehensible input, learners' uptake and repair processes, and language

output (Chen, 2017). In this sense, it fits into the indirect approach of teaching conversational skills in which students are not instructed about how to indulge in speaking but acquire conversational skills by delving into intriguing topics in their style of interactions bereft of any control of outside factors (Brown & Lee, 2015). Meddings and Thornbury (2009) put forth three reciprocally interwoven pillars, which were put into practice in the current study. Conversation-driven teaching prioritises social and dialogical learning where knowledge is co-constructed by utilising and scaffolding interactive talk that occurs between and about the students with the guidance of teachers. Materials-light rather than materials-free teaching exploits the learners' needs and interests as sources of topics and texts by underusing textbook-like materials, which could obstruct creativity and disregard learner needs and interests. Emergent language involves forming classroom activities conducive to developing learners' interlanguage, which could be analysed, recorded, reviewed, and recycled for reactive language teaching in the stages of post-lesson focus on form bare of a pre-determined syllabus.

Heretofore, some publications have emerged that investigated Dogme ELT in review or research works (Akça, 2012; Ali et al., 2023; Chappell, 2013; Coşkun, 2017; Gökmen & Takkaç, 2020; Nguyen & Phu, 2020; Nureldeen, 2020; Sarani & Malmir, 2019; Worth, 2012; Xerri, 2012; Zhang, 2023). The study conducted by Gökmen and Takkaç (2020) in the Turkish context with practising teachers showed that practising English teachers are devoid of knowledge and practice of Dogme ELT. However, if teachers and students meet in a classroom instructed in Dogme ELT, their dispositions would be very far from negative, as Coşkun (2017) found. Their possible concerns would be the light use of instructional tools and an absence of examinations, which were discovered by Worth (2012), who indicated that learners support a balanced utilisation of such tools and are apprehensive regarding inevitable national examinations. Nevertheless, Xerri (2012) incorporated Dogme ELT in an exam-oriented course and came up with favourable outcomes on the part of teachers and students. Another factor that can affect the success of Dogme ELT is related to students' proficiency level, as Sarani and Malmir (2019) found more willingness to communicate and more favourable attitudes with more competent learners. However, Nureldeen (2020) did not find such relationships between EFL teachers' beliefs of Dogme ELT and teachers' gender, years of teaching experience, and the age group of students. As Dogme ELT values having more classroom conversations, Chappell (2013) analysed these classroom talks. He encountered that a high percentage of classroom talks lies within the category of rote, recitation and elicitation, instruction and exposition but not discussion or inquiry dialogues, which practitioners who implement Dogme ELT should be aware of the nature of talks in classrooms. Grounded on the review of the ten articles (Ali et al., 2023), it could be concluded that Dogme ELT could be helpful specifically in speaking skills yet saving the particularity of the research contexts.

Self-regulation

From the sociocultural perspective serving as the framework of this study, interactions can ensure more scaffolding to help learners regulate their learning by jointly constructing linguistic acts to close the information, reasoning, and opinion gaps (Uztosun,

2021). One of sociocultural theory's primary constructs is self-regulation, which plays a critical role in ELT to empower students with learner autonomy to control their learning processes. Self-regulation was defined as the "modulation of affective, cognitive, and behavioural processes throughout a learning experience to reach a desired level of achievement" (Sitzmann & Ely, 2011, p. 421, as cited in Hardy et al., 2019). Zimmerman (2002) emphasised the cyclical nature of self-regulation, where learners plan, monitor, and evaluate their learning strategies and outcomes, boosting greater autonomy and motivation. Oxford (1990) also highlights the importance of metacognitive strategies required for self-regulation. These strategies include setting goals, organising resources, self-monitoring, and self-assessment, all of which empower learners to manage their progress effectively. Furthermore, Dörnyei (2005) underscored the role of motivation in self-regulation, arguing that learners' intrinsic and extrinsic motivations are pivotal in sustaining their efforts and perseverance in language learning. Besides liberating students, self-regulation assigns teachers the role of facilitator, which could be best embraced in teacher education programs where teachers can still see themselves as learners (Randi, 2004).

Self-regulation has been investigated for its role in the other variables of language proficiency as teacher beliefs (Yılmaz & Akyıldız, 2023), language achievement (Karacan et al., 2022), factors affecting the use of self-regulated L2 learning strategies (Köksal, & Dündar, 2017), and language skills (Meşe & Mede, 2023; Uztosun, 2021). Yılmaz and Akyıldız (2023) found that EFL teachers held some misconceptions and inconsistency between behaviours and beliefs, not to mention the limited understanding of the exact nature of self-regulation. Köksal and Dündar (2017) conducted their study with pre-service teachers at a Turkish ELT department. They discovered that learners' yet future English teachers' personality traits, identity, beliefs about L2 learning, and proficiency could affect self-regulated L2 learning strategy use. Karacan et al. (2022) found that only 14% of the prediction of EFL achievement was through self-regulated behaviours, probably due to the research setting being an online interface. Only two studies were detected to examine the relation of self-regulation with speaking skills. Meşe and Mede (2023) examined the effect of self-regulation on speaking skills through differentiated instruction, meaning the adaption of instruction according to diverse background knowledge, reading level, and students' interests. They concluded that differentiated instruction did not boost self-regulated behaviours but significantly improved students' speaking skills. However, Uztosun (2021), in his study with Turkish university students, demonstrated that self-regulated behaviour, if accompanied by motivation, could predict 34% of EFL speaking competence aided by regulation of effect. By integrating these two constructs of Dogme ELT and self-regulation in commencing, cultivating, and concluding stages of the current study, students of the English language could be best supported by developing their self-regulated behaviours to improve their conversational skills via Dogme ELT.

Rationale of the study

Due to the space limitations and the nature of the qualitative works that include and discuss the literature at the end of the study in the culminating stages (Creswell, 2009), the review of research, in a nutshell, suggests that the findings that emerged are pretty scanty

and mixed. Therefore, more studies, especially in action research designs, are needed to test the viability of Dogme ELT for English for specific purposes such as conversational skills. In terms of the methodology of the conducted studies, all the reviewed studies were conducted without analysing students' needs to be considered in the classroom. In the literature review, no study was detected that followed research designs to raise self-regulated learners by applying the principles of Dogme ELT. Thus, the study aimed to raise more autonomous learners, which could lead to enhanced speaking performance; therefore, the teacher-researcher followed the typical phases of self-regulated learning in this action research (Uztosun, 2021). These phases involve a preparatory phase that embraces task analysis, planning, and goal setting; a performance phase encompassing monitoring and controlling the process; and finally, an appraisal phase in which learners go through a reflection process. In the preparatory phase, a needs analysis was conducted to explore learners' needs. In the performance phase, students kept journals to monitor their progress, and lastly, in the appraisal phase, students were asked for their reflective views about the Dogme ELT embedded in the speaking course. Therefore, in light of the reasons inflicting Turkish learners of English stated in the introduction and the preliminary needs analysis in the current study that learners evaluated themselves as not proficient at conversational skills, the current study will initially aim to contribute to students' development of conversational skills. The study will also add to the literature, which might inspire other ELT professionals to readjust their instruction in conversational skills in the classroom. This study attempted to answer the research questions below:

1. How do the students assess their conversational skills in the English language, and what do they need to develop?
2. What patterns of factors could have affected students' conversational skills in the intervention?
3. To what extent did the intervention of Dogme ELT improve learners' conversational skills?

Methodology

The intervention

Dogme ELT principles represent an instructional framework seeking to disengage English language pedagogy from over-reliance on conventional educational materials such as textbooks, predetermined linguistic content, and the perceived constraints associated with traditional teacher roles. Therefore, Dogme ELT principles aspire to foster a more conversation-driven, materials-light, and emergent linguistic instructional approach. To illustrate the intervention, following the conversation-driven principle, participants engaged in conversations with their partners about any topics of interest for two 45-minute lessons. As for the second materials-light principle, during these conversations, there was no strict interference or instructions by the teacher or use of textbooks or other materials, as happens in many traditional speaking lessons. Depending on the choices of students, the partners have changed occasionally. The participants also delivered a small talk to the class. Inspired by the third principle about emerging linguistic instruction, as they also

took notes of the contents and the processes of the conversations, the instructor, from time to time, provided a brief explanation about some structural or lexical forms that the students needed help to use in the conversations. At the end of each week, the participants wrote a reflective paper regarding these talks.

Research design

As one of the main functions of research endeavours is to offer solutions to the challenges in the micro- or macro-settings (Creswell, 2009), the current research was conducted to explore the extant problem elucidated in the introduction. This study thus proposes and implements a viable solution rooted in Dogme ELT and thereafter examines the effects of the proffered solution upon the underlying problem. Therefore, the selection of an action research design for this study is theoretically underpinned by the shared objective of facilitating instructional change and the developmental progress of learners, which necessitates systematic analysis of the classroom environment and careful examination of the effects of the intervening instructional approach on teaching and learning outcomes (Burns, 1999). Nevertheless, though action research is presumed to be within the qualitative research due to the convergent objectives of qualitative research and action research, the data analysis in this study availed of descriptive quantitative statistics as frequencies, sums, and percentages of codes along with extensive quotes from the participants. Therefore, this type of data analysis could meet the criteria of mixed methodology of data analysis following the reconceptualisation of research paradigms by Hampson and McKinley (2023).

Context and participants

Conducted within a state university's English Language Teaching program, the study samples first-grade ELT students undergoing foundational courses in comprehensive and productive language skills at the B1 proficiency level as they have already passed the prep class. They enrolled in this department due to national university entrance exam scores focused on reading comprehension, lexical development, and grammatical mastery. The participants in the class consist of 72 Turkish students enrolled in a compulsory two-credit-hour course named “Speaking Skills”, where instruction was delivered in two intact groups. Sixty of them were female, and 12 participants were male. As 69 of the participants had just graduated from high school, their ages were between 18-20 years. There were only three outsiders. One was around 40 years old and was also a teacher. The other two were receiving their second undergraduate degrees. As the participation in the data-gathering tools was based on voluntary participation to ensure convenient sampling, the number of participants fluctuated from one tool to another. Therefore, self-reports, the first data-gathering tool, were filled out by 44 participants; 58 participants kept journals, and the whole class of 72 participants presented feedback on the intervention.

Data collection procedures

The cyclical stages of planning, action, observation, and reflection in typical action research were meticulously followed in implementing this study (Burns, 1999). The tools for both intervention and data gathering were systemically collected in the pre-intervention

stage for planning, during the intervention for action and observation, and post-intervention for reflective purposes. The employed methodologies included self-evaluation reports for needs analysis to inform intervention planning, reflective journals to monitor progress, and open-ended questionnaires to assess students' overall reflective perspectives on speaking practice and the efficacy of the intervention.

Initiating data collection with self-reports analysed participants' needs and specific challenges in speaking to facilitate the formulation of appropriate interventions, as suggested by Tsang and Wong (2002) and also availed by Glover (2019). Participants were given written questionnaires and two weeks to reflect extensively on their speaking skills. Subsequently, 58 voluntary learners kept weekly journals for 15 weeks during the intervention. Journals represent a valuable form of learner narratives that disclose learners' insights about two interwoven contexts: the internal context of learners' inner selves and the external context embracing external occasions and situations (Oxford, 2011). The practice of keeping journals offers benefits for both researchers and learners (Oxford et al. 1996), allowing the researcher to see participants' ongoing progress and the efficacy of the intervention and guide learners to reflect on their affective and cognitive aspects of speaking by raising their awareness (Oxford et al. 1996). Participants documented linguistic forms encountered, conversational topics discussed, and difficulties faced during interactions. They also concluded each entry with reflections on the session on the evening of the course day. Regular monthly reviews of the journals were conducted to provide feedback and refine instructional strategies. Lastly, at the end of the semester, an open-ended questionnaire was submitted to the whole class to solicit feedback about the intervention, participants' speaking development, and their insights about the course. To raise self-regulated autonomous learners (Uztosun, 2021), self-evaluation was emphasised at the beginning and end of the intervention to empower students in the assessment process by allowing them to take control of their learning process and reassess their abilities more realistically (Alderson, 2005; Meddings & Thornbury, 2009). In addition, as the speaking tasks in the classroom primarily encompass the speaking types of interactive and extensive conversations, assessments were also integrated into conversational exchanges and oral presentations (Brown & Lee, 2015). Institutional permissions were secured after the commencement of the study with document no: 6346 and date: 01.02.2024. Additionally, informed consent was obtained from all participating individuals. All these ethical acts underscored the ethical rigour of the research endeavour.

Data analysis procedures

Self-reports were gathered from a cohort of 44 students. Fifty-eight learners kept reflective journals for 15 weeks. Additionally, 72 learners provided feedback on the intervention by granting responses to seven open-ended questions.

The data underwent a meticulous qualitative analytical process involving three iterative and intermittent readings. In the initial reading, key codes were identified and tabulated. The secondary reading subsumed codes under emerging categories and overarching themes. After six weeks of break from the second reading, the tertiary reading

aimed to reconfirm the identified codes' consistency, coherence, and alignment with the emergent categories and themes.

The reliability of the data analysis was checked by both intra- and inter-reliability tests. An intra-coder reliability analysis that was tested between three readings yielded a Cohen's Kappa coefficient of .94, indicating a high level of consistency. On the other hand, inter-coder reliability, established through collaborative scrutiny with a specialist colleague, resulted in Cohen's Kappa coefficient of .89, signifying robust agreement regarding code emergence and categorisation. These reliability coefficient results corroborate the data analysis's robustness; that is, the codes and categories were determined by agreement across time and coders, which connotes the reliability of data analysis in qualitative research.

As regards the specific procedures of collecting and analysing data, the themes derived from the self-reports, which served as a form of needs analysis, were identified based on the prevalence of recurring codes. Afterwards, these themes served as pre-set themes for subsequent content analyses of the journals and open-ended questionnaires. The cumulative data encompassed an extensive corpus comprising hundreds of thousands of words.

To streamline the presentation of the data, the most pertinent excerpts from the reflective journals and responses to open-ended questionnaires were quoted and juxtaposed under germane themes. While the self-report data was subjected to quantitative analysis and presented in a tabulated and numeric display, data extracted from the journals and open-ended questionnaire underwent qualitative content analysis, emphasising verbal evidence through contextualised quotes subsumed under thematic categories. Acknowledging the inherent subjectivity in qualitative research analysis, the researcher has an interpretative role. Additionally, statements originally articulated in the participants' native language were translated into English for analysis and reporting purposes. A colleague also checked these translations to match the original meaning with the translated meaning.

Results

Self-reports

In the inaugural session of the course, students were assigned to compose a self-report, serving as a needs analysis instrument concerning their conversational skills to answer the first RQ. This data collection phase entailed a self-assessment, delineation of reasons underpinning their perceived level of efficacy and identification of areas necessitating improvement. From a cohort of 72 enrolled students, 44 self-reports were received, constituting a substantial portion and facilitating a reliable estimation of the broader student population.

Students initially revealed their self-assessment regarding their conversational skills. The most common descriptors that they used for assessing their conversational skills were "good", "bad", and "average". According to the five levels of conversational proficiency delineated by the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR, 2012), the

statements “good”, “bad”, and “average” could be associated with the levels as follows: “good” stands for around 4 (advanced professional proficiency), “bad” represents the level of 2 (limited working proficiency), and “average” corresponds to 3 (general professional proficiency). Among the 44 respondents, as shown in Table 1, 27 students appraised themselves as possessing bad speaking skills (level 2), while 10 regarded their proficiency as good (level 4). Seven respondents positioned themselves at the average level (3). Upon redistributing the average group's count evenly across the “good” and “bad” categories, nearly two-thirds of the cohort (n=30) were found not to perceive themselves as sufficiently proficient in conversational skills in English, amounting to a limited working proficiency. Students’ self-assessment of speaking proficiency to be low was also affirmed by the study conducted by Yanar and Tütüniş (2016), who discovered that most of the students were below the average level.

These findings prove the prevalent disposition of low speaking proficiency among Turkish speakers of English in Turkish educational contexts, which betakes us to ponder over some potential intervening solutions in the context of the course. To determine the intervention, students’ justifications for having high or low proficiency in English need to be examined in depth.

The codes of reasons for determining students’ proficiency levels in conversational skills were converged under four thematic categories, as shown in Table 1, such as affective, contextual, linguistic, and schooling factors that emerged out of the most prevalently recurring codes. Regarding the affective category, two of the most defining factors behind their ability to converse in English are their reticent personality (n=7) and fear of making mistakes (n=8), primarily stemming from their classmates’ potentially debilitating reactions. This result is salient because the frequency of the mentioned factors falls discernibly when the perceived proficiency levels rise. As for the contextual factors, a dearth of practice (n=16) emerged as a significant impediment for low-proficient students, but high-proficient students ascribed their efficiency to consistent practice (n=6), which proves the pivotal worth of consistent engagement with conversational skills. Factors in schooling (n=19) and linguistics (n=24) were mentioned more by the low-proficient students as crucial factors, which again decreased when their self-efficacy improved.

Table 1. Content Analysis of Students' Rationalisations For Their Self-Assessment

Categories	Low self-assessment		Medium self- assessment		High self- assessment		Total
	Codes	**f**	**Codes**	**f**	**Codes**	**f**	
Affective factors	Reticent personality	7	Reticent personality	0	Reticent personality	3	10
	Fear of making mistakes	8	Fear of making mistakes	1	Fear of making mistakes	2	11
	Anxiety	3	Anxiety	3	Anxiety	2	8
	Confidence	3	Confidence	1	Confidence	3	7
Total		**21**		**5**		**10**	**36**
Contextual factors	Dearth of practice	16	Dearth of practice	3	Consistent practice	6	25
	Language exposure	8		0	Utilizing audio-visual media	4	12
Total		**24**		**3**		**10**	**37**
Linguistic factors	Vocabulary	10	Vocabulary	3	Vocabulary	3	16
	Grammar	7	Grammar	1	Grammar	3	11
	Pronunciation	4	Pronunciation	0	Pronunciation	2	6
	Translation	3	Translation	0	Translation	2	5
Total		**24**		**4**		**10**	**38**
Schooling factors	Examination	10	Examination	1	Examination	0	11
	Teachers' use of English	7	Teachers' use of English	1	Teachers' use of English	1	9
	Educational system	2	Educational system	3	Educational system	3	8
Total		**19**		**5**		**4**	**28**

The identification of students' needs for conversation skills was contingent upon their perceived proficiency in speaking. Therefore, their needs were combined into three thematic categories, as displayed in Table 2: the needs of individuals characterized by low, average, and high self-efficacy. Among students with low self-efficacy, a prevailing inclination towards more speaking practice (n=10) and consumption of audio-visual media (n=7) was observed, whereas students with average self-efficacy expressed a lesser demand for additional practice (n=3). On the other hand, highly self-efficacious students expressed a preference for engaging with audio-visual texts (n=2).

Table 2. Content Analysis for The Needs To Improve Speaking Proficiency

Categories	Code	Frequency
Needs of low self-efficacious students	More practice	10
	Watching and listening to audio-visual media	7
	Talk to myself	2
	Online friends	2
	Reading books	2
Total		**23**
Needs of average self-efficacious students	More practice	3
	Teachers help in speaking	2
Total		**5**
Needs of high self-efficacious students	Audio-visual media	2
Total		**2**

Based on the overall findings, students ascribe their proficiency in conversation in English to the affective, contextual, schooling, and linguistic factors. These results indicate that the intervention should be multi-layered and mitigate the aforementioned factors. Therefore, the potential intervention should include some levels of practice aligned with contextual factors, a comfortable and supportive atmosphere in classrooms linked with affective factors, more absence of distressing exams yet more inclusion of student-centred interactions related to schooling factors, and more use-oriented instruction of linguistic forms associated with linguistic factors. Within this framework, an intervention rooted in the tenets of Dogme ELT emerges as a promising path that could be characterised by a conversation-driven extensive practice, the incorporation of emergent language instruction centred on lexical chunks, and a departure from traditional textbook-centred instruction.

Journals

In each lesson, students delved into conversations in pairs, which the teacher-researcher occasionally reorganised. These interactions happened to focus on topics of personal relevance. Throughout these exchanges, students encountered challenges primarily associated with word recall and sentence formulation. Therefore, these emerging linguistic forms were briefly explained by the teacher-researcher. Another prevalent source of anxiety and low self-confidence, as evidenced in self-reports, stemmed from concerns regarding examinations and public speaking. To test their conversational skills and familiarise and comfort them on such occasions, students also underwent assessments of their speaking proficiency, both within pair interactions and before the class. Similar quantifying data about the factors affecting speaking were also encountered in the journals. While self-reports predominantly featured quantitative data, journal entries were characterised by qualitative analysis, emphasising the utilisation of direct quotations to elucidate emerging themes such as contextual, affective, linguistic, and schooling factors. These quotations served as supporting evidence to the self-reports, substantiating the identified thematic categories to answer the second RQ.

Regarding the affective factors, students (28. Participant, hereafter P) reported experiencing a notable sense of enjoyment and satisfaction, aligning with the principles of flow theory. Through consistent practice, students reported a gradual increase in self-confidence, which in turn led to a corresponding reduction in anxiety levels. The cultivation of this positive emotional state was attributed, in part, to the supportive demeanour of the teacher-researcher during both pair work (37. P) and public speaking tasks (20. P). Students were afforded agency in selecting speech topics inspired by their personal interests and background knowledge to foster intrinsic motivation and comfortable speaking (38. P). Topics of interactions encompassed a wide range of familiar subjects, including social media, sports, music, dormitory life, family dynamics, language learning experiences, celebrities, movies, literary works, and so on.

> P28: Like always, this lesson was effective, productive, and enjoyable. I love this lesson so much.
>
> P37: That was good because speaking spontaneously relieved our excitement and increased our self-confidence with the teacher's help.
>
> P20: Sometimes, we cannot even say a simple sentence because we are excited, and if we practice speaking in front of people, our confidence will increase, and we can speak better.
>
> P38: We were lucky that the teacher wanted us to choose the subject; this motivated and relieved us more because we were not entirely used to it yet, so the teacher helped us to get used to it.

Regarding the contextual factors, all participants emphasised the significance of their partners' personality traits and linguistic proficiency in shaping their conversational skills and influencing the assessment of pair interactions. While some students (8. P) advocated for the efficacy of partner rotation, others (40. P) expressed reservations, contending that frequent changes hindered the depth of discourse and often constrained conversations to superficial topics. As the classroom settings were recognised to be the primary opportunities to practice conversation in English in the EFL context (16. P), classroom practice with just 2 hours per week may not be sufficient for language exposure or practice (7. P), online platforms were identified as potential supplements to classroom practice, offering increased opportunities for language exposure beyond the confines of classrooms because translation sites and online dictionaries were invariably availed to address some linguistic needs (29. P) during the conversations.

> P8: I think it was not good because talking with the same partner in both lessons got boring.
>
> P40: I do not like our partner changing. Because I didn’t feel comfortable speaking. I had more difficulty in speaking. I think we can talk better if our partner doesn’t change.
>
> P16: I think instead of solving tests after learning grammatical rules we should do practice by speaking and we should solve tests when we go to the home. I say this because when we are in school, there are people or friends who know English, but at home, we can’t have this chance.
>
> P7: I think everything starts to practice more. But time in the class is not enough to speak or learn English.
>
> P29: Anyway, while speaking, we started to take notes about everything we didn’t know and searched on the phone.

Regarding linguistic gains, students relatively overcame the challenges of word recall appropriate to the contexts of the situation, intelligibility of the pronunciation of the words, and sentence construction (58. P). Students identified several emerging grammatical points needing further instruction, encompassing conditional clauses, noun clauses, adverbial and adjective clauses, and verb tenses (4. P). Additionally, students actively took notes of linguistic expressions such as collocations and colligations to ease and enhance their speaking proficiency, and the teacher-researcher provided succinct explanations (29. P). Observing their developmental progress, students reported heightened motivation for oral communication (16. P).

> P58: I have seen a change in pronunciation and vocabulary for the past weeks.
>
> P4: I think this course was efficient and fruitful. Because we studied grammar, we remember it as well. We also use them in sentences and daily life and combine them with ourselves.
>
> P29: Anyway, while speaking, we started to take notes about everything we didn't know and searched on the phone.
>
> P16: It was a fruitful class for me to practice my English because I remembered the words I had forgotten when speaking with my partner. I remembered the grammatical rules, phrasal verbs, etc. Also, I gained self-confidence. Before, I was ashamed of speaking English because I was making mistakes, but now I don't feel shame when I make mistakes.

As for the schooling factors, students expressed gratitude for the guidance provided by the teacher-researcher during the conversational activities (8. P). It was also observed that none of the students identified a requirement for textbooks in their conversational practice (20. P). Furthermore, the prevalence of anxiety among students was prominently associated with exam-like assessments, mainly when speaking in front of an audience (6. P).

> P8: Students feel so excited and nervous on the stage, but thanks to the lecturer's questions, the speech is easy and comfortable.
>
> P20: Since our lesson is speaking, it makes sense not to stick to any book.
>
> P6: The teacher always wanted us not to be worried about exam points. Thanks to the teacher, I improved myself, not for grades but for myself.

Questionnaire

Upon completing the course and the intervention, students were surveyed regarding their perspectives on their conversational skills and the efficacy of the intervention to answer the third RQ. Of the 72 responses to the question of conversation-driven principle, 69 students (95.83%) acknowledged the efficacy of this method in enhancing their speaking skills (54. P). Only three respondents expressed hesitations regarding the aid of conversation-driven principle and attributed the deficiency of perceived benefit to insufficient instructional hours. This finding suggests that the conversation-driven principle in Dogme ELT proves effective when implemented even for two weekly hours for one semester and could be more efficacious if implemented more than this period.

> P54: Practicing language, learning new words and expressions, improving pronunciation, and enhancing grammar can be highly beneficial by conversing with native speakers, language

> exchange partners, or language learning tools. Continuous conversation helps us better understand grammar rules, expand our vocabulary, and develop our speaking skills naturally.

Out of 71 replies to the efficacy of emerging language, only two students averred that they did not benefit from this technique. The remaining respondents (n=69, 97.18%) emphasised attaining lexical knowledge and grammatical proficiency through this principle. Furthermore, they also underscored the significance of employing and learning grammatical and lexical structures during and after usage (37. P).

> P37: Learning grammar and vocabulary through practice is more memorable. Otherwise, memorising grammar rules or words is forgotten after a while. Working on these two aspects through speaking ensures permanent learning.

The feedback from the students regarding the use of educational materials in speaking classes indicates diversified views. Nevertheless, contrary to the traditional use of textbooks, it was observed that none of the students resorted to textbook materials and unanimously advocated their non-usage. However, a minority subset of students (n=16, 22.54%) abstained from employing technological aids such as telephones or computers during speaking courses (27. P). In contrast, the majority (n=55, 77.46%) availed themselves of online resources such as dictionaries, translation websites, mobile applications, and audio-visual media, mainly when they encountered difficulties related to word retrieval, pronunciation, or sentence construction (26. P).

> P27: Yes, I think it's more beneficial to communicate in class without relying on technology. When even a simple word doesn't come to mind, we can sometimes get stuck and immediately turn to our phones. Instead of doing that, I believe it would be more beneficial to try to express the words we can't remember differently.
>
> P26: I believe utilising technology would make lessons more practical and efficient. I consider technology to be effective and necessary for language learning. I have used the tech tools for pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and translation. I will definitely continue to use them because, in my opinion, technology is the most effective tool in language learning.

At the end of the intervention, the most predominant obstacles identified by students were associated with affective factors, including confidence (n=14), fear of making mistakes (n=12), reticent personality (n=4), and anxiety (n=4), contextual factors such as the dearth of practice (n=36) and language exposure (n=4), linguistic factors involving vocabulary use (n=9) and grammar (n=3), and schooling factors as examination (n=2) and educational system (n=1). The frequency of mentions in each category was counted before and after the intervention, as displayed in Table 3.

As illustrated in Table 3, despite general approval of the intervention's efficacy, persistent challenges were primarily attributed to affective factors, including anxiety, contextual constraints necessitating consistent practice, and linguistic deficiencies concerning vocabulary recall and use. However, the intervention conspicuously contributed to reducing students' tendency to attribute challenges to linguistic and schooling factors. This reduction can be ascribed to transferring students' linguistic competence, encompassing both structural and lexical knowledge, to the speaking

performance, thereby diminishing the frequency of such attributions. Additionally, the contextual factors, including the absence of anxiety-inducing exams and the supportive role of the teacher, likely facilitated this reduction in attributions related to schooling. However, the duration of the intervention, limited to a 2-hour course per week, was deemed insufficient by participants to develop conversational skills. Consequently, this inadequacy failed to bolster participants' self-confidence, leading to a sustained presence of affective and contextual factors affecting their performance.

Table 3. The Discrepancy in The Frequency Of Mentions In Each Category Before and After The Intervention

	Before the intervention	After the intervention
	Frequency of mentions	Frequency of mentions
Affective factors	36	34
Contextual factors	37	40
Linguistic factors	38	12
Schooling factors	28	3

As a response to the question regarding students' reflective suggestions for further improvement in conversational skills, students needed and suggested further regular practice (n=35, 55.56%), more language exposure through other language skills (n=15, 23.81%), a supportive atmosphere in the classroom conducive to building confidence (n=6, 9.52%), and studying vocabulary (n=7, 11.11%).

On the grounds of the overall findings, to compensate for schooling factors, first and foremost, a friendly and comfortable environment in the classroom needs to be established to alleviate students' anxiety and foster speaking practice without the fear of making mistakes. Subsequently, as the suggestions above substantiated the need for more practice, extensive speaking practice would enhance students' linguistic competence, which in turn would improve students' conversational skills. It thus would help students gain confidence and elude anxiety (59. P). To compensate for the limited time of the course with the outside-the-class practice and exposure (61. P), online platforms could be leveraged as extracurricular language practice and exposure.

> P59: I think that as we practice and speak with each other more, our self-confidence will encourage us to speak even more.
>
> P61: Actually, speaking is not a problem. There is only one keyword to solve it, and everyone who does that can speak very easily. That is "practice." The more you speak, the more you improve.

Given that one of the essential stages in formal education is the assessment, measuring and evaluating conversational skills is much more crucial and distressing due to the affective problems of anxiety experienced by learners, possible examiner biases, the dynamics commonly used in paired examinations where students converse in pairs as a

form a speaking test (Foot, 1999) or speaking in front of an audience. In the current study, students underwent assessment in pairs and through individual speeches delivered to the class. The self-assessment technique was employed to encourage students to foster ownership of their progress (Talandis & Stout, 2015).

As a result, a significant majority of students (n=67, 93.06%) noticed a certain level of self-perceived progress in their speaking ability. While students in the first stages felt a certain level of anxiety, they gradually gained a certain level of confidence besides efficacy in speaking English. Despite initial anxiety levels, students progressively developed a sense of confidence (59. P) alongside enhanced proficiency in spoken English (48. P). The efficacy of the intervention in promoting practical skills and self-confidence further reinforced students' conviction regarding the necessity for consistent practice (61. P).

> P59: I think that as we practice and speak with each other more, our self-confidence will encourage us to speak even more.
>
> P48: There has definitely been a difference; in fact, there was a difference even about three weeks after taking this course. In the initial stages, I experienced difficulties in speaking and consequently felt less confident; later on, I noticed that I didn't stumble and hesitate as much when speaking, and I felt more comfortable.
>
> P61: We can't speak because we are afraid of making mistakes, embarrassing ourselves, and lacking self-confidence. But the more we speak, the fewer mistakes we make. That's why I believe we need to speak no matter how many mistakes we make.

Regarding the students' overall opinion about the intervention, the vast majority of students (n=68, 94.44%) expressed fulfilment and perceived benefits. These benefits were identified primarily to be associated with enhanced self-confidence, improved speaking proficiency, and increased social engagement, which contributed to the mitigation of reticent tendencies among the students (67. P).

> P67: The course was both very enjoyable and highly developmental for me. I can say that I started speaking English with this course. It was so enjoyable that I continued and did many things individually to improve it, and I continue to do so. If I hadn't taken this course, I'm not sure if I would have put in so much effort and enthusiasm to speak English as I do now. Besides the benefits it provided me, the motivation it instilled in me is also very important.

As an overall summary of all findings, it was found that students' challenges regarding conversational skills could be attributed to affective factors, including reticent personality, self-confidence, anxiety, and fear of making mistakes, contextual factors involving dearth of practice and language exposure, linguistic factors such as structural lexical competence, issues of pronunciation, and reliance on translation, and lastly to schooling factors encompassing examination, teachers' command of English, and macro-educational system. As for the principles of Dogme ELT, the participants expressed appreciation for the conversation-driven and emergent language instruction, yet they reported concerns regarding the light usage of technology. At the end of the intervention, though the participants stated a relatively good level of improvement in their

conversational skills and enhancement of self-confidence, they still grapple with challenges stemming from affective and contextual factors. Nevertheless, there was a notable reduction in the influence of linguistic and schooling factors.

Discussion

As the incentive of the study was the discovery of students' low proficiency in conversation in English in the needs analysis, the subsequent findings from the following data substantiate the reasons behind the low self-efficacy mentioned in the introduction (Talandis & Stout, 2015). At large, the positive results on speaking performance in the studies found by Ali, Ali, and Ngah (2023), Coşkun (2017), Glover (2019), Larson-Hall (2016), Nureldeen (2020), Sarani and Malmir (2019), Sayed (2016), Solimani et al. (2019), and Xerri (2012) were also corroborated by the current study. On the other hand, the emerging themes of affective, contextual, linguistic, and schooling factors could also be associated with the areas of self-regulation that Uztosun (2021) researched in the case of speaking skills. These areas are task value activation, regulation of the learning environment, regulation of the classroom environment, and regulation of affect. Affective issues such as anxiety, self-confidence, or motivation are akin to the regulation of affect; task value activation could be associated with the linguistic factors related to the speaking skills per se; contextual factors involve self-regulation of learning to offset the deficits of the macro-environments as EFL contexts; and schooling factors including exams and teachers involve self-regulation of the classroom environment. The result that primarily linguistic and schooling factors in speaking were reduced towards the end of the intervention was also encountered by Glover (2019), who explored students' awareness of speaking skills over four years. To streamline the following discussion in line with the main findings found in this study, the following discussion will be covered under the above themes: affective, contextual, linguistic, and schooling factors. However, under each theme, specific findings or research areas inspired by the literature review written by Zhang (2023) will be expounded. To reify, the classroom atmosphere under the affective theme, the use of educational technologies to practice English outside the classrooms under the contextual theme, the effectiveness of Dogme commonly related to the specific course under the linguistic theme, and teachers' efficiency and exams under the schooling theme were discussed in the following pages.

As the findings approved the crucial value of speaking practice in the class, confirming Uztosun (2021), who found a correlation between the regulation of classroom environment and speaking competence, the role of the teacher could be the facilitator of the organisation of speaking pairs in the classroom rather than the source of interaction. To this end, the interlocutor effect (Nunan, 1991) plays a significant role in the assessment of conversations as some students preferred a stable partner for deeper talk and some others opted for a change of partner for some reasons as the dominance of a speaking partner in a dialogue as stated by a teacher in the study of Coşkun (2017). The need for deeper talk or 'long conversation' (Mercer, 1995) was also echoed by Chappell (2013), who deduced that discussion and inquiry dialogue should not be disregarded in the classroom to achieve success in Dogme ELT. Another explanation of the finding related to changing partners is

concerned with equality and mutuality between peers, and this corroborates Chen's findings (2017). Mutuality between peers, that is, peers responding to questions of each other, utilising emerging learning opportunities, exchanging ideas, and solving communication breakdowns, led to the preference of sticking to the same partner or a change of partner for lack of mutuality. Evaluation of speaking proficiency is even greatly determined by the personality and linguistic proficiency of the partners (Foot, 1999). Therefore, the choice of partners could be left to the peers' preferences because they would better know the mutuality between each other rather than the teacher organising the speaking pairs (Chen, 2017). As regards the benefits of conversations, enabling dialogic pedagogy (Freire, 1998; Mercer & Howe, 2012), conversations not only improved students' speaking skills but also reciprocally socialised with their peers, gained confidence and empowerment, were disentangled from reticence by being included in the talks, and knew each other better by critically co-constructing the knowledge related to the topics of the conversations. Enacting and modelling such dialogic practice in the teacher education programs, as investigated by Arslan and Whitehead (2022) in the teacher education programs in Türkiye deserve much attention so that future English teachers can receive the knowledge, method, and practice of dialogic practice in their future classrooms, especially in the courses of speaking skills. In another sense, by engaging in dialogic practice in the Dogme ELT, the participants were socialised and liberated through language as purported in socialisation theory (Bandura, 1977). These engaging and enjoyable dialogues between pairs were similarly observed by Coşkun (2017) and Xerri (2012), also supporting the nature of flow theory (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Therefore, one of the most significant assets of Dogme ELT is conversation-driven lessons that can raise more empowered and liberated individuals by making them socialise through language while improving their speaking skills in English by having dialogues on engaging topics and talks.

Secondly, the approval of the non-use of textbooks discovered in this study affirms the findings of Coşkun (2017). Another finding that students exploited mobile and online technologies during the interactions for needed information regarding emerging language could falsely be deemed incongruent with the materials-free principle of Dogme ELT. However, Ushioda (2011) contends that tech-integrated Dogme ELT could be more effective in language education, not to mention that Dogme does not wholly object to materials used in the classroom. On the contrary, Dogme ELT supports materials that mediate talk, as in Dogme 2.0 tools (Nguyen & Phu, 2020). As a piece of supporting evidence of such tools' effectiveness, Yanar and Tütüniş (2016) conducted classroom research to explore the effects of mass media tools on 38 adult learners' speaking skills. They found that using such tools has improved learners' use of communicative expressions in speaking. The concern could be more related to the over-use of textbooks, which none of the students suggested studying textbooks for speaking because textbooks do not provide diversity and creativity in teaching practises and do not meet students' learning needs (Cunningsworth, 1995). Instead of textbooks, as students are more liable to regulate their classroom environment in speaking courses (Uztosun, 2021), these courses could be devoted to extensive conversations between acquainted individuals rather than strangers on

the internet. However, as the classroom time was not deemed to be sufficient enough to practice English in the EFL context and thus to direct speaking outside the classroom, chatrooms could provide opportunities to transfer linguistic competence to performance by engaging in meaningful, motivating, and comforting interaction and collaboration leading to linguistic exposure, which is also necessitated by the participants in the current study to improve spoken interaction (Hamano-Bunce, 2011; Meşe & Mede, 2023).

Thirdly, the success of Dogme in the present study could have resulted from the course being a speaking course rather than the other courses on structure, lexis, or other skills because the central principle of Dogme was conversation, which also helped improve students' conversational skills as found in many studies reviewed by Ali et al. (2023) These findings also affirm that students appreciate the development of speaking skills since task value activation was found to be the most regulated area of students in speaking courses (Uztosun, 2021). The reasons behind the intervention and the conducive results also substantiated the idea of 'small talk' (Hunter, 2012) regarding its positive effects on speaking performance and affective factors as enjoyment because students were the subjects of the speaking practice free of teacher's interventions. However, linguistic proficiency cannot be limited to speaking skills. Dogme integrated into other courses may not yield similar results. For instance, Worth (2012) unveiled that Dogme could be implemented for speaking practice, but textbook-based teaching could be better applied for grammar and lexical exercises or other skills. Coşkun (2017) also averred the exact prediction, claiming that Dogme may not be appropriate for exam-oriented educational settings. Such debilitating settings, along with speaking, which generates anxiety more than other skills (Young, 1990), could create more anxiety and fear. This makes sense when the affective factors did not decrease as much as expected at the end of the current study. On the other hand, applying Dogme in speaking courses cannot ensure success unless classroom talk contains discussion and inquiry types of classroom talks, which were lacking in the Dogme classrooms (Chappell, 2013). However, considering all the sociolinguistic variables, the pursuit of 'talk as interaction' enclosing discussion and inquiry could also seem to be a far-fetched goal, given that teachers endeavour to achieve all the criteria of accuracy, fluency, and complexity in speaking performance (Hunter, 2012). Therefore, the goals on accuracy and complexity also bring forth the value of explicit instruction of conversational forms and expressions since explicit instruction could be successful only if it is supported by consistent revision practice about diverse or familiar topics at students' disposal and background knowledge (Richards, 2008; Talandis & Stout, 2015). The familiar topics that the students preferred to converse on also support most of the findings in the literature that background knowledge is a defining factor in receptive skills such as reading and listening comprehension. Regarding linguistic expression, some conversational routines or germane fixed multi-word phrases in pre-speaking activities to be used in turn-taking or topic nominations, etc., could be provided to students (Richards, 2008).

Lastly, the effectiveness of Dogme could have resulted from the teacher-researcher's linguistic proficiency and teaching experience because inexperienced teachers with inadequate English proficiency cannot separate their instruction from textbooks-based

or exam-oriented instruction as found in the review study by Tsui (2003) and thus, practitioners could face a failure in applying Dogme. For instance, Coşkun (2017) disclosed that two teachers out of three stated that their low-level speaking proficiency in exploiting emergent language dissuaded them from adopting Dogme and unwillingly preferred traditional teaching methods based on materials (Tosun & Cinkara, 2019). As for the classroom settings, the current findings that Dogme was successful in large classes with around 60 reticent students also invalidated the critiques that Dogme ELT may not be viable in traditional exam-oriented contexts with reticent students and large classes (Akça, 2012). However, the success of the intervention could also be attributed to the lack of distressing exam conventions to establish a non-threatening classroom environment (Ma & Oxford, 2014) since the exam in this course did not serve as a formal summative assessment but rather as an informal formative assessment which is more prevalent in higher-level educational settings. Therefore, such an assessment can lead students to regulate the affective factors, which can positively contribute to speaking competence and, in turn, help them gain more motivation (Uztosun, 2021). Teachers' observation and evaluation of classroom interactions in Dogme could also contribute to speaking proficiency (Chappell, 2013). To wrap up, Dogme's success is conditioned on teachers' and students' value of liberation in education (Nguyen & Phu, 2020) and willingness to communicate (Sarani & Malmir, 2019).

Conclusion

The overall findings showed that the objective of the course, that is, to improve students' conversational skills, was relatively achieved with the help of the principles of Dogme ELT. Specifically, to check the practicality of the principles of Dogme with the data, students' conversational skills were discovered to have improved with conversation-driven practice. As knowledge of vocabulary and grammar is crucial, emergent linguistic points that popped up during these conversations were used for brief instruction by the teacher. This helped develop structural and lexical competence, which, in turn, aided speaking. As for the tech-free principle, online apps and social platforms rather than textbooks provided opportunities for conversation and language exposure inside the classroom in the EFL context, which also supports textbook-free yet tech-light instruction in the classroom.

Regarding the emerging themes, as affective factors significantly affect students' efficiency in speaking, teachers' comforting and guiding demeanour, the classroom's secure atmosphere, personal choices in topics, and engaging partners that should be paired with different personalities and learning styles as proffered by Ma and Oxford (2014) are some of the suggestions. After gaining confidence, more diverse and challenging topics could be assigned to students to broaden their range of vocabulary use. As for the schooling theme, in speaking classes, textbooks are not suggested to be utilised; instead, teachers could capitalise on the interactions and subjects emerging from those interactions. Exams could be an institutional requirement, but language teachers could decrease the role of summative assessment in overall evaluation and increase the weight of formative assessment methods. In terms of linguistic factors, as textbooks or other formal

publications were not found to be used by students, classroom speaking practice could be devoted to conversation but with the guidance of the teachers, especially for the instruction of emerging linguistic points. Emerging linguistic points in the interactions could be explained briefly, and lexical chunks concerning pragmatics and discourse use could be provided. Regarding the contextual factors, given all these issues and Glover's (2019) discovery that good speaking practice in classes could lead students to practice English outside the classroom, Dogme could be best applied and be successful in extra-curricular activities such as speaking communities outside the classrooms because of the non-imposed exams and textbook-free environment. To this end, online platforms could also be used outside classrooms since language exposure in schools is limited due to the EFL context and instructional hours.

Concerning some of the study's limitations, self-reports could be approached by suspects regarding their reliability concerns, such as social desirability and self-deception (Dörnyei, 2002). This qualitative design cannot be generalised to other socio-cultural contexts, so more research could be conducted in diversified settings. The efficiency of the intervention depends on the teacher's belief and ability, as asserted by McIver (2009), that professional and skilful English teachers might be required to achieve success. As some students suggested and preferred watching audio-visual materials, researchers interested in this area could test the effect of audio-visual materials on speaking skills. As one of the basal pillars was emergent language, this method could be tested with grammar and vocabulary learning rather than speaking. As a last word, as teachers can be good or bad models for students, this intervention could inspire those ELT pre-service teachers to apply such a model in their future classrooms as apprentices of observation.

References

Akça, C. (2012). Dogme Unplugged. In Institute of Language and Communication Studies (ILCS) (Eds.), *International symposium on language and communication: research trends and challenges – proceedings book* (pp. 1743–1756). Mega Press. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320585179_Dogme_Unplugged/citations

Alderson, J. C. (2005). *Diagnosing foreign language proficiency*. Continuum.

Ali, I., Ali, Z., & Ngah, E. (2023). A review of the use of the Dogme ELT method in speaking skills. In M. Rahim, A. A. Ab Aziz, I. Saja @ Mearaj, N. A. Kamarudin, O. L. Chong, N. Zaini, A. Bidin, N. Mohamad Ayob, Z. Mohd Sulaiman, Y. S. Chan, & N. H. M. Saad (Eds.), Embracing Change: Emancipating the Landscape of Research in Linguistic, Language and Literature, vol 7. *European Proceedings of Educational Sciences* (pp. 670-680). European Publisher. https://doi.org/10.15405/epes.23097.60

Arslan, S., & Whitehead, G. E. (2022). Fostering pre-service teachers' perceived ability to implement dialogic teaching in Turkey: Examining the contributing factors of an intensive short-term teacher education program from the teacher-learners' vantage point. *Language Teaching Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221093755

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice Hall.

Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching principles*. P. Ed Australia.

Burns, A. (1999). *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Chappell, P. (2013). Engaging learners: conversation-or dialogic-driven pedagogy? *ELT Journal*, *68*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct040

Chen, W. (2017). The effect of conversation engagement on L2 learning opportunities. *ELT Journal*, *71*(3), 329–340. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw075

Christison, M., & Murray, D. E. (2021). *What English language teachers need to know Volume III: Designing curriculum*. Routledge.

Coşkun, A. (2017). Dogme: What do teachers and students think? *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, *6*(2), 33–44. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsll.2016.1445

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience.* Harper & Row.

Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Macmillan Education.

Dörnyei, Z. (2002). *Questionnaires in second language research*. Lawrance Erlbaum Associates.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Foot, M. C. (1999). Relaxing in Pairs. *ELT Journal*, *53*(1), 36–41. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/53.1.36

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of the heart*. Continuum

Glover, P. (2019). Awareness of speaking abilities in English over four years of undergraduate study. *Dil Eğitimi ve Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *5*(2), 139–156. https://doi.org/10.31464/jlere.605911

Gökmen, M. F. (2020). *Post-method pedagogies for English language teaching: Emerging research and opportunities.* Nobel.

Gökmen, M. F. (2023). The preferences of ELT pre-service teachers regarding conventional language teaching approaches. *Proceedings of the 9th International KTUDELL Conference: Language, Literature, and Translation,* (pp. 192–197). Türkiye.

Gökmen, M. F. & Takkaç. M. (2020). English language teaching professionals' grip of post-modern language teaching. In Z. S. Genç & I. G. Kaçar (Eds.), TESOL *in the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities* (pp. 505–547). Peter Lang.

Hamano-Bunce, D. (2011). Talk or chat? Chatroom and spoken interaction in a language classroom. *ELT Journal*, *65*(4), 426–436. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq084

Hardy, J. H. III, Day, E. A., & Steele, L. M. (2019). Interrelationships among self-regulated learning processes: Toward a dynamic process-based model of self-regulated learning. *Journal of Management*, *45*(8), 3146–3177. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318780440

Hunter, J. (2012). 'Small Talk': Developing fluency, accuracy, and complexity in speaking. *ELT Journal*, *66*(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq093

Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR). (2012). *Descriptions of proficiency levels.* http://www.govtilr.org/Skills/ILRscale1.htm

Karacan, C. G., Yıldız, M., & Atay, D. (2022). The relationship between self-regulated learning and EFL achievement in synchronous online language education. *Mextesol Journal,46 (3).*

Hampson, T., & McKinley, J. (2023). Qualitative and quantitative are data types not paradigms: An MMA framework for mixed research in Applied Linguistics. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *16*(2), 1–7.

Köksal, D. & Dündar, S. (2017). Factors affecting the use of self-regulated l2 learning strategies in Turkish FLE context. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13*(2), 397-425.

Larson-Hall, J. (2016). Fluency awareness as a way to increase speaking ability in a first-year college-level English class *Shiken, 20*(1), 1–11.

Ma, R., & Oxford, R. L. (2014). A diary study focusing on listening and speaking: The evolving interaction of learning styles and learning strategies in a motivated, advanced ESL learner. *System*, *43*, 101–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.010

McIver, N. (2009). Review of teaching unplugged: Dogme in English language teaching. *ELT Journal*, *63*(4), 419–421. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp072

Meddings, L., & Thornbury, S. (2009). *Teaching unplugged. Dogme in English language teaching.* Delta Publishing.

Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and learners.* Multilingual Matters.

Mercer, N., & Howe, C. (2012). Explaining the dialogic processes of teaching and learning: The value and potential of sociocultural theory. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 1(1), 12–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2012.03.001

Meşe, E., & Mede, E. (2023). Using digital differentiation to improve EFL achievement and self-regulation of tertiary learners: The Turkish context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *17*(2), 340-353. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2022.2043872

Nguyen, N. Q., & Phu, H. B. (2020). The Dogme approach: A radical perspective in second language teaching in the post-methods era. *Journal of Language and Education*, *6*(3), 173–184. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2020.10563

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Prentice-Hall.

Nureldeen, W. A. (2020). EFL teachers' beliefs about language teaching and learning: Implications for Teaching Unplugged. *Journal of English Teaching*, *6*(3), 232-245.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies.* Pearson Longman.

Oxford, R. L., Lavine, R. Z., Hollaway, M. E., Felkins, G., & Saleh, A. (1996). Telling their stories: language learners use diaries and recollective studies. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 19–34). University of Hawaii Press.

Randi, J. (2004). Teachers as self-regulated learners. *Teachers' College Record, 106(9),* 1825–1853.

Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking*. Cambridge University Press.

Sarani, A. & Malmir, A. (2019). The effect of Dogme language teaching (Dogme ELT) on L2 speaking and willingness to communicate (WTC). *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning Studies, 11*(24), 261–288. https://elt.tabrizu.ac.ir/article_9637_1149.html

Sayed, O. H. (2016). Teaching unplugged: Does it have the potential to improve EFL students' speaking skills in a writing class? *Journal of Research in Curriculum, Instruction and Educational Technology*, *2*(3), 93–127. https://doi.org/10.21608/jrciet.2016.24505

Solimani, E., Ameri-Golestan, A., & Lotfi, A. (2019). Flipped vs. unplugged instructions: Sailing EFL learners' oral proficiency through virtual and real learning communities. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(3), 459-480. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12328a

Talandis Jr, G., & Stout, M. (2015). Getting EFL students to speak: An action research approach. *ELT Journal*, *69*(1), 11–25. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu037

Thornbury, S., & Slade, D. (2006). *Conversation: From description to pedagogy*. Cambridge University Press.

Tosun, Ö. Ö., & Cinkara, E. (2019). Coursebook dependency in secondary and tertiary-level EFL teachers. *How*, *26*(1), 81–105. https://doi.org/10.19183/how.26.1.445

Tsang, W. K., & Wong, M. (2002). Conversational English: an interactive, collaborative and reflective approach. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching* (pp. 212–224). Cambridge University Press.

Tsui, A. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of second language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Ushioda, E. (2011). Language learning motivation, self and identity: Current theoretical perspectives. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *24*(3), 199–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2010.538701

Uysal, H. H. (2012). Evaluation of an in-service training program for primary-school language teachers in Turkey. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *37*(7), 14–29. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2012v37n7.4

Uztosun, M. S. (2021). Foreign language speaking competence and self-regulated speaking motivation. *Foreign Language Annals*, *54*(2), 410–428. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12559

Yanar, M. & Tütüniş, B. (2016). The impact of mass media tools on EFL students' speaking skills case. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET), 3*(1). 2–24. http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/105/122

Yılmaz, G., & Akyıldız, S. T. (2023). EFL teachers' perspectives towards self-regulation in language learning. *Elektronik Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *12*(24), 152-183.

Young, D. J. (1990). An investigation of students' perspectives on anxiety and speaking. *Foreign Language Annals, 23*(6), 539–553. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1990.tb00424.x

Willis, J. (1992). Inner and outer: spoken discourse in the language classroom. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis* (pp. 162–182). Routledge.

Worth, A. (2012). A Dogme-based approach from the learners' perspective. *The Journal of Kanda University of International Studies.24*. 77–99. http://id.nii.ac.jp/1092/00000604/

Xerri, D. (2012). Experimenting with Dogme in a mainstream ESL context. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(9), 59–65. https://www.um.edu.mt/library/oar/handle/123456789/45952

Zhang, C. (2023). A review of Dogme approach: Principles and practices. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, *6*(7), 51–57. https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2023.6.7.6

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice, 41*(2), 64-70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2