

*Scaffolding Teacher Talk in Face-to-Face vs. Online EAP Contexts:
Teachers' and Students' Views*

Gizem Adeka, Bahçeşehir University, Turkey
Derin Atay, Bahçeşehir University, Turkey

The European Conference on Education 2023
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Despite growing research evidence on the facilitative role of scaffolding strategies in enhancing students' learning outcomes, scaffolding L2 learners in hybrid EAP contexts has been an under-researched area. The aim of the present study is twofold: 1) to explore how English language instructors use teacher talk to scaffold language learning during online and face-to-face EAP lessons, and 2) to find out instructors' views on their scaffolding strategies and students' regarding the effectiveness of these strategies. The study was conducted in the English preparatory program of a foundation university in Istanbul, Turkey, and data were collected from four English instructors and 61 students through video recordings and stimulated recall interviews. Analyses revealed that instructors' scaffolding included similar metacognitive, cognitive, and affective strategies in both face-to-face and online lessons. Instructors used various cognitive, metacognitive, and affective scaffolding strategies to cater to students' language learning while preparing them for the academic requirements of the English program and future studies without considering the differing needs of the instructional contexts. Finally, although students generally benefited from the scaffolding strategies used by their instructors, individual differences were observed. The findings shed light on the effective scaffolding strategies of teachers used in hybrid contexts and students' ideas about to what extent they can benefit from them.

Keywords: Scaffolding, Teacher Talk, English for Academic Purposes, Hybrid Education

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Inspired by the Vygotskian sociocultural theory, scaffolding describes how a teacher constructs or guides learners' uptake of knowledge and skills through interactive and intentional support. Teacher support is modified based on learners' current performance, slightly declined over time, and the responsibility of learning should be gradually passed on to the learner (Van de Pol, Volman, & Beishuizen, 2010). In language classrooms, teachers provide learners with experiences in which they engage in communicative activities through collaborative talk. Thus, they can perform better than they could individually. Such supportive dialogue between a learner and a teacher or a more proficient peer is critical as linguistic support and negotiation of meaning have a significant place in learners' language development (Kayi-Aydar, 2013).

In EAP settings, scholars have mainly focused on the role of scaffolding strategies employed in face-to-face lessons. Wilson's (2016) study indicated that delicate scaffolding is significant in allowing students to make their meaning and become critical readers as they proceed with their academic studies. Other researchers point out that contextual support in the form of making connections between activities and both short-term and long-term objectives might scaffold students (e.g., Barnard & Campbell, 2005; Heron & Webster, 2019). Besides, the scaffolding strategies identified by Hammond and Gibbons (2005) in the ESL context can also be adopted in EAP settings, such as linking current learning to past and future activities, correcting errors through appropriation of student contributions, and prompting to elicit the expected answer (e.g., Heron & Webster, 2019; Mannion et al., 2021). In hybrid settings, only a few attempts to scrutinize scaffolding EAP goals have been observed (e.g., Du & Zhou, 2019; Meri-Yilin, 2019; Santoso, 2008). Despite their contribution to the investigation of scaffolding in hybrid EAP contexts, these studies focused on applying a specific framework or an implementation rather than observing the scaffolding strategies adopted by teachers.

Although there have been studies on scaffolding classroom talk in different L2 contexts (e.g., Kayi-Aydar, 2013; Li, 2012), few attempts have been made to investigate scaffolding classroom talk in face-to-face EAP settings (e.g., Heron & Webster, 2019; Mannion et al., 2021). Therefore, there is a need to extend the existing literature by exploring teacher talk to support EAP objectives in hybrid education, which has become prevalent in tertiary education worldwide, including Turkey. Furthermore, to the researchers' knowledge, no study thus far has identified both instructors' and students' views on scaffolding teacher talk strategies and their effectiveness in EAP contexts. To address these gaps, the current study attempted to explore the use of classroom talk to support EAP objectives in online and face-to-face lessons and to collect teachers' views on the scaffolding strategies they use and students' opinions on the effectiveness of these strategies. Hence, the research questions that guided the study were as follows:

1. How do English instructors use teacher talk to scaffold the objectives of online and face-to-face EAP lessons?
2. What are English instructors' views regarding their scaffolding strategies in online and face-to-face EAP lessons?
3. What are students' views on the effectiveness of scaffolding classroom talk in online and face-to-face EAP lessons?

Method

Setting and Participants

The study was conducted in the spring semester of the 2021-2022 academic year in the preparatory program of a foundation university in Istanbul, Turkey, with four English instructors and 61 students in their classes. Both instructors and students were given pseudonyms to protect their anonymity and confidentiality. The profile of the participating instructors is shown in Table 1.

The English preparatory program adopts a content-based approach that assists students in learning the content to perform various academic tasks and develop such academic skills as notetaking and paraphrasing to deal with the demands of their future academic studies. Since the beginning of the academic year, a hybrid mode of education has been implemented. Students have been given online instruction twice a week and face-to-face instruction on campus three days a week.

	Hazal	Adil	Sinem	Farah
Age	32	34	42	39
Nationality	Turkish	Syrian	Turkish	Iranian
Bachelor's degree	English Language and Literature	English Language and Literature	English Language and Literature	English Translation and Interpreting
Master's degree	English Language Education (in progress)	English Language Education	English Language Education	English Language Education
Certificate Level	Track 2 (Elementary)	TESOL Track 3 (Pre-intermediate)	DELTA Track 4 (Intermediate)	CELTA Track 5 (Upper-intermediate)
Years in the institution	5	3	14	3
Teaching experience	9	12	17	16

Table 1: The profile of the instructors.

Procedure and Data Analysis

First, permission was granted from the administration of the preparatory program, and ethics clearance was obtained from the university's Ethical Board. Four English instructors agreed to participate in the study. Before data collection, the first researcher visited the instructors' classes and informed students about the study. Signed informed consent forms were taken from both the instructors and their students. Data were collected through video recordings of 4 online and four face-to-face lessons, each of 50 minutes. Online classes took place on Zoom and were recorded to the cloud or on the computer by the instructors. The first researcher recorded face-to-face lessons by placing a camera at the back of the classroom to have a clear view of both the instructors and the classroom, including the whiteboard and another camera in front of the class to identify students unobtrusively. Lesson materials such as worksheets, reading texts, and texts on the chat box were also compiled as documentary evidence.

After lesson recordings, videos were transcribed verbatim, and transcripts were read iteratively to identify the excerpts that contain the scaffolding strategies employed by the instructors through teacher talk based on a framework taken from Van de Pol, Volman, and Westhuizen (2010), which consists of three scaffolding purposes (see Table 2).

Scaffolding purposes		Examples
Supporting metacognitive activities	Direction maintenance: The maintenance of the students' focus on a specific objective	"Now, we are going to watch a video about 3d printing."
Supporting cognitive activities	Marking critical features: The teacher draws the student's attention to the correct forms and compares the students' current knowledge with the desired level	"What do we call it, Ayşe, instead of pictures? What is it called?"
	Reducing the degree of freedom: The teacher's simplification of the task for students	"So, for the gist part, what do we normally do? Do we read fast? Quickly? Do we pay attention to details?"
Supporting student affect	Recruitment: Engaging the students in the activities	"In Istanbul, for example, there is too much traffic congestion, right? If you had a flying car, would it be good for you?"
	Frustration control: Keeping students motivated by praising	"Good, two correct answers in a row."

Table 2: The framework used in the study.

Following the analysis of the video transcripts, reflection questions adapted from Heron and Webster (2019) were shared with the instructors to identify the EAP objectives of their lessons and allow them to reflect on their lessons. Later, stimulated recall interviews with each instructor were conducted in English on Zoom, which took approximately 50 minutes each. During the interviews, they were provided with specific excerpts from their lessons selected based on the framework and asked why they used those strategies in their lessons. To help them recall the incidents, they were also shown the relevant parts in the videos. They were recorded to the cloud by the first researcher, transcribed, and analysed.

Finally, to collect students' views on the effectiveness of scaffolding teacher talk, certain students from each class (17 in total) were chosen purposefully and shown the same excerpts as in the stimulated recall interviews with their instructors. They were asked how effective each strategy used by their teacher was for their learning. All interviews were conducted online in Turkish except one in English with an international student, transcribed, and analysed.

Findings

This section reports how instructors used teacher talk to scaffold the objectives of online and face-to-face lessons (see Table 3) derived from the analysis of the lesson transcripts based on the framework above.

Objectives	Hazal	Adil	Sinem	Farah
Face-to-face lesson	“To identify advantages and disadvantages of three new inventions.”	“To learn vocabulary and practice skimming and detailed reading.”	“To understand key vocabulary, use them in a sentence, and practice scanning.”	“To practice reading skills, i.e., skimming and exploiting the main ideas of the text.”
Online lesson	“To plan to write by analysing advantages and disadvantages.”	“To practice detailed reading using an outside material to check reading comprehension.”	“To familiarize the students with the topic of art and design.”	“To practice reading skills, i.e., skimming and exploiting the main ideas of the text.”

Table 3: Lesson objectives.

Scaffolding Metacognitive Activities

Online. Instructors maintained direction by focusing on the short-term objectives of their lessons. For instance, Hazal asked students to choose one of the inventions covered in the class and write a letter to a friend describing the advantages and disadvantages of the invention. However, they also referred to long-term academic goals. Adil associated the current activity with the institution’s assessment requirements by explaining the activity’s importance. Besides, Farah connected the current task and an academic requirement (e.g., paraphrasing). Hazal and Sinem referred to the other assessment requirements of the preparatory program, such as avoiding writing personal ideas and using a particular pattern for writing definitions.

Pointing backwards (e.g., “We watched a video in the last lesson. What was the video about?”) and forwards (e.g., “When you come back, it's time to go to a breakout room again to complete the outline and then prepare yourself for the presenting.”) helped students make connections between and across the lessons. All instructors set time for activities to keep students focused on the tasks and organized interaction patterns (e.g., “Think about the answers to these three questions with your partners in breakout rooms”).

Face-to-Face. Instructors used direction maintenance scaffolding by referring to the short-term goals. Adil stated: “In this lesson, we're going to do three things. First, we're gonna finish the vocabulary work in groups... After that, we will do one skimming activity, ... then we're going to do detailed... reading using this layout.” Nevertheless, Hazal also addressed long-term academic objectives by pointing out an assessment requirement of the institution while correcting a student’s mistake. Moreover, Farah explained the characteristics of academic tasks (e.g., summary) and, as in Sinem’s lesson, linked the current activity to an academic requirement, i.e., paraphrasing.

Instructors referenced past and future learning to allow students to make links between and across lessons. Farah reminded students of what they had learned in the previous class (e.g., cryptocurrency) to activate their schema. Additionally, they set time for activities (e.g., “You have 5 minutes to skim the last seven paragraphs.”) and organized interaction patterns to keep students on task.

Scaffolding Cognitive Activities

Online. All instructors were supportive while correcting student mistakes and eliciting student responses. They marked critical features through recast, clarification requests, intonation, explicit feedback, and echoing correct answers for confirmation. Hazal and Sinem sometimes used the “yes, but” type of expression to imply an incorrect answer by avoiding discouraging students. Other strategies were eliciting and asking students to justify their responses (e.g., “Where is it [this information] in the text?”).

They simplified activities by providing examples, asking questions, prompting, and modelling before a new activity (e.g., “You’re writing a letter to your friend. How would you start?”). Hazal also accepted student answers in L1 to encourage participation. Furthermore, Adil broke down the activities into stages and checked students’ understanding of the activity by asking instruction check questions (ICQs) (e.g., “Let’s have a look at our detailed reading questions, ..., there are two parts.”). Finally, unlike other instructors, Sinem occasionally used L1 to ease students’ comprehension of the target vocabulary.

Face-to-Face. The instructors’ positive attitude was apparent while providing feedback and eliciting student answers. They all used diverse error correction techniques such as recast, intonation, elicitation, and explicit feedback and echoed correct answers for confirmation. They asked students to justify their answers to check their comprehension. Only Adil used choral practice to ensure students could correctly pronounce the target vocabulary.

They reduced the degree of freedom by giving examples, prompting, asking questions, and modelling a new activity (e.g., “Mess... which is not easy to clean. You know the gum? ... It is sticky. So, this is a big mess.”). As observed in her online lesson, Hazal accepted answers in L1 to motivate students to express their ideas. Adil broke down activities into manageable chunks, and Sinem used L1 to explain certain target vocabulary to ease students’ comprehension. All instructors used ICQs to ensure students’ understanding of the activities.

Scaffolding Student Affect

Online. Hazal utilized recruitment scaffolding by discussing shared experiences and helping students personalize the content (e.g., “You need to talk about it like an influencer.”). Nomination was common among instructors to involve students in the activities and make them feel recognized and appreciated. Positive adjectives such as “Very good” were used for praising. They also maintained momentum to avoid distraction. Finally, they preferred “we” over “you” and positioned themselves as learners to remind students that they were a learning community.

Face-to-Face. Hazal used recruitment scaffolding by personalizing the lesson content and referring to shared experiences such as traffic congestion in Istanbul (e.g., “In Istanbul, ..., there is too much traffic congestion, right? If you had a flying car, would it be good for you?”). All instructors nominated individual students to keep them immersed in the activities.

They used student names to demonstrate their recognition and appreciation (e.g., “Fatma, you’re a nurse, right? Think about these robot suits. What can be the medical benefits?”). Moreover, Hazal approached a student and asked if she needed help because she was a weaker student. Unlike other instructors, Adil gamified checking answers to keep students engaged and motivated. They all maintained momentum and praised students using positive adjectives (e.g., “Very good. ... continue with the third question, but be a little bit quick.”). Finally, they used “we” and positioned themselves as learners to indicate that they were a team and to build a good rapport with students (e.g., “Now we are going to... check the advantages and disadvantages of these inventions.”).

Instructors’ Views on the Scaffolding Strategies

The following section presents the views of each instructor regarding the scaffolding strategies obtained through stimulated recall interviews. The strategies were similar in both online and face-to-face classes. Hence, they were reported regardless of the educational context.

Hazal. Concerning direction maintenance, Hazal explained that reminding students of the previous lesson’s content and activating their schemata would ease students’ understanding of the text to be covered in the current lesson. Therefore, she pointed backwards. Moreover, she set time for students not to get distracted and preoccupy with other activities, such as checking their mobile phones. Furthermore, she arranged interaction patterns so students could collaborate and learn from each other. They also would not feel isolated in the class or nervous because of missing the instructions. Finally, she reminded a student to answer a question according to the text, as in their institution, students were not allowed to write their personal opinions in the writing exam. They had to remember the book’s content.

As for supporting cognitive activities, she gave examples to elicit the correct word from the students to make it more memorable, as they would match the word with the example. Besides, she accepted answers in L1 and continued the dialogue in English because students were worried about making mistakes in front of their peers. She ignored L1 utterances when her aim was students’ content comprehension. Similarly, she modelled activities to assist students in completing them due to their low proficiency level. Moreover, she echoed the correct answer to indicate approval and for other inattentive students to hear it. Furthermore, checking instructions before starting an activity enabled everyone to listen to them again. Specifically, she asked distracted students to get their attention to the task and make others more alert. Finally, she gave feedback through recast to make students focus on the correct answer. She also used “yes, but” not to demotivate students and appreciate their effort.

Regarding supporting student affect, personalization kept students on the topic, fostered creativity, and allowed them to speak in English. She used nomination to engage distracted or silent students in the lesson. Besides, she referred to a shared experience since it would be easier for students to relate to and understand the content. As for the use of “we,” she indicated that they were a team and wanted to create a learning environment where everybody supported each other. Regarding frustration control, she liked appreciating her students through positive adjectives, as they were lower-level students and needed more encouragement from their teacher.

Adil. Relating to direction maintenance, Adil shared the lesson objectives at the beginning to provide students with a structure to follow to increase their concentration. He also referred to

the previous lesson to build on their background knowledge. Besides, he arranged interaction patterns because weaker students could benefit from peer support and enjoy activities more. Finally, he mentioned the usefulness of the activity for the upcoming exam to catch the attention of disengaged students.

Regarding supporting cognitive activities, he used choral practice to strengthen students' pronunciation, as some students might mispronounce the words. Moreover, he used ICQs to ensure their comprehension of the task because some students were not focused when he first gave the instructions. Besides, he echoed the correct answer for confirmation. Furthermore, he reminded the use of new vocabulary in context because there was a gap in students' study habits. They focused on translating new words into Turkish instead of writing examples. Besides, he used recast not to discourage students from attempting to use the target language. He maintained momentum since some students were not engrossed in the task. He also asked questions about skimming to refresh students' memory about the activity and ensure they knew how to do it. Moreover, he asked students to justify their answers to ensure they answered knowingly and that other students could learn from their peers. Finally, he broke down the task into two parts so that students would not feel overwhelmed and manage the task efficiently.

As for supporting student affect, he used "we" to create a supportive learning environment and personalization as a way of comprehension check. He believed using student names made the classroom atmosphere friendlier so they could talk freely. Additionally, he gamified the answer check part and praised students for giving them a sense of achievement and a challenge to motivate them. Finally, he assigned responsibilities to some students because they were silent and would participate more if they had a duty.

Sinem. Regarding direction maintenance, Sinem referred to the previous lessons to activate students' schemata so that they could better understand the current lesson's content. She arranged interaction patterns so students could support and learn from each other. They would also feel more confident while sharing their answers with the class. Besides, setting time for activities aimed to prepare students for the exams in which they had limited time. Furthermore, she implicitly reminded them of some academic requirements due to assessments (e.g., writing exams). Finally, she told students what to do in the next lesson to create a lesson thread to reduce stress.

As for supporting cognitive abilities, she used L1 to help weaker students comprehend the target vocabulary. Recast was used not to discourage students and to prevent fossilization. She also echoed correct answers to ensure their understanding. Besides, she asked questions and prompted students to create an interactive classroom and facilitate their understanding of the tasks. Moreover, she asked students to justify their answers to make them explain the rationale behind their answers. Furthermore, she used "yes, but" to appreciate the student's effort while indicating an incomplete answer. She wanted students to realize their mistakes by raising intonation and offering an explanation if students did not understand the clue. Finally, elicitation helped students remember what they had learned.

Concerning supporting student affect, she gave an example based on a shared experience to help students internalize the target word. Additionally, she used personalization to connect students' background knowledge and the target vocabulary and nomination to engage distracted students with the lesson and alert others. She praised students for showing her

satisfaction with their answers and motivating them. Finally, she used “we” to create a friendlier and non-hierarchical atmosphere.

Farah. Regarding direction maintenance, Farah set time for activities to familiarize students with completing tasks in limited time, as in the exams. She also organized interaction patterns for students to correct their answers and interact with each other. Improving their critical thinking and teamwork skills was also significant, as the topics they covered at this level were more abstract. They would also be expected to be critical thinkers in their faculties. Besides, she focused on study skills since some students needed help with exam timing. Moreover, she referred backwards and forwards to create a lesson thread and facilitate learning. Finally, she emphasized some academic requirements in the institution (e.g., paraphrasing) to prepare students for their departments.

As for supporting cognitive activities, she asked questions about the skimming activity to check students’ understanding of the task. Besides, she broke an activity into two parts to facilitate students’ text comprehension. However, she also explained if the task was challenging or if students were confused. Moreover, checking instructions ensured that students knew what they should do. In addition, she used raising intonation to imply an incorrect answer and elicitation to help students remember what had been taught previously. Furthermore, explicit feedback was given if there was a misconception in students’ minds. She also echoed correct answers for confirmation or to correct their pronunciation. She modelled activities to ease students’ understanding and reduce teacher talking time. Finally, she asked students to justify their answers to ensure they were not simply guessing.

Regarding supporting student affect, she nominated individual students because they were distracted or sometimes knew the student could answer the question. During text exploitation, she mainly selected distracted students because it was essential for all students to see the content for the assessment. Furthermore, she kept the momentum to remind students to complete the activity faster. She also situated herself as a learner to show interest and guide students. Besides, she designed a jigsaw activity and assigned responsibilities to individual students to keep them involved in the lesson. Finally, she praised students for motivating them.

Students’ Views on the Effectiveness of the Scaffolding Strategies

The current section reports the students’ views regarding the effectiveness of the scaffolding strategies used by their instructors. They were presented holistically as the strategies were similar in both educational contexts and among the levels.

Concerning direction maintenance scaffolding, several strategies were found effective at all levels. Pointing backwards helped students link past and current learning, engage with the lesson content better and come to the class prepared. Thanks to pointing forwards, they could get ready for the next lesson. Setting time kept them on task and was good practice for the exams and their departments. Besides, all students knew the academic requirements in the institution and their significance for their exams and future studies. Therefore, even when their instructors implicitly referred to long-term academic goals, they were aware of the rationale behind those activities. Moreover, they believed organizing interaction patterns was an excellent opportunity to learn from their peers. However, some people did not focus on the task or spoke in L1, which impeded their learning. It could also be time-consuming since they started chatting with others. Furthermore, Track 3 students believed that setting goals for the

lesson at the beginning helped them get mentally ready to handle the activities efficiently. Focusing on study skills was found effective by Track 5 students.

Relating to marking critical features, students at all levels indicated that their instructors used elicitation to check their engagement and make them use the target language. It helped them focus on the lesson content and made learning memorable as they were mentally involved. Besides, they believed that their instructor echoed the correct answer for confirmation. It was also a good opportunity for other students to hear the answer in case they missed it and correct their pronunciation. Additionally, checking instructions allowed them to understand the task better, clarified misunderstandings, and helped them concentrate on the activity if distracted. Moreover, intonation as a feedback technique was considered adequate because it allowed students to think more critically and find the correct answer independently. However, one student from Track 4 indicated that it could be stressful for the student due to their low self-confidence. Besides, students believed that explicit feedback should be provided if a student struggles to find the correct answer after receiving some clues from the instructor. Nevertheless, one Track 5 student stated that students could easily forget the feedback or get stressed. Furthermore, recast motivated them to speak as their mistake was not explicitly pointed out in front of the class. However, one student from Track 4 indicated that the effectiveness of this strategy depended on students' concentration level. Similarly, when the instructor said "yes, but", students could self-correct without being discouraged or offended. Besides, asking for justification prevented cheating, particularly in online lessons, and challenged them to do the tasks properly. Finally, Track 3 students found choral practice helpful as they could correct their pronunciation errors.

As for reducing the degree of freedom, students at all levels believed that examples assisted them in recalling the target information by making associations. Modelling made students more confident in performing tasks and helped them focus on the activity. Furthermore, asking questions and prompting helped them understand activities better and kept them on task. However, if it was a familiar task, it could lead to time waste. Additionally, breaking an activity into parts allowed them to manage the task and avoid distractions efficiently. Finally, Track 2 students stated that when their instructor allowed them to use L1, they felt less stressed. Similarly, Track 4 students believed that Turkish translation helped them grasp complex vocabulary.

Regarding recruitment scaffolding, personalization and referring to shared experiences were effective at all levels because they made learning permanent, relatable, and memorable. Similarly, being nominated by their instructor meant they could answer their question. However, some believed that it indicated they could have been more attentive. Thus, they became more alert and interested. It was particularly beneficial for online lessons. Besides, using "we" built a bond between the instructor and students and created a sense of community. Moreover, maintaining momentum kept students focused on tasks, but could be considered pressure by some students. Furthermore, assigning responsibilities in breakout rooms kept them on task during activities in Tracks 3 and 5. Finally, Track 3 students believed gamification motivated them. Regarding frustration control, all students found positive adjectives helpful as they encouraged them to participate more, improved their concentration, and boosted their self-esteem. They also emphasized the importance of a stress-free learning environment.

Discussion

The current study attempted to identify how English instructors used teacher talk to scaffold the EAP goals in a hybrid context. One unexpected finding was that the face-to-face and online lessons regarding scaffolding talk were similar. A recruitment scaffolding strategy was utilized in the online classes (e.g., assigning responsibilities) to keep students immersed in the activities, which the students found compelling. Besides, students believed that asking for justification prevented cheating, particularly in online lessons.

The analysis revealed that all instructors supported the EAP objectives of their lessons by using metacognitive, cognitive, and affective scaffolding strategies. Metacognitive scaffolding through direction maintenance focused on the short-term goals of the lessons and academic requirements in the institution, which derive from future academic expectations. The instructors connected the current lesson with previous and future learning (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005), set time limits, and arranged interaction patterns. Besides, they used modals of obligation. These findings concur with the study of Green (2015), who recommended that EAP instructors should explicitly refer to future academic objectives and extend their classroom activities to future academic procedures. Furthermore, they also support Lee's (2016) study in that EAP instructors contextualize classroom activities and explain the rationale behind the tasks. However, the findings contrast with Heron and Webster (2019), who suggested that in pre-sessional courses, instructors used scaffolding talk for micro-goals of the lesson. The study demonstrated that even in an English preparatory program, instructors referred to the broader goals related to the curriculum. Besides, in the stimulated recall interviews, the instructors and their students linked certain direction maintenance strategies with future academic practices.

The instructors in the study scaffolded cognitive activities by marking critical features through error correction, asking for justification, echoing student answers, which are commonly used in non-EAP contexts (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005), and simplifying the activities for students by breaking them down, asking questions, and prompting. In line with Heron and Webster's (2019) study, the instructors in the program elicited the requirements of an academic task or skill from the students in both face-to-face and online lessons primarily for preparation and comprehension check purposes, as supported by the stimulated recall interviews with the instructors. Overall, students found the strategies used by their instructors effective, with some individual differences. Thus, it is recommended that instructors adapt their scaffolding talk based on students' needs and expectations.

The participating instructors supported student affect through praising and recruitment strategies such as personalization, referring to shared experiences, nomination, and establishing a sense of community. They also adopted a positive attitude while providing students feedback by accepting partial answers and confirming their correct responses. These findings resonate with several studies in the literature (Alexander, 2012; Heron & Webster, 2019; Wilson, 2016). Furthermore, in the stimulated recall interviews, the instructors and their students discussed the significance of a stress-free classroom atmosphere and motivation.

Conclusions

To conclude, the study revealed that instructors scaffolded metacognitive, cognitive, and affective activities using various strategies. Besides, the stimulated recall interviews with

instructors demonstrated that they used scaffolding teacher talk purposefully, focusing on institutional and academic requirements and student needs while disregarding differing needs of instructional contexts. Finally, although students primarily benefitted from the scaffolding strategies, several individual differences were observed.

It should be noted that some interactions with students during the instructors' monitoring were inaudible due to the cameras' positions. Thus, they could not be transcribed and analysed. Overall, the present study contributes to the existing literature in several ways. First, it highlights how teacher talk is used to achieve EAP objectives in a hybrid context. Secondly, reporting their perceptions regarding the scaffolding strategies creates awareness in EAP instructors and provides an opportunity to reflect on their practices. Finally, students' views on the scaffolding strategies offer insights into their effectiveness and inform practitioners regarding students' needs and expectations. Future studies might compare student achievement with the scaffolding strategies used by instructors.

References

- Alexander, O. (2012). Exploring teacher beliefs in teaching EAP at low proficiency levels. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11*(2), 99–111.
- Du, W. Y., & Zhou, C. Y. (2019). Web-based scaffolding teaching of EAP reading and writing. *Creative Education, 10*, 1863-1872.
- Green, J. H. (2015). Teaching for transfer in EAP: Hugging and bridging revisited. *English for Specific Purposes, 37*, 1–12.
- Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). Putting scaffolding to work: The contribution of scaffolding in articulating ESL education. *Prospect, 20*(1), 6–30.
- Heron, M., & Webster, J. (2019). Scaffolding talk in EAP lessons: An examination of experienced teachers' practices. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 13*(4), 358-370.
- Kayi-Aydar, H. (2013). Scaffolding language learning in an academic ESL classroom. *ELT Journal, 67*(3), 324-335.
- Lee, J. J. (2016). “There’s intentionality behind it...”: A genre analysis of EAP classroom lessons. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 23*, 99–112.
- Li, D. (2012). Scaffolding adult learners of English in learning target form in a Hong Kong EFL university classroom. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 6*(2), 127-144.
- Mannion, P., Bangun, I. V., Li, Z., & Wolgemuth, J. (2021). An EAP instructor’s perceptions of and engagement in dialogic scaffolding. *Linguistics and Education, 66*, 1-10.
- Meri-Yilan, S. (2019). Learning in scaffolded autonomous e-learning environments amongst EAP students in a UK university. *Focus on ELT Journal (FELT), 1*(1), 70-85.
- Santoso, A. (2008). The art of scaffolding an EFL writing class in a hybrid environment: A practical experience. *International Journal of the Computer, the Internet and Management, 16*(SP3). 8.1-8.12.
- Van de Pol, J., Volman, M., & Beishuizen, J. (2010). Scaffolding in teacher–student interaction: A decade of research. *Educational Psychology Review, 22*(3), 271–296.

Contact email: gizemaiyigun@gmail.com