Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies
Print ISSN: 2676-5357
Online ISSN: 2676-5985

The Types of Scaffolding Used by EFL Teachers in Isfahan

Somayeh Safdari[1], Momene Ghadiri[2*], Zohreh Kashkouli[3]

[1]M.A. Student, Center of English Language, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran, *somayeh.safdari@yahoo.com*

[2*]Assistant Professor, Center of English Language, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran, *momene.ghadiri@cc.iut.ac.ir*

[3]Assistant Professor, Center of English Language, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran, *z.kashkouli@cc.iut.ac.ir*

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the types of scaffolding used by EFL teachers in Iran. Through the availability sampling technique, eight EFL teachers in Isfahan were selected. Accordingly, their classes were recorded, the discourse of which was transcribed, codified, and analyzed using the framework proposed by Wu (2010). The results of the study revealed that the EFL teachers mostly exploited cognitive, metacognitive, procedural, and context scaffolding. Motivational scaffolding, however, was not used in any of the classes. This study puts forward the view that scaffolding practices, though heavily investigated in empirical studies and strongly verified to be of great help, are not largely provided in EFL classes. Teachers prefer to provide direct feedback rather than helping learners find the answer themselves.

***Keywords*:** Classroom Discourse Analysis, EFL Teachers, Types of Scaffolding

Received 27 August 2019 Accepted 02 March 2020
Available online 19 February 2021 DOI: 10.30479/jmrels.2020.11753.1462

Article Type: Research
Vol. 8, No. 2, 2021, 199-220

1. Introduction

Ever since Vygotsky introduced his sociocultural theory at the beginning of the 20th century, emphasizing the role of social interaction and meaning construction in learning, assiduous attention has been devoted to this school of thought. Though originally rooted in psychology, the theory was adopted by the SLA scholars, the most prominent of whom is James P. Lantolf, at the end of the 20 century. Among the key concepts of this school of thought lie the notions of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) and scaffolding. The latter is interwoven with ZPD, indicating the gap existing between what the student can do without help and what he/she can only do with assistance (Engine, 2014). Providing an example, Vygotsky (1986) indicated how students through the scaffolded practices provided by the teacher could bridge their ZPD, where they could construct meaning through social and mental processes. Here, the support provided by the teacher is crucial to increase cognitive abilities; this is done through scaffolding (Wu, 2010). That is to say, the teacher helps students to internalize information to have self-conscious control over learning (Kazak et al., 2015).

The importance of scaffolding in language learning is inevitable due to its marked effect on fostering autonomy (Dabbagh, 2003). The students can structure their thought with the provided scaffolds, helping them to solve problems. Hence, teachers should know how to provide scaffolds for their students at various levels of language proficiency (Holton & Clarke, 2006). This instructional scaffolding helps EFL learners overcome learning barriers, thereby reaching higher levels of language proficiency. It also persuades students to do classroom tasks in a social context (Wolf et al., 2016).

Reviewing the results of the studies done on scaffolding, van de Pol et al. (2010) pointed to three main qualities of scaffolding. First, the provided support should be carefully gauged, tuned, and adopted based on the specific purpose, thus being adjusted to the existing level of the learners. Next, the support or assistance should disappear systematically. Finally, learners must be empowered to take the responsibility of performing the tasks themselves.

Scaffolding also includes four phases. In the first two phases (trust and collaboration), students have absolute trust in the expert and rely on him or her; this results in a collaboration between them. They work together to construct knowledge. This is the external phase. In the next internal phases (self-reliance and internalization), students learn by themselves and internalize what they have learnt (Gillani, 2003). Teachers must choose an appropriate task for scaffolding. The task should help students' engagement. The difficulty of the task should be evaluated, and the teacher should anticipate the errors students may make in order to help them learn better. A

teacher may use a number of questions, modeling, cues, or explanation, all of which facilitate the learning process. The teacher may also employ post-task activities (Yelland & Masters, 2007).

Since there are differences among students, teachers must scaffold the learning that best motivates the students and suits their diverse needs (Daniel, 2016). This seems to be demanding as teachers must be sensitive to the progress or development of the students in the classroom and consider what should be taught and what should be ignored. The teacher should be aware of the extent and types of assistance required (Many & Aoulou, 2014).

The effects of providing scaffolding on language skills have been studied so far (e.g. Ahangari et al., 2014; Amiri Samani & Khazayie, 2017; Gholamipasand & Tahriri, 2017; Liu , 2018; Kamil, 2017; Khajeh Khosravi, 2017; Kim & Cho, 2016; Mirahmadi & Alavi, 2016; Rahimi, 2015; Rahimidoost et al., & Amirteymori, 2013; Shoari & Assadi Aidinlou, 2015; Shin & Song, 2015; Shabani & Malekdar, 2016; Soleimani & Biria, 2016; Ranjbar & Ghonsooly, 2017; Safein Salem, 2017; San Martín, 2018; Taghizadeh et al., 2017). The results of these studies indicated that when scaffolded activities were provided for students, their language abilities enhanced.

Goh (2017) underlined the integration of scaffolding techniques to speaking activities inside EFL classes. To him, the plan and organization of communicative practices can be enhanced by the scaffolding practices provided by a well-informed peer or a teacher. Similarly, Rezaee et al. (2015) empirically demonstrated how the use of scaffolding practices yielded to improvement in students' knowledge of collocation. They studied both the support provided by peers and that arranged by the teacher, concluding that both types of support would increase students' abilities in using collocations with varying degrees of success.

In a similar vein, Chen and Tseng (2019) designed an intervention, integrating electronic assessment, immediate feedback, and scaffolding practices to improve students' knowledge of grammar. The author of the study indicated that those learners who cognitively processed information holistically benefitted from the provided scaffolding more than those who processed information serially who needed more help to do the tasks. Likewise, while reviewing more than 100 empirical studies done on scaffolding, Belland et al. (2016) highlighted the significant and positive impact of scaffolding on cognition and autonomy.

Few studies, however, have identified the types of scaffolding used in English language classes in Iran. It is consequently important to know which type is mostly exploited and which one is largely ignored so as to guide novice teachers in this regard. To put it in a nutshell, this study aimed to

investigate the extent to which various types of scaffolding were provided in EFL classes. It was also to delineate the types of scaffolding provided in the examined classes.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

The population of this study comprised eight EFL teachers teaching English at two language institutes in Isfahan, whose selection was based on the availability sampling technique (due to confidentiality, the researchers preferred not to name the institutes). Initially, 14 teachers accepted to take part in the study. Nonetheless, six teachers excluded from the study because of the following reasons:

1. The quality of the voice recorded from the given classes was poor.
2. A number of them changed their mind and decided not to continue the study.

Eventually, eight EFL teachers (both male and female) teaching TOP NOTCH2 courses in the given language institutes accepted to record their classes. Two of the classes were held three times a week; students totally attended 25 sessions, each of which lasted for one hour and a half. Two of the classes were held twice a week; learners attended 15 successive sessions, each of which lasted two hours. The other four classes were held once a week; students went to class for eight successive sessions, each of which lasted for three hours and 45 minutes (see Table 1).

Table 1

Descriptive Information of Investigated Classes

Classroom	Frequency (per week)	Session (per term)	Duration (min)
A	3	25	90
B	3	25	90
C	2	15	120
D	2	15	120
E	1	8	225
F	1	8	225
G	1	8	225
H	1	8	225

The teachers had B.A. and M.A. degrees in English Literature, English translation, and English Teaching. Their age ranged from 24 to 36. In addition, their teaching experience varied between zero and twelve years. The effects of teaching experience, age, and gender of the teacher on the provided

scaffolding was beyond the scope of this study. Thus, the researchers did not focus on individual difference in this regard.

2.2. Materials and Instruments

The data of the present study was obtained from the classes were Top Notch 2 (intermediate level) was taught. The given books include different parts, including preview, photostory, conversation, model, now you can, vocabulary, grammar, listening, and reading. The first part is *preview* whose focus is on speaking, vocabulary building, or reading. The teacher can choose the skill on which he/she can work. Next, the *conversation* model and *now you can*, mostly deal with speaking. *Now you can* occasionally focuses on strengthening reading proficiency as well. The part *grammar* was inductively integrated with speaking and occasionally writing. Vocabulary, listening, and reading sections were also integrative. The framework suggested by Wu (2010) was used to categorize scaffolded practices in the classes.

2.2.1. The Framework Suggested by Wu (2010)

Wu (2010) introduced the one of the recent categories of scaffolding types. According to Wu (2010), scaffolding types are:

- Cognitive scaffolding: "support for helping individuals understand the content of learning materials" (p.39);
- Metacognitive scaffolding: "support for helping individuals to develop both the ability to recognize their knowledge and regulate their behaviors based on their reflection" (p.39);
- Procedural scaffolding: "support for helping individuals to employ learning processes or strategies in order to complete a task, reach a goal, or solve a problem" (p.39);
- Context scaffolding: "support for helping individuals to maneuver through a learning environment and to operate tools and resources embedded in the learning environment" (p.39);
- Motivational scaffolding: "support which helps individuals to increase their perception of their own interests, abilities, and task values" (p.39);

2.3. Procedure

This study involved two phases. First, the given classes were recorded throughout the term. Next, the recording was transcribed and analyzed to understand what types of scaffolding teachers used in the class. The discourse analysis technique was used to analyze the data based on the framework suggested by Wu (2010).

2.4. Data Analysis

The discourse of the classes was recorded, transcribed, codified, and qualitatively analyzed in terms of the types of scaffolding the teachers provided. The time devoted to scaffolding was obtained in different skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking). Two researchers analyzed the data to ensure the reliability of the study. Descriptive statistics, including the mean, were also obtained for each type of scaffolding.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Results

3.1.1. Quantitative Analysis

3.1.1.1. Types of Scaffolding Provided in the Investigated Classes

In this part, the results of the study concerning the type of scaffolding are quantitatively mentioned for each classroom.

Table 2

Time Spent on Providing Scaffolding per Language Skill in Class A

Type	writing	grammar	listening	speaking	vocabulary	reading
Cognitive	-	-	-	9	11	81
Metacognitive	-	-	140	110	-	71
Procedural	-	185	52	-	-	8
Context	-	-	-	-	-	-
Motivational	-	-	-	-	-	-

As shown, the scaffolding used in class *A* included cognitive, metacognitive, and procedural scaffolding. The time that teacher spent on reading skill was 430 minutes. In reading skill, 81 minutes were spent on cognitive scaffolding; 71 minutes on metacognitive scaffolding, and eight minutes on procedural scaffolding. The teacher did not use context and motivational scaffolding in teaching the reading section. One hundred and six minutes of the class were spent on vocabulary part. In the part *vocabulary*, 11 minutes were spent on cognitive scaffolding. Metacognitive, procedural, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher in teaching the reading skill. The teacher spent 215 minutes of the class on speaking skill. In terms of speaking, 9 and 110 minutes were spent on cognitive scaffolding and metacognitive scaffolding, respectively. Procedural, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher to teach speaking. The teacher spent 240 minutes on listening skill, out of which 140 minutes were spent on metacognitive scaffolding and 52 minutes on procedural scaffolding. Cognitive, procedural, context, and

motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher here. In terms of grammar, 185 minutes were spent on procedural scaffolding. Metacognitive, Cognitive, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher in this skill. Unfortunately, in this class, the teacher did not work on improving students' writing ability.

Table 3

Time Spent on Providing Scaffolding per Language Skill in Class B

Type	writing	grammar	listening	speaking	vocabulary	reading
Cognitive	-	-	2	11	48	57
Metacognitive	-	-	3	180	-	4
Procedural	-	165	19	-	-	7
Context	-	-	-	-	-	-
Motivational	-	-	-	-	-	-

The whole time of the class B was 1620 minutes. As indicated in the table, the scaffolding used in class B included cognitive, metacognitive, and procedural scaffolding. The teacher spent 370 minutes on the reading skill. Fifty-seven, four, and seven minutes were spent on cognitive, metacognitive, and procedural scaffolding, respectively. The context and motivational scaffolding were not used in teaching reading skill. The teacher spent 305 minutes of the classroom on vocabulary; 48 minutes were spent on cognitive scaffolding. Metacognitive, procedural, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher in teaching the vocabulary part. The teacher spent 328 minutes of the classroom on speaking skill. In speaking skill, 11 minutes were spent on cognitive scaffolding and 180 minutes on metacognitive scaffolding. The procedural, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher in teaching speaking skill. The teacher spent 256 minutes on listening skill. In teaching listening skill, two minutes were spent on cognitive scaffolding. Three minutes were spent on metacognitive scaffolding, and 19 minutes were devoted to procedural scaffolding. The context and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher to teach listening skill. In the part *grammar*, 165 minutes were spent on procedural scaffolding. Metacognitive, Cognitive, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher in teaching grammar. Unfortunately, in this class, teacher did not work on improving students' writing ability.

The whole time of the class C was 1980 minutes. As demonstrated in the table, the scaffolding used in the class C included cognitive, metacognitive, and procedural scaffolding. The teacher spent 402 minutes on the reading skill. Fifty-three minutes were spent on cognitive scaffolding, and five minutes on procedural scaffolding. The metacognitive, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used in teaching reading skill. The teacher spent 185 minutes of the class teaching vocabulary, while no attempt was

made to exploit any kind of scaffolding during the vocabulary. The teacher spent 405 minutes of the class on the speaking skill. In speaking skill, 13 minutes were spent on cognitive scaffolding and 214 minutes on metacognitive scaffolding. The procedural, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher in working on speaking skill. The teacher spent 365 minutes on listening skill. In terms of listening skill, no scaffolding was used by the teacher. In the part *grammar*, 175 minutes were spent on procedural scaffolding. The metacognitive, cognitive, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher in teaching this skill. Unfortunately, in this class, the teacher did not work on improving students' writing ability.

Table 4

Time Spent on Providing Scaffolding per Language Skill in Class C

Type	writing	grammar	listening	speaking	vocabulary	reading
Cognitive	-	-	-	13	-	53
Metacognitive	-	-	-	240	-	-
Procedural	-	375	-	-	-	5
Context	-	-	-	-	-	-
Motivational	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 5

Time Spent on Providing Scaffolding per Language Skill in Class D

Type	writing	grammar	listening	speaking	vocabulary	reading
Cognitive	4.2	-	-	0.5	18.6	39
Metacognitive	-	-	-	40	3	84
Procedural	0.6	286	-	-	0.28	-
Context	-	-	-	-	-	-
Motivational	-	-	-	-	-	-

The whole time of the class D was 1980 minutes. As demonstrated in the table, the scaffolding used in class D included cognitive, metacognitive, and procedural scaffolding. The teacher spent 645 minutes on teaching reading skill. Thirty-nine minutes were spent on cognitive scaffolding, and eighty-four on metacognitive scaffolding. The procedural, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used to teach reading skill. The teacher spent 165 minutes of the class to teach vocabulary; 18.6, 3, and 0.28 minutes of the class were devoted to cognitive, metacognitive, procedural scaffolding, respectively. The teacher spent 255 minutes of the class on speaking skill. In teaching speaking skill, 0.5 and 40 minutes were spent on cognitive and metacognitive scaffolding, respectively. The procedural, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher in teaching speaking skill. The teacher spent 230 minutes on listening skill. In teaching listening skill, no scaffolding was used by the teacher. In part

grammar, 286 minutes were spent on procedural scaffolding. The metacognitive, cognitive, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher to teach this skill. The teacher spent 240 minutes on improving students' writing ability. Here, 4.2 and 0.6 minutes were spent on cognitive and procedural scaffolding, respectively.

Table 6

Time Spent on Providing Scaffolding per Language Skill in Class E

Type	writing	grammar	listening	speaking	vocabulary	reading
Cognitive	-		30	20.36	40.93	64
Metacognitive	-	-	75	105	-	100
Procedural	-	150	110	0.91	0.4	5
Context	-	-	-	-	0.25	-
Motivational	-	-	-	-	-	-

As demonstrated in the table, the scaffolding used in class E included cognitive, metacognitive, procedural, and context scaffolding. The whole time of the class E was 1620 minutes. The teacher spent 576 minutes on the reading skill. Here, 64, 100, and 5 minutes were spent on the cognitive, metacognitive, and procedural scaffolding, respectively. The context and motivational scaffolding were not used to teach reading skill. The teacher spent 160 minutes of the class on teaching vocabulary, of which 40.93, 0.46, and 0.25 minutes were devoted to cognitive, procedural, and context scaffolding, respectively. The teacher spent 380 minutes of the class on teaching speaking skill, where 20.36, 105, and 0.91 minutes were spent on cognitive, metacognitive, procedural scaffolding, respectively. The context and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher in teaching speaking skill. The teacher spent 300 minutes on teaching listening. Here, 30, 75, 110 minutes were spent on cognitive, metacognitive, and procedural scaffolding, respectively. The context and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher to teach this skill. In teaching grammar, 150 minutes were devoted to procedural scaffolding. The metacognitive, cognitive, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher to teach this skill. Unfortunately, in this class, the teacher did not work on students' writing ability.

The whole time of the class F was 1620 minutes. As indicated in the table, the scaffolding used in the class F included cognitive, metacognitive, procedural, and context scaffolding. The teacher spent 226 minutes on teaching reading skill, of which 42.3, 35, 3, and 0.25 minutes were devoted to cognitive, metacognitive, procedural, and context scaffolding, respectively. The motivational scaffolding was not used in teaching reading skill. The teacher spent 215 minutes of the classroom on teaching the vocabulary skill, where 42, 6, and 4 minutes were devoted to cognitive, procedural, and context scaffolding, respectively. The teacher did not use

metacognitive and motivational scaffolding in teaching vocabulary. The teacher spent 273 minutes of the class to teach the speaking skill. Here, 25 and 70 minutes were spent on cognitive and metacognitive scaffolding, respectively. The procedural, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher in teaching speaking skill. The teacher spent 150 minutes on teaching listening skill, where no scaffolding was used. In the part *grammar*, 290 minutes were spent on procedural scaffolding. No metacognitive, cognitive, context, and motivational scaffolding were used by the teacher to teach grammar. Unfortunately, in this class, the teacher did not work on improving students' writing ability.

Table 7

Time Spent on Providing Scaffolding per Language Skill in Class F

Type	writing	grammar	listening	speaking	vocabulary	reading
Cognitive	-	-	-	25	42	42.3
Metacognitive	-	-	-	70	-	35
Procedural	-	290	-	-	6	3
Context	-	-	-	-	4	0.25
Motivational	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 8

Time Spent on Providing Scaffolding per Language Skill in Class G

Type	writing	grammar	listening	speaking	Vocabulary	reading
Cognitive	-	-	20.5	16	17	80.3
Metacognitive	-	-	12	69	-	65
Procedural	-	330	23	-	-	11
Context	-	-	-	-	-	-
Motivational	-	-	-	-	-	-

The whole time of the class G was 1620 minutes. As indicated in the table, the scaffolding used in class G included cognitive, metacognitive, and procedural scaffolding. The teacher spent 465 minutes on teaching reading skill. He spent 80.3 minutes on cognitive scaffolding, 65 minutes on metacognitive scaffolding, and 11 minutes on procedural scaffolding. The context and motivational scaffolding were not used in teaching reading skill. The teacher spent 270 minutes of the class to teaching vocabulary, where 17 minutes were devoted to cognitive scaffolding. The metacognitive, procedural, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used to teach this skill. The teacher spent 175 minutes of the class to teaching speaking. Here, 16 and 69 minutes were devoted to cognitive and metacognitive scaffolding, respectively. The procedural, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher to teach speaking. The teacher spent 330 minutes to the teaching of listening. In listening skill, 20.5, 12, and 23 minutes were spent

on cognitive, metacognitive, and procedural scaffolding, respectively. The context and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher to teach this skill. In the part grammar, 330 minutes were spent on procedural scaffolding. The metacognitive, Cognitive, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher to teach this skill. Unfortunately, in this class, teacher did not work on improving students' writing ability.

Table 9

Time Spent on Providing Scaffolding per Language Skill in Class H

Type	writing	grammar	listening	speaking	vocabulary	reading
Cognitive	-	-	-	7.5	18	113
Metacognitive	-	-	-	173	-	3
Procedural	-	208	-	-	1.9	120
Context	-	-	-	-	-	-
Motivational	-	-	-	-	-	-

The whole time of the class H was 1530 minutes. As indicated in the table, the scaffolding used in the class H included cognitive, metacognitive, and procedural scaffolding. The teacher spent 430 minutes on the reading skill, of which 113, 3 and 120 minutes were devoted to cognitive, metacognitive, and procedural scaffolding, respectively. The context and motivational scaffolding were not used to teach reading skill. The teacher spent 155 minutes of the class to teach vocabulary, where 18 and 1.9 minutes were devoted to cognitive and procedural scaffolding, respectively. The metacognitive, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used to teach this skill. The teacher spent 245 minutes of the class to teach speaking skill. To teach speaking, 7.5 and 173 minutes were devoted to cognitive and metacognitive scaffolding, respectively. The procedural, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher to teach speaking. The teacher spent 270 minutes to teach listening, where no scaffolding was used by the teacher. In teaching grammar, 208 minutes were spent on procedural scaffolding. The metacognitive, cognitive, context, and motivational scaffolding were not used by the teacher to teach this skill. Unfortunately, in this class, the teacher did not work on improving students' writing ability.

3.1.1.2. The Extent to Which Scaffolding Was Provided in The Investigated Classes

In this part, the time spent on providing each type of scaffolding in the classes was obtained, and eventually the percentage of each scaffolding type in all language classes was reported.

Table 10

Time Spent on Providing Scaffolding in EFL Classes under Investigation

Type	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Cognitive	101	118	66	62.3	155.79	109.3	133.8	138.5
Metacognitive	321	187	240	127	280	105	146	176
Procedural	245	191	380	287	266.3	299	364	330
Context	0	0	0	0	0.25	4.25	0	0
Motivational	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	667	496	686	476.3	702.34	517.55	643.8	644.5

As demonstrated in the table, 884.69 minutes of the classes were devoted to providing cognitive scaffolding, while 1582 minutes were spent on metacognitive scaffolding. Moreover, 2362 and 4.5 minutes of the classes were dedicated to providing procedural and context scaffolding, while no motivational scaffolding was provided.

Table 11

Total Time of EFL Classes

Classes	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Time	1530	1620	1980	1980	1620	1620	1620	1530

As demonstrated in the table, the total time of the classes was 13500 minutes. And the total percentage of scaffolding provided was 35.69 %.

Table 12

Extent of scaffolding Provided in All EFL Classes

Types of scaffolding	Percentage
Cognitive	6.55%
Metacognitive	11.71%
Procedural	17.4%
Context	0.03%
Motivational	0

As indicated in the table, 6.55%, 11.71%, 17.4 %, and 0.03% of all classes were spent on providing cognitive, metacognitive, procedural, and context. No trace of motivational scaffolding was found.

3.1.2. Qualitative Analysis

In this part, a number of examples are provided concerning different types of scaffolding used in the classes under investigation.

Extract 1

01 T: If there is no air conditioning, would you feel comfortable?
02 S: No but (.)

03 T: No sofa, do you feel comfortable? =
04 Ss: =No.
05 T: They help you feel comfortable (writing on the board). They. What are they?
06 S: Services
07 T: But a sofa isn't a service.
08 Ss: (1)
09 T: They are?
10 Ss :()
11 T: Amenities.

This extract is related to teaching *vocabulary*. Here, the teacher intended to teach students the word *amenities*, while using a number of examples. The researchers considered this action a kind of cognitive scaffolding as it engaged students' cognition.

Extract 2

01 SA: I will (.) my err drop off (1). @
02 T: Again (.)
03 SB:I drop off=
04 T:=IT's (about present)
05 SB: (I'm) drop off=
06 T:= It's (about now)
07 SB: I'm
08 SC:[I'm]
09 SA:[I'm] dropping off my car.

This extract is related to the part *Now You Can*, where the student practicing the conversation made a mistake. The teacher provided hints for the student when he made such a mistake. In Wu's (2010) model of scaffolding, hints were considered as cognitive scaffolding because they engage students' cognition to learn the concept. Thus, the teacher used cognitive scaffolding to help the student correct his mistake.

Extract 3

01 S: To communicated well with er other people in er with people in other country we
02 Er (1) muster learn to speak [well]
03 T: [Aha]
04 S: But er some experts er say er speaking er is just 30 percent .h important and er 30
05 percent important of communication. And er (3)
06 T: So what is the other (.) 70 percent? (.)
07 S: The experts say er just ( ) and 30percent of er com er makes communication with

08 other people. We er can use the geser gesture and verbal er we (.) er when hh when 09 we want to (.) to make conversation with other people and er=

10 T: = That's right (.) You mean gestures are more important than speaking (.) It's the

11 whole part. Thank you.

This extract is related to the *reading* skill. The teacher asked students to read the reading and summarize the reading. That is to say, the teacher provided an opportunity for them to evaluate their learning. The researchers considered this metacognitive scaffolding.

Extract 4

01 S: My family surprising me =
02 T: = No (.) why? Why we say surprising? (3)
03 S: Parents=
04 T: =Well the parents did that (.) Didn't they?
05 (.)
06 T: Is it right to say surprising? =
07 S: =No, surprised (.)
08 T: Why? =
09 S: = It's adjective (.)
10 T: It's a verb, not an adjective. Simple past. My parents surprised me.
11 I was surprised. Simple past.

This extract is related to the part *vocabulary*. The teacher asked students to make some sentences with new words, where the student made a mistake and the teacher asked students a question to think and evaluate their learning instead of correcting the mistake directly. Thus, based on in Wu's (2010) framework, the teacher used metacognitive scaffolding.

Extract 5

01 S: More likely?
02 T: What is the meaning of likely?
03 (.)
04 Ss: Same?
05 T: Same. No. It's not the verb.
06 S: Adverb
07 T: Sure, it's adverb, but is it SHURELY or MAYBE?
08 (.)
09 T: Surly or maybe?
10 S: Surly
11 T: Likely here means certainly or surly

This extract is related to *reading*. In this example, the teacher helped students to find the meaning of a word gradually. It is a kind of procedural scaffolding because the teacher considered a procedure for learning, and in Wu's (2010) framework, it is called procedural scaffolding. First, the student asked the meaning of a word from teacher; however, the teacher did not answer and asked the question from the students in order to think. One student stated a meaning that was not correct; the teacher guided her by stating, "It's not the verb". In the next step, where students got closer to the answer. The teacher said, "is it SHURELY or MAYBE?" Finally, the students could find the answer with the help of the teacher.

Extract 6

01 T: Look at first sentence (.) I was watching TV from 7 to 8(.) What is the meaning of
02 this sentence?(1)
03 SA: I was watching TV from (.) during ( ) time
04 T:Ok(1)
05 SB:I: (1) I watching(1)TV last(2) er last er
06 SA: Do something in the past between er exact time(1)
07 SC: I think it's routine er rotten er work he or she did it
08 T:sometimes it can be routine but not .hh always(1) er: here(.) if you want to talk
09 about the time you say
10 Sf: its past continues.
11 T: sure its past continues .hh and it talks about finished activity

This example is related to teaching a *grammar* related to the past continues. The teacher had a procedure for teaching the grammar, where systematically, he led students toward the new points. The researchers considered this as procedural scaffolding based on Wu's (2010) framework. This extract started with an example and continued by asking students to think about the meaning. Then, the teacher told the students the grammatical rules and, by engaging the students, the teacher helped them learn negative and question forms in the next steps.

Extract 7

01 T: This word is the synonym for gas pedal (1) (Teacher plays the dictionary)
02 T: Accelerate (.)Accelerate synonym for gas pedal
03 S :()
04 T: Accelerator? This one (1) (Teacher plays the dictionary)
05 T: Accelerate is the verb and accelerator is the noun. It means the part of car () gas
06 pedal

This extract is related to part *vocabulary*. The teacher used the dictionary as a resource to introduce a new word to the students. The researchers considered this context scaffolding.

3.2. Discussion

The types of scaffolding that teachers used in this study were cognitive, metacognitive, procedural, and context scaffolding. These results agreed with what Rahimidoost et al. (2013) found, indicating that instructional scaffolding needed metacognitive and cognitive scaffolding.

In this study, the teachers used cognitive scaffolding in different ways to improve students' reading comprehension since reading comprehension needs the knowledge more than vocabulary and syntax; students need to know what happens between the lines of reading. It is a skill requiring cognitive strategies to comprehend the text (Safein Salem, 2017). Thus, the teachers used warm-up activities to activate students' mind in order to comprehend the text before teaching the text, and this increased the time spent on providing cognitive scaffolding in the study. Occasionally, the teachers provided some examples to help learning considered as cognitive scaffolding. The metacognitive scaffolding in the reading skill included the opportunities that teachers provided to help students evaluate their learning. The teacher asked students to summarize reading or sometimes asked some questions from reading parts. The teachers used metacognitive scaffolding because metacognition leads to high learning outcomes and has a great effect on language learning, especially writing and reading (Safein Salem, 2017). It helps the students to regulate their learning behaviors and is helpful scaffolding for making the students autonomous. The time devoted to procedural scaffolding was higher because in *photostories*, the teacher played the tape, asked some questions, then played the tape again, and asked the students to repeat after the tape. That is to say, the teachers considered an order for teaching in order to help students understand the material. Although some studies have been done on the effects of scaffolding on reading comprehension in Iran, none of these studies identified the types of scaffolding the teachers used in their classes. The authors of this study tried to fill this gap. For example, Khajeh Khosravi (2017) revealed that scaffolding through interaction affected students' performance in reading comprehension. The results of this study were also in line with the results of the study done by Safein Salem (2017) who showed that most teachers used scaffolding for teaching reading skill. He showed that metacognitive scaffolding (74%) was used more than cognitive scaffolding (52%) by teachers.

In this study, the teachers used different types of scaffolding to improve listening comprehension. The metacognitive scaffolding in listening skill included the opportunities that teachers provided to help students evaluate their learning. The teacher asked students to summarize listening or sometimes asked some questions from listening. The time spent on metacognitive scaffolding was more than other that spent on providing other types of scaffolding in teaching listening comprehension. The reason is that students must learn to listen, and the best way is to help them know their weakness. The students should know what problems they have while listening to the tape. Using metacognitive scaffolding, the students discover the problems they face during listening, and they try to find strategies that would help them improve their listening. The time devoted to procedural scaffolding increased in listening because the teacher considered an order for teaching in order to help students understand the material. He/ she played the tape, asked some questions, and replayed the tape in case the students did not know the answer. Some teachers used cognitive scaffolding for listening as well. That is, they provided warm-up activities for listening or gave examples to introduce the meaning of new words in listening. Although some studies have been done on the impact of scaffolding on listening comprehension in Iran, few studies identified the types of scaffolding that teachers used in their classes while teaching listening skill. They just studied the impact of scaffolding on listening ability. Shabani and Malekdar (2016) studied the impact of scaffolding on Iranian EFL learners' listening comprehension. They showed that collaborative scaffolding strategies improved listening comprehension.

In this study, teachers used different types of scaffolding to improve speaking as well. They used cognitive scaffolding in different ways. They used warm-up activities to activate students' mind in order to comprehend the conversation before teaching. The time spent on metacognitive scaffolding in speaking skill was more than that spent on other types of scaffolding and included the opportunities that teachers provided to help students evaluate their learning. For example, teachers asked students to practice the conversation after teaching and changed some parts. The cognitive scaffolding in speaking included the introduction that the teacher provided before teaching conversation. In the part *grammar*, the teachers had a special procedure. They considered an order for teaching in order to help students understand the material. This was considered as procedural scaffolding. Although some studies have been done on the effects of scaffolding on speaking skill in Iran, few studies identified the types of scaffolding. They just studied the effect of scaffolding on speaking skill. For example, Mirahmadi and Alavi (2016) studied the effect of scaffolding on Iranian EFL learners speaking ability and their fluency, lexicon, grammar, and pronunciation. They showed that hard, soft, reciprocal, and virtual

scaffolding improved Iranian EFL students' post-test of speaking and their fluency, grammar, lexicon, and pronunciation.

In this study, just one of the teachers asked students to write some writing at home, while others did not work on writing. The teachers used cognitive scaffolding, such as hints to correct students' errors. The results of this study were in line with the results of the study done by Kamil (2017) who investigated the teacher's scaffolding in teaching writing in seventh grade students in Indonesia. He revealed that the teacher scaffolded teaching using cognitive scaffolding (reading text model), provided supportive and corrective feedback, explained grammar and text structure (asking questions from previous parts, providing illustration), and engaged students in the learning process).

The authors considered vocabulary and preview in the category of vocabulary. In the part vocabulary, the teachers used warm-up activities to provide an introduction to activate students' mind in order to comprehend the vocabularies before teaching based on their experience of teaching (cognitive scaffolding). Some teachers helped students find the meaning of words by dividing them into understandable parts (procedural scaffolding). For introducing some new vocabularies, the teachers used cognitive scaffolding and made some examples. In a number of cases, the teacher helped and guided students to relate the vocabularies to what they knew. The teachers used context or technical scaffolding rarely in order to improve students' vocabulary. Some studies have been done on scaffolding vocabulary part in Iran, while few of these studies identified the types of scaffolding that teachers used in their classes. They just studied the influence of scaffolding on vocabulary learning. For example, Taghizadeh et al. (2017) studied the influence of computer scaffolding, and teacher scaffolding on vocabulary learning. In total, 108 Iranian high school students participated in the study. They were divided into three groups: (a) no-scaffolding group (b) teacher-scaffolding group, and (c) computer-scaffolding group. The results showed that the second and third groups were more successful than the first one. In both immediate and delayed post-tests, the teacher-scaffolding group outperformed the computer-scaffolding group.

The teachers mostly used procedural scaffolding because they followed the steps in the book. Therefore, the book had an important role in the scaffolding that teachers used. Cognition and emotion go hand in hand and the growth of cognition depends on the growth on emotion in the classroom (Rosiek, 2003). The percentage of cognitive scaffolding was less than metacognitive and procedural scaffolding in the EFL classes, and the reason was the integration of cognition and emotion. The teachers did not pay

attention to students' motivational scaffolding. Thus, the level of cognitive scaffolding decreased.

4. Conclusion and Implications

The present investigation aimed at studying the extent to which various scaffolding types were provided in EFL classes concerning all four skills. It was also to delineate the types of scaffolding used in the classes. The population of this study comprised eight EFL teachers who taught Top Notch 2 series, selected based on availability sampling technique. The classes were recorded during the term and transcribed. Then, the recording was analyzed to understand what types of scaffolding the teachers used in the class. The types of scaffolding examined in the classroom were cognitive, metacognitive, procedural, and context scaffolding. The motivational scaffolding was not used in the classes because all teachers followed a special guideline for teaching in the language institute, forcing them to follow the teachers' book. This hinders the creativity while teaching. Totally, 35.8 % time of the classes was devoted to scaffolding, of which 6.55%, 11.71%, 17.4 %, and 0.03% time of the classes were spent on cognitive, metacognitive, procedural, and context scaffolding. No motivational scaffolding was traced. The context scaffolding was used in a few classes, although it can convey information efficiently, and the information would remain in students' mind for a long time. The teachers are suggested to increase the use of context and motivational scaffolding, provide facilities, and regulate the time of the class so that each type of scaffolding can be used when required.

References

Ahangaria, S., Hejazib, M., & Razmjouc, L. (2014). The impact of scaffolding on content retention of Iranian post-elementary EFL learners' summary writing. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98,* 83–89.

Amiri Samani, E., & Khazayie, S. (2017). Scaffolding low-intermediate adult EFL learners to write. *Journal of applied linguistics and language research, 4*(2), 216-230.

Belland, B.R., Walker, A.E., Kim, N.J., & Lefler, M. (2017). Synthesizing results from empirical research on computer-based scaffolding in stem education: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 87*(2), 309-344.

Chen, S. Y., & Tseng, Y. F. (2019). The impacts of scaffolding e-assessment English learning: A cognitive style perspective. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. Latest Articles. DOI: 10.1080/09588221.2019.1661853.

Dabbagh, N. (2003). Scaffolding: An important teacher competency in online learning. *Tech Trends, 47*(2), 39-44.

Daniel, S.M. (2016). Moving beyond yes or no: Shifting from over-scaffolding to contingent scaffolding in literacy instruction with emergent bilingual students, *TESOL Journal, 7*(2), 39-420.

Engin, M. (2014). Macro-scaffolding: Contextual support for teacher learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(5), 26-40.

Gholamipasand, P., & Tahriri, A. (2017). Peer scaffolding in an EFL writing classroom: An investigation of writing accuracy and scaffolding behaviors. *Research in English Language Pedagogy, 5*(2), 147-166.

Gillani, B.B. (2003). *Learning theories and the design of e-learning environments*. Oxford: University Press of America.

Goh, C.C.M. (2017). Scaffolding learning processes to improve speaking performance. *Language Teaching, 50*(2), 247-260.

Holton, D., & Clarke, D. (2006). Scaffolding and metacognition. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology, 37*(2), 127-143.

Kamil, R. (2017). Exploring teacher's scaffolding to the students in teaching writing. *Journal of English and Education, 5*(2), 187 – 193.

Kazak, S., Wegerif, R., & Fujita, T. (2015). Combining scaffolding for content and scaffolding for dialogue to support conceptual breakthroughs in understanding probability. *ZDM Mathematics Education, 47*(7), 1269-1283.

Khajeh Khosravi, S. (2017). The effect of symmetrical scaffolding on the reading comprehension of Iranian EFL Learners. *International Journal of Psychological and Brain Sciences, 2*(4), 95-99.

Kim, S., & Cho, S. (2015). How a tutor uses gesture for scaffolding: A case study of L2 Tutee's Writing. *Discourse Processes: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *54*(2), 105-123.

Liu, L. (2018). Teaching EFL reading skills with instructional scaffolding microlectures: Chinese non-English major undergraduates' performances and perceptions. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal, 5*(1), 210-217.

Many, J., & Aoulou, E. (2014). Understanding literacy teacher educators' use of scaffolding. *Reading Horizons, 53*(3), 45-71.

Mirahmadi, S.H., & Alavi, S.M. (2016). The role of traditional and virtual scaffolding in developing speaking ability of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 6*(2), 43-56.

Rahimi, A., & Tahmasebi, S. (2010). Mediating Iranian learners' speech and scaffolding in reading comprehension. *LiBRI. Linguistic and Literary Broad Research and Innovation, 1*(2), 56-71.

Rahimidoost, Gh., Noruzy, D., Fardanesh, H., & Amirteymori. (2013). A framework for instructional scaffolding in computer-based and problem-solving learning environment. Journal of Educational Studies, 20(1), 243-268.

Ranjbar, N., & Ghonsooly, B. (2017). Peer scaffolding behaviors emerging in revising a written task: A microgenetic analysis. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 5*(2), 75- 90.

Rezaee, A. A., Marefat, H., & Saeedakhtar, A. (2015). Symmetrical and asymmetrical scaffolding of L2 collocations in the context of concordancing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 28*(6), 532-549.

Rosiek, J. (2003). Emotional scaffolding: An exploration of the teacher knowledge at the intersection of student emotion and the subject matter. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54(5),* 399-412.

Safein Salem, A. A. M. (2017). Scaffolding reading comprehension skills. *English Language Teaching, 10*(1), 97-111.

San Martin, M.G. (2018). Scaffolding the learning-to-teach process: A study in an EFL teacher education program in Argentina. *PROFILE: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 20*(1), 121-134.

Shabani, K., & Malekdar, S. (2016). The Effect of peers on Iranian EFL learners' listening comprehension. *English Language Teaching, 3*(1), 49-65.

Shin, S., & Song, H.D. (2015). Finding the optimal scaffolding for learners' epistemological beliefs during ill-structured problem solving. *Interactive Learning Environments, 24*(8), 1-16.

Shoari, E., & Assadi Aidinlou, N. (2015). Zone of proximal development: The effect of verbal scaffolding on improving Iranian young EFL

learners' vocabulary learning. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 2*(8), 208-217.

Soleimani, E., & Biria, R. (2016). Instructional scaffolding, socioeconomic status, and oral performance: A case of Iranian preschoolers. *American Research Journal of English and Literature (ARJEL), 2*, 1-10.

Taghizadeh Langari, M., Zeinali Gorizi, H., & Rezaie, M. (2017). Working within the ZPD: Computer and teacher scaffolding of second language vocabulary learning. *Palma Journal, 16*(3), 397-406.

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.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wolf, M. K., Guzman-Orth, D., Lopez, A., Castellano, K., Himelfarb, I., & Tsutagawa, F. S. (2016). Integrating scaffolding strategies into technology-enhanced assessments of English learners: Task types and measurement models. *Educational Assessment, 21*(3), 157–175.

Wu, H. L. (2010). *Scaffolding in technology-enhanced science education* (Unpublished PhD dissertation). Texas A&M University, USA.

Yelland, N., & Masters, J. (2007). Rethinking scaffolding in the information age. *Computers and Education, 48*(3), 362-382.

Bibliographic information of this paper for citing:

Safdari, S., Ghadiri, M., & Kashkouli, Z. (2021). The types of scaffolding used by EFL teachers in Isfahan. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies, 8*(2), 199-220.