EFFECT OF DIALOGIC TEACHING ON VOCABULARY ACQUISITION AND PHONOLOGICAL AWARENESS AMONG FIRST GRADERS: AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

[1]Dr. Roshi Khalid (Principal Author)
Al Hikmah High School and College
Email: roshi.khalid@yahoo.com
[2]Syeda Maryam Naqvi
Lahore Garrison University
Email: syedamaryamnaqvi@lgu.edu.pk
[3]Dr. Farzana Yousaf (Corresponding Author)
Assistant Professor of Education, University of Education, Bank Road Campus Lahore
Email: farzana.yousaf@ue.edu.pk
[4]Zahir Hashmi
Lahore Garrison university, Lahore
Email: hashmizahir67@gmail.Com
[5]Tayyaba Rana
University of Central Punjab
Email: tayyaba.rana@ucp.edu.pk

Abstract
Dialogic teaching is an effective approach for teachers and students to collaborate and expand upon each other's ideas. It can make the classroom more interactive and improve learning achievements. This research investigates how dialogic teaching can help Pakistani learners with different levels of English vocabulary (low, average, and high) and phonological awareness learn English better. There will be 60 first graders from a private school in Lahore who will be examined on their understanding of English vocabulary and phonological awareness. They will then be put into a selected group either a control or experimental group. A 3-month dialogic teaching program will be used in English classes every day. We will administer the t-test to look at the pre-test and post-test outcomes in a statistical way. Results from repeated tests ANOVA showed that students who were taught with dialogic teaching made much more progress in their expressive vocabulary knowledge on textbook items than those who were not taught with dialogic teaching, both in the low-level and high-level vocabulary groups. High-vocabulary group also made more progress in their phonological awareness. These results suggest that using conversation to instruct in English as a second language (ESL) helps pupils acquire the language.
KeyWords: *English as a second language (ESL), First Graders, Experimental Study, Phonological Awareness, Vocabulary Acquisition*

Introduction
Teacher-student dialogue is a key aspect of language instruction because it not only helps learners and teachers communicate in the target language, but it also builds a group of people who speak and listen to the language for a purpose. For most of young people learning a language in the Asia-Pacific region, interacting with other students in the classroom is one of the main ways they learn early skills that help them improve their second language abilities, such vocabulary and phonological awareness (PA) (Spencer et al., 2015). According to existing literature, dialogic teaching, which lets educators and students work together to improve on each other's ideas, can make kids more interested in school and help them learn more language

(Haneda & Wells, 2008). Nevertheless, it is not apparent if dialogic education has distinct effects on language learning for students with varying degrees of language abilities. Young people who are learning a language are a mixed population with varied degrees of linguistic competency (Humes-Bartlo, 1989). So, looking at the things that affect language development in kids with varying levels of ability might help us understand their learning requirements and cognitive traits (Carretti et al., 2016).

This study looks at how dialogic teaching affects Pakistani students with different levels of vocabulary and phonology while they are studying English as a foreign language (ESL). From two points of view, this study builds on previous studies. This study is one of the few that looks at how well dialogic teaching works for young ESL learners. Second, this study looks at how dialogic education affects language development in students with varying levels of vocabulary. This study's results can help us better understand how well dialogic education works for young students with different degrees of language proficiency in the classroom.

Teaching via Dialogue

Teaching via dialogue is a teaching method that lets both educators and learners work together to improve each other's ideas to help them learn better (Hennessy, et. al., 2011). It focusses on finding the dialogic procedures in which instructors and learners take part (Wells, 2008; Lyle, 2008). In conventional didactic education, on the other hand, educators prefer to give out material while students passively receive it and don't take part in classroom discussions very much (Hennessy, 2017). Including dialogic education in the curriculum lets instructors and kids help build knowledge in the target language. So, to reach their teaching and learning goals, students and teachers work together to build meanings over time (Makhdum et. al., 2023). This manner, students are likely to hear several points of view on the issue being discussed (Haneda & Wells, 2013). Such an approach facilitates student engagement with multiple perspectives during the classroom education; students ask questions and talk to each other.

Dialogic reading is a viable technique to assist students learn and improve language (for example, Hargrave & Sénéchal, 2000). Dialogic reading is a technique for adults and kids to read together that helps the kid talk and use more complex language supported by adults (Zevenbergen & Whitehurst, 2003). The "PEER" pattern (prompt, evaluate, expand, and repeat) and the "CROWD" question pattern (complete, recall, open-ended, wh-, and distancing) (Chow, et. al. 2010) are the main parts of dialogic reading. These structures encourage the use of different sorts of questions to get students to participate. For instance, in language instruction, the PEER method begins with the instructor asking the pupils to apply the second language to explain an image with the help of one of the "CROWD" questions. The instructor then looks over the pupils' answers and gives them both positive and helpful criticism. The teacher often builds on what the pupils said at first by incorporating more language elements, such phrases, to make their answers more interesting. Lastly, the instructor tells the kids to say the longer sentences again. This dialogic method helps students enhance their speaking and writing abilities in a way that is natural and not intrusive, enabling them to be active consumers and speakers (Chow et al., 2010). It gives kids a reason to learn the meanings of words well by giving them long examples, more explanations, repetition, and time to think about new words (Wasik et al., 2016). Dialogic reading, like other methods such as Educational and Academic Conversations and Classroom Dialogues, gets learners involved. These methods urge teachers to dynamically get learners to participate in the conversation, which is based on how the children respond to the teacher's questions. Dialogic reading, on the other hand, is more organised since it has a "PEER" sequence and a "CROWD" question design structure. In the "PEER" pattern, repetition makes sure that the children comprehend and have an

opportunity to practise the answers that the instructor has graded and added to. These are vital for instructors to reach their learning goals.

Previous study (Landry, et. al., 2017) has shown that it is possible to use dialogic reading along with other language teaching methods. The goal of adding creative literacy exercises to dialogic reading in this study is to help kids use second language words in innovative ways. Using creative learning materials as prompts to create interpersonal interactions between educators and students that are one of the most common types of creative activities (Faisal et al., 2023). Creative activities let kids criticise, add to, and build on their ideas by interacting with one other in the classroom (Mayesky, 2014). Research on teaching languages demonstrate that planned creative activities in the classroom may create a dialogic environment that lets kids say new and innovative things (Chow et al., 2018). For example, a innovative activity may learners to envision a perfect, made-up place or situation and explain it in the foreign language. This can lead to a lot of new replies from children (Chow et al., 2018).

Dialogic Teaching and Its Effect on Language Acquisition

Several important advantages of dialogic instruction for helping kids learn a language have been shown in previous studies. First, dialogic instruction uses different types of semiotic mediation to help students get better at speaking and writing by giving them the assistance they need and learn new language tools (Klingelhofer & Schleppegrell, 2016). Second, dialogic teaching gives educators a lot of linguistic self-reference to help students become more aware of language. It also gives students chances to read and write in the target language and lets them investigate meaning in their own way (Schleppegrell & Moore, 2018). Third, dialogic education can help teachers and students talk to each other better by making it easier for them to have interactive conversations. This gives children more chances to strengthen their cognitive abilities within their zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Wells, 1999a). Fourth, dialogic education lets instructors employ fun activities to help students come up with unique ways to talk (Cremin, 2009; Kremer, 2016).

Researchers have found that dialogic education helps young children learn new words (2015; Lowman et al., 2018). Educators were advised to apply dialogic reading as the major technique to teach a group of young children how to read and write. Most of the kids spoke English as their main language. The results revealed that kids who took part in the dialogic reading intervention program had far bigger vocabulary increases than kids who read in regular settings. Wasik and Hindman (2014) asserted that students who learnt more grammar and vocabulary were more likely to hear their teachers talk about the target language. Gonzalez et al. (2014) did another study that showed how essential the sorts of dialogic reading exercises were. They discovered that extratextual discourse helped ESL students understand the target language better than text-focused talk. Petchprasert (2014) also did a study on how well home setting dialogic reading worked for the ESL learners. They found that dialogic reading helped kids learn English vocabulary because it let them be both storytellers and masters of their own learning. This made them more motivated and independent in their ESL learning after the intervention.

We know more about how dialogic instruction affects vocabulary knowledge (VK) than we do about how it affects PA. The results have been mixed. Whitehurst et al. (1994) showed that an approach that taught youngsters how to read and recognise sounds and letters did not help their phonological abilities. But most of the kids who took part in this research came from households where at home, English was the dominant language. A subsequent study done in the U.S. with mostly African Americans indicated that dialogic reading improved PA abilities after 3-month of dialogic reading. Elmonayer (2013) also discovered that dialogic reading

helped Egyptian kids acquire Arabic as their first language by making them more attentive of sounds. Two important signs of a student's language abilities are their VK and their PA (Lipka & Siegel, 2012; Tong & Deacon, 2017). Because of this, it's crucial for this research to look at how dialogic instruction affects ESL kids' vocabulary and PA.

This study looks at how dialogic teaching affects ESL acquisition in young students with different levels of VK in English throughout the course of a 3-month dialogic teaching intervention. It looks at two parts of improving English as a foreign language: 'VK and PA'. We want to address two items that we have been studying. First, does dialogic teaching help Pakistani ESL kids learn more words and become more aware of how sounds work? Second, do Pakistan ESL students with varied levels of VK respond differently to dialogic teaching? We use both receptive and expressive vocabulary to measure how well youngsters know the target language. Researchers have shown that VK is not just a good way to tell how well young learners can read (Grøver et al., 2018), but it is a good way to tell how well they can listen, read, and write (Schmitt, 2014). This study aims to add to what we already know about how people learn a second language and how dialogic teaching affects young students with varied levels of language skills by looking at how it affects kids with varied phases of vocabulary knowledge.

Objectives:

The objectives of this research are as follows:

1. To examine the the effect of dialogic instruction on the vocabulary knowledge of first graders in an ESL classroom.

2. To examine the effect of dialogic teaching on the phonological awareness of first graders students in an ESL classroom.

Research Hypotheses

To achieve above objectives, following hypothesis are formulated:

H_1: There is a significant difference of dialogic teaching on vocabulary knowledge and phonological awareness among first graders of ESL classroom.

Methodology

This section talks about the participants, the measurements, and the circumstances for the experimental and control groups in this quasi-experimental study.

Participants

There were seventy-two first-grade students (*Mean* = 6.59 years, *Standard Deviation* = .33, *Minimum* = 5.90, *Maximum* = 7.50) from a private school of Lahore, Pakistan who took part. Everyone who took part and went to school every day for language lessons. In Pakistan, students start taking formal English classes. However, most of them start listening to stories in English language, and learning alphabets and words in English at kindergarten or at home.

We chose students from a bigger group of 253 students from two private schools (school A, N = 120; school B, N = 133). Both schools were like standard private institutions in Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan that taught ESL to local Urdu-speaking students every day. The aim of this paper is to figure out if dialogic education affects how students learn a language differently depending on how much vocabulary they already know. To do this, people with both high and low levels of VK were chosen and signed up for the study. We gave all 253 first graders tests in English receptive vocabulary and English expressive vocabulary to detect kids with low-vocabulary and high-vocabulary. We figured out the average z-scores for students who took both an English Receptive Vocabulary test and an English Expressive Vocabulary test. Kids with low VK were put in the group with kids who scored below the 25th percentile, while kids with high VK were put in the group with kids who scored above the 75th percentile. The results of the data suggest that English teachers, teacher educators, and administrators need to help

teens understand texts in a way that lets them use that knowledge in useful ways so they can fully participate in social, civic, and economic issues.

We utilised the SPSS Select Cases feature to randomly choose the same number of participants from each treatment since ANOVA is sensitive to sample sizes that are not equal (Fitts, 2010; Howell, 2009; Liu, 2003). In the past, researchers have used this strategy to choose an even distribution of participants in each condition (for instance, Sadler & Fowler, Scarpati et al., 2006; Scarpati et al., 2009. To make sure that there were the same number of students in each condition, using the SPSS Select Cases function, participants were chosen randomly to be in the experimental condition such that there were the same number of people in the vocabulary groups as there were in the control condition. The primary goal of this paper is to figure out what dialogic teaching does. It was done by comparing the situations of both groups using statistical methods. The number of people in the two groups that were compared was the same, but not the groups with low and high vocabulary. The group contained 32 youngsters who didn't know a lot of words. The control group contained 10 boys and 6 girls, whereas the experimental group had 7 boys and 9 girls. Forty of the students in the group were good in vocabulary. There were 10 boys and 10 females in the control group, whereas there were 7 boys and 13 girls in the experimental group.

The Receptive Vocabulary exam is based on the Receptive One-Word Picture Vocabulary tests (ROWPVT; Brownell, 2000). The researcher said a phrase out loud for each of the 20 objects, and the students had to choose the right picture from four choices. The test items were chosen at random from the first 60 items in the ROWPVT. The ROWPVT featured some easier items The people who took part were studying English as a foreign language and had just started taking official English courses at school. Researchers have utilised these items earlier to find out how well first graders understand language (Wong et al., 2014). The Receptive Vocabulary test has a highest score of 20 and a Cronbach's α of.89. It used things from textbooks to test English receptive vocabulary. We conducted a test of English Receptive Vocabulary using questions from textbooks to find out more about how the treatment impacted the vocabulary that was taught throughout the intervention. The method this test was given was like the way the Receptive Vocabulary test was given. The person in charge of the experiment gave each of the 16 objects a word, and the students had to choose the right picture from four choices. The test words were from the English textbook that the students used for their English classes throughout the intervention. The words on this exam were not the same as the ones on the English Expressive Vocabulary with Textbook Items test. The Receptive Vocabulary-Textbook exam has a top score of 16 and a Cronbach's α of.81. The youngsters were instructed to name an English word that best defined each of the 18 things the experimenter showed them. All chosen at random from the first 60 in the EVT-2. Some of the questions on the EVT-2 were easier since the people who took it were learning English as a second language and had just started taking official English classes at school. Researchers have given school kids tests on their English expressive vocabulary that are comparable to the ones in this study (Liu, et. al., 2017). The highest score for this assignment was 18, and the Cronbach's α was 0.92.

The words in Expressive Vocabulary test were from the students' English textbooks, which they used to study the language. There were several terms that were not the same as the ones on the English Receptive Vocabulary with Textbook Items test. The highest score on this exam was 16, and the Cronbach's α was.88. There were 12 questions on the English PA test that asked students to delete English syllables. The researcher said the three-syllable terms out loud one at a time. After that, the students had to take one syllable away from each word. If you take off "ter" from "butterfly," you get "but" and "fly." In the past, and primary school children have taken similar English syllable deletion examinations (Chow et al., 2010; Chung et al., 2013).

The test terminated after the student couldn't answer five questions in a row. The highest score on this job was 12, and its Cronbach's α was 0.85.

Research Process

All of the pupils' parents had to provide their approval before the data could be collected. After that, each student was tested on their receptive vocabulary with its textbook, expressive vocabulary with its textbook, and PA in half-hour session. We followed the treatment procedures used in other research (Hargrave & Sénéchal, 2000) and gave instructors in the experimental condition a 1.5-hour workshop at the start of our intervention program to help them teach ESL using dialogic teaching approaches. The program gave the instructors principles for dialogic teaching and specific reading and learning resources for creative activities and interactive discourse. The present intervention program lasts for 3-month since prior research (such Chow et al., 2018) showed that dialogic teaching intervention programs worked well. Some research on dialogic teaching only used it for a month (e.g. Opel et al., 2009). We thought that 3-month would be a good amount of time for this study since it would be long enough for us to see improvements in children's vocabulary and PA There were three class visits over the 3-month intervention program, one every month. Also, instructors were often contacted to make sure they could use dialogic education methods without any problems and that there was active interaction between teachers and students in their courses. After the intervention session was over, the students took the five tests again. There were five kinds of vocabulary: receptive vocabulary with its textbook, expressive vocabulary with its textbook, and PA. Four of the five classes in school A and three of the five classes in school B were picked at random to be in the treatment group. The control condition was given to the other three classes. Both circumstances had the same amount of time to learn English. There was a total of 10 teachers in this research, and they did not know what was on the assessments.

The experimental condition

Students in the experimental group had 3-momth of dialogic education that was meant to encourage teachers and students to talk to one other and talk about things that were linked to what they were learning in class. There were two main parts to the dialogic instruction: interactive discussion and creative exercises. For 80 minutes a week on average, the standard school curriculum was substituted with dialogic instruction in the classroom. The study team gave teachers the resources they needed to teach and learn through interactive discourse and creative activities. Participants in the treatment group got the the same quantity of English lessons as the students in the control group.

Control condition

Participants in the control group studied the same things as everyone else in English. The main focus of this curriculum is to help children learn basic and tangible facts, such grammar and vocabulary, including other

English classrooms in the school, this one focusses on rote learning and drills including activities like reciting and dictating, and other vocabulary memorisation tactics (Lau & Rao, 2013).

Analysis

Descriptive statistics and reliability coefficients were computed for the tests. All of the tests had a reliability coefficient of more than 0.80, which means they were very reliable. Independent-samples and chi-square tests Before the intervention, t-tests were used to see if the experimental and control groups were different in terms of age, gender, and task

achievement. After that, repeated measurements We used ANOVA tests on English measurements to look at how differences between conditions changed over time. We used Cohen's (1988) rule for the sizes to figure out what the effect sizes meant. According to this criterion, a partial eta-squared ($\eta p2$) value of .01, .06, and .14 suggests a minor, medium, and high influence, in that order. These studies indicate how effectively the intervention worked and how it can have differing effects on pupils based on how much language they already knew.

Results

Tests like the chi-square test and the independent-samples test We gave t-tests to both the low and high groups to see if they were different in terms of age, gender, and how well they did on the task before the treatment. We applied chi-square tests to compare the number of men and women in the low and high vocabulary categories. The results indicated that there were no big changes in gender between the conditions. In the first table. We also used independent-samples t-tests to compare the performance and chronological age of the two conditions at the start of the exam for the low and high vocabulary groups. There weren't any substantial differences between the conditions on any of the pre-test variables (all ps >.05), as shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1: Participant Demographics by Vocabulary Group

Age:

	N	*M*	*SD*	*T*	*p*	*d*	95% CI for *M* difference
Low-vocabulary st.							
Exp. Group	16	6.52	.36	.75	.45	.26	[-.17, .38]
Cont. Group	16	6.62	.40				
Total	32	6.57	.38				
High-vocabulary st.							
Exp. Group	20	6.61	.33	-.14	.88	-.06	[-.20, .18]
Cont. Group	20	6.59	.26				
Total	40	6.60	.29				

Gender:

	Male	Female	χ^2	p	φ
Low-vocabulary st.					
Exp. Group	7	9	1.12	.28	.18
Cont.	10	6			
Total	17	15			
High-vocabulary st.					
Exp.	7	13	.92	.33	.15
Cont.	10	10			
Total	17	23			

For each word group, Tables 1 and 2 revealed descriptive data, independent samples T-tests of age, and Chi-square testing of gender between the experimental and control groups.

Comparison of how the conditions became better over time of both the Groups

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the post-test results in both cases. These ratings demonstrate how both the treatment and control group members performed after the intervention. We utilised repeated measures ANOVA to see how the differences between treatments varied over time based on

the interaction effects and effect sizes. We looked at how things changed over time (from before the test to after the test), how things were different between the experimental and control groups, and how time and the experiment condition affected each other. Five separate repeated measures ANOVAs were employed to find out how well the treatment worked for the groups with low-vocabulary and high-vocabulary. Time was an issue for some subjects, while condition was a factor for all participants. These tests looked at how much better students' receptive vocabulary got after three months of help. They used a textbook for receptive vocabulary, expressive vocabulary with its textbook, and PA for groups with low and high vocabulary, respectively. The results revealed that time had a major influence on all of the variables except for PA and expressive vocabulary. For these two parameters, the primary effect of time was only important in the high-vocabulary group. The results showed that the scores on the pre-test and post-test were different for both vocabulary groups when it came to expressive vocabulary and receptive vocabulary. The strong vocabulary group also had distinct scores for expressive vocabulary and PA. There was no significant effect for condition, which suggests that the experimental and control groups did the same on all tests. The most notable thing was that there was a big interaction effect for expressive vocabulary-textbook in both vocabulary groups and for PA in the high-vocabulary group. persons who took part in the intervention performed better than persons who didn't that can be seen in Table 3. The next several parts will talk more about the results.

Table 3: Repeated Measures (Time * Condition Interaction Effects)

Measure	Group	F	p	ηp^2
Receptive vocabulary	Low	.00	.94	.00
Receptive vocabulary	High	1.21	.27	.03
Receptive vocabulary-textbook	Low	1.16	.28	.03
Receptive vocabulary-textbook	High	1.76	.19	.04
Expressive vocabulary	Low	.38	.54	.01
Expressive vocabulary	High	1.09	.30	.02
Expressive vocabulary-textbook	Low	7.25**	.01	.19
Expressive vocabulary-textbook	High	9.54**	.00	.20
Phonological awareness	Low	.00	1.00	.00
Phonological awareness	High	5.31*	.02	.12

Vocabulary: Both the low and high vocabulary groups had a big effect on time when they looked at the expressive vocabulary textbook. This indicated that the participants did better over time: For the low vocabulary group, F(1, 30) = 83.45, p <.001, ηp2 =.73; for the high

vocabulary group, $F(1, 38) = 145.59$, $p <.001$, $\eta p2 =.79$. There was no important main effect for condition. For the low vocabulary group, $F(1, 30) = 1.37$, $p > .05$, $\eta p 2 = .04$, and for the high vocabulary group, $F(1, 38) = .15$, $p > .05$, $\eta p 2 = .004$. For both the low and high vocabulary groups, There was a considerable interaction impact between time and condition.. $F(1, 30) = 7.25$, $p <.05$, $\eta p 2 =.19$ for the low vocabulary group and $F(1, 38) = 9.54$, $p <.01$, $\eta p 2 =.20$ for the high vocabulary group. This indicated that kids who got the intervention fared better on expressive vocabulary-textbook tests than students who didn't, no matter how many words they knew. This means that finding dialogic teaching was better at helping youngsters understand the expressive language of the textbook than regular didactic instruction. Cohen's (1988) rule for the effect sizes says that there was a strong interaction effect for both the low and high vocabulary groups in the expressive vocabulary-textbook (all $\eta p 2$ s $> .14$). Time had a big impact on receptive vocabulary, receptive vocabulary-textbook, and expressive vocabulary for both groups (all ps $< .01$). The high vocabulary group in receptive vocabulary didn't have a big effect, $F(1, 38) = .39$, $p > .05$, $\eta p 2 = .01$. This showed that the group with less vocabulary got better with time. For receptive vocabulary, $F (1, 30) = 9.35$, $p <.001$, $\eta p2 = .23$; for receptive vocabulary-textbook, $F (1, 30) = 28.19$, $p <.001$, $\eta p2 = .48$; and for expressive vocabulary, $F(1, 30) = 32.42$, $p <.001$, $\eta p2 =.51$. The group that knew a lot of words also got better with time. For receptive vocabulary, $F (1, 38) = 83.79$, $p <.001$, $\eta p2 =.68$, and for expressive vocabulary, $F (1, 38) = 21.11$, $p <.001$, $\eta p2 = .35$. In receptive vocabulary, receptive vocabulary-textbook, and expressive vocabulary, nevertheless, there was no significant interaction effect or main impact for condition in either vocabulary group (all ps $> .05$). This showed that both the kids who had the intervention and the kids who didn't became better at language at the same pace. In this study, the control group studied the same English as everyone else. These results demonstrated that dialogic education was just as good as regular didactic instruction at helping kids learn new words.

Phonology: There was a strong impact for time in the high vocabulary group when looking at phonological awareness (PA): $F (1, 38) = 5.82$, $p <.05$, $\eta p 2 = .13$. This indicated that they became better with time. But the main effect on condition wasn't big enough to be important, $F (1, 38) = .11$, $p > .05$, $\eta p 2 = .003$. There was a big difference in how the high vocabulary group did depending on the situation and the period. This suggests that students who had the intervention became more conscious of phonology than those who didn't, $F (1, 38) = 5.31$, $p < .05$, $\eta p2 = .12$. This interaction effect has a modest to large impact. Time, condition, and interaction did not have a big effect on the group with limited vocabulary (all ps $> .05$).

Discussion

After the 3-month intervention, the results show that participants in the experimental group are better at acquiring English expressive vocabulary-textbook than students in the control group. Teachers are advised to give students a lot of time to learn new words in dialogic teaching. When teachers can persuade students to explain the meaning of target vocabulary, pupils have more chances to practise it. There weren't any statistically significant differences in English. Expressive vocabulary changes depending on the context. The items for the Expressive Vocabulary-Textbook task were from the textbooks the students used throughout the intervention, whereas the items for the Expressive Vocabulary task were more general. This means that dialogic education helps students with both low and high vocabulary learn more from textbook language than from vocabulary that isn't in the textbook. The Expressive Vocabulary test employed in this study might not have enough details to indicate that there were large increases in overall expressive VK across the three-month intervention.

A bigger expressive vocabulary test can corroborate the conclusion with future investigation. Previous study has shown that early second language learners absorb vocabulary from textbooks at a normal rate compared to other sources (Davidson et al., 2008). The reason is because teachers utilise textbook terminology more often than other kinds of vocabulary. This is especially true for those who are just starting to learn ESL in a formal setting. Beginning learners tend to depend more on their understanding of textbook vocabulary, which is easier for them to get at, than extra-textual vocabulary when they talk to teachers.

This is because they don't have a lot of vocabulary yet. Dialogic teaching gives kids more chances to employ textbook terminology in the classroom than typical didactic education. As we said before, the dialogic teaching method may make learning word meanings more interesting for kids by using long examples, more explanation, repetition, and exposing them to new words over time (Faisal, 2023). So, by being involved in class, they learn more about the words in their textbooks. Future studies can look into how often the target vocabulary is used in class to find out what makes dialogic teaching so good for ESL vocabulary mastery. Another way to look at this conclusion is that the country's education system focusses more on textbook vocabulary than on language that isn't in books. The intervention program helped students utilise more language outside of the book by having extensive conversations and doing creative literacy activities. But students may nevertheless use textbook jargon more regularly in class. It's important to remember that even though students' scores on the Expressive Vocabulary-Textbook test got a lot better over time, there weren't many questions on the test. This means that some groups may not have made very big gains (Low: Control: 3.44; Low: Experimental: 6.31; High: Control: 3.05; High: Experimental: 5.15). But in the past, short vocabulary exams have been used to find out how much vocabulary young ESL kids know. For example, Petchprasert (2014) offered Thai ESL kids aged three to six a 14-item English vocabulary test to assess how much their vocabulary has grown from the pre-test to the post-test. The fact that the test items were chosen at random and that there were statistically significant differences in growth on these items between conditions suggests that the intervention had an effect. In the same manner, earlier research that employed longer vocabulary tests revealed that dialogic reading helped kids express their vocabulary a lot but not their receptive vocabulary. It's crucial to remember, nevertheless, that the absolute increase is minor (4.7 for the experimental group and 1.2 for the control group) (Hargrave & Sénéchal, 2000). You need to know how much money you made in order to understand the claims and conclusions. Also, the high scores on the pre-test for the high vocabulary group, especially on the Receptive Vocabulary test, would not leave much room for development over time. The tests might not be sensitive enough to reveal that your general VK has grown. More vocabulary tests can back up the result with more research. It's also important to note that the students in both the high-vocabulary experimental group and the high-vocabulary control group did roughly the same on the expressive vocabulary-textbook post-test. The results on the expressive vocabulary-textbook pre-test were not very different between the two groups. However, it is probable that the high vocabulary experimental group scored a little worse on the pre-test, which suggests they have more space to grow than the high vocabulary control group. We need to do further research to be sure that the intervention helped kids with a lot of VK improve their expressive vocabulary.

The kids in the high vocabulary group who got the treatment scored better on English PA tests than the students who didn't get the intervention. But for pupils with a small vocabulary, those who got the help and those who didn't did the same in PA. The Phonological Awareness (PA) exam only comprises a few questions, therefore the small number of gains displayed should be thought of while looking at the outcomes. The difference in PA is clear since the low

vocabulary group and the high vocabulary group had the same amount of time in English class. The results suggest that ESL students' PA will increase a lot if they know a lot of English words. During the dialogic intervention, kids with limited VK and kids with great VK both achieve the same progress in expressive vocabulary-textbook. However, their phonological processing competence stays the same. This finding fits with past research that says kids who know a lot of words could be able to learn PA faster (Strom & Neuman, 2016). For a long time, a lot of people have thought that a child's vocabulary can tell you how well they would learn to read and write in the first few years of school (Grøver et al., 2018). It looks that having a little bit of VK is crucial for helping new learners become more conscious of phonology through interactive conversation. If youngsters don't have a big enough vocabulary, it could be challenging to persuade them to converse to each other in a way that helps them learn more about phonology. We need to look into this hypothesis more to find out how much and what sorts of VK can aid kids with their phonological processing skills.

Conclusion

This study suggests that dialogic education, which employs creative activities and participatory discourse, may work well in the ESL classroom. Dialogic teaching helps young ESL learners improve their English skills, no matter how much vocabulary they already know. Children with a lot of vocabulary who finished the intervention also showed a far bigger improvement in PA than those who did not. This result shows that dialogic education can also help kids learn English at the metalinguistic level. Even though the increases are statistically significant, but there aren't many of them because the tests were short. This study does, however, build on past research in two ways. First, this research is one of the few that looks at how well dialogic teaching works for young ESL learners. Second, this study looks at how dialogic instruction affects the English language development of students with different levels of vocabulary. Overall, the results show that it is possible to use dialogic teaching in ESL classes in schools, as long as teachers keep in mind that kids have different levels of vocabulary knowledge. Teachers need to think about how dialogic education affects kids with varying levels of language competence in second language classrooms.

References

Brownell, R. (2000). Receptive one-word picture vocabulary test. 2nd edition. Novato, CA: Academic Therapy.

Burchinal, M., Vandergrift, N., Pianta, R., & Mashburn, A. (2010). Threshold analysis of association between childcare quality and child outcomes for low-income children in pre- kindergarten programs. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 25, 166–176.

Carretti, B., Motta, E., & Re, A.M. (2016). Oral and written expression in children with reading comprehension difficulties. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 49, 65–76.

Chow, B.W.-Y., Hui, A.N.N., & Chui, B.H.-T. (2018). Creative literacy activities promote positive reading attitude in children learning English as a foreign language. Journal of Research in Reading, 40, 278–289.

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences. 2nd edition. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cremin, T. (2009). Developing speakers and listeners creatively. In Cremin, T., Bearne, E., Dombey, H., & M. Lewis (Eds.), Teaching English creatively (pp. 12–25). London: Routledge.

Davidson, D.J., Indefrey, P., & Gullberg, M. (2008). Words that second language learners are likely to hear, read, and use. Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 11, 133–146.

Elmonayer, R.A. (2013). Promoting phonological awareness skills of Egyptian kindergarteners Through dialogic reading. Early Child Development and Care, 183, 1229–1241.

Faisal, A., Ahmed, S.E., Makhdum, M., & Makhdum, F.N., (2023). A Comparative Study of Predictive Supervised-Machine Learning Algorithms on Cardiovascular Diseases (CVD). *Journal of Population Therapeutics and Clinical Pharmacology,* 30(19), 1159-1177. https://doi.org/10.53555/jptcp.v30i19.3661

Fitts, D.A. (2010). The variable-criteria sequential stopping rule: Generality to unequal sample sizes, unequal variances, or to large ANOVAs. Behaviour Research Methods, 42, 918–929.

Gonzalez, J., Pollard-Durodola, S., Saenz, L., et al. (2016). Spanish and English early literacy profiles of preschool Latino English language learner children. Early Education and Development, 27, 513–531.

Gonzalez, J.E., Pollard-Durodola, S., Simmons, D.C., et al. (2010). Developing low-income preschoolers' social studies and science vocabulary through content-focused storybook reading. Journal of Educational Effectiveness, 4, 25–52.

Gonzalez, J.E., Pollard-Durodola, S., Simmons, D.C., et al. (2014). Enhancing preschool children's vocabulary: Effects of teacher talk before, during and after shared reading. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 29, 214–226.

Grøver, V., Lawrence, J., & Rydland, V. (2018). Bilingual preschool children's second-language vocabulary development: The role of first-language vocabulary skills and second-language talk input. International Journal of Bilingualism, 22, 234–250.

Haneda, M., & Wells, G. (2008). Learning an additional language through dialogic inquiry. Language and Education, 22, 114–136.

Haneda, M., & Wells, G. (2013). Dialogic inquiry and teacher talk in second language classrooms. In Chapelle, C.A. (Ed.), The encyclopedia of applied linguistics. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hargrave, A.C., & Sénéchal, M. (2000). A book reading intervention with preschool children who have limited vocabularies: The benefits of regular reading and dialogic reading. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 15, 75–90.

Hennessy, S. (2017). International experiences with integrating interactive whiteboards: Policy, practice, pedagogy and professional development. In Maclean, R. (Ed.), Life in schools and classrooms: Past, present and future (pp. 633–650). Singapore: Springer.

Hennessy, S., Mercer, N., & Warwick, P. (2011). A dialogic inquiry approach to working with teachers in developing classroom dialogue. Teachers College Record, 113, 1906–1959.

Howell, D.C. (2009). Unequal cell sizes do matter. Available at: http://www.uvm.edu/~dhowell/StatPages/More_Stuff/Unequal-ns/unequal-ns.html (accessed December 2020).

Humes-Bartlo, M. (1989). Variation in children's ability to learn second languages. In Hyltenstam, K., & L.K. Obler (Eds.), Bilingualism across the lifespan: Aspects of acquisition, maturity, and loss (pp. 41–54.

Kinginger, C. (2002). Defining the zone of proximal development in US foreign language education. Applied Linguistics, 23, 240–261.

Klingelhofer, R.R., & Schleppegrell, M. (2016). Functional grammar analysis in support of dialogic instruction with text: Scaffolding purposeful, cumulative dialogue with English learners. Research Papers in Education, 31, 70–88.

Kremer, J.B. (2016) Giving learners a voice: A study of the dialogic 'quality' of three episodes of teacher–learner talk-in-interaction in a language classroom. Dialogic pedagogy:

The importance of dialogue in teaching and learning (pp. 135–152). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Landry, S.H., Zucker, T.A., Williams, J.M., et al. (2017). Improving school readiness of high-risk preschoolers: Combining high quality instructional strategies with responsive training for teachers and parents. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 40, 38–51.

Lau, C., & Rao, N. (2013). English vocabulary instruction in six early childhood classrooms in Hong Kong. Early Child Development and Care, 183, 1363–1380.

Lipka, O., & Siegel, L.S. (2012). The development of reading comprehension skills in children learning English as a second language. Reading and Writing, 25, 1873–1898.

Liu, X. (2003). Statistical power and optimum sample allocation ratio for treatment and control having unequal costs per unit of randomization. Journal of Educational and Behavioural Statistics, 28, 231–248.

Liu, Y., Yeung, S.S., Lin, D., & Wong, R.K.S. (2017). English expressive vocabulary growth and its unique role in predicting English word reading: A longitudinal study involving Hong Kong Chinese ESL children. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 49, 195–202.

Logan, J.A.R., Piasta, S.B., Justice, L.M., Schatschneider, C., & Petrill, S. (2011). Children's attendance rates and quality of teacher–child interactions in at-risk preschool classrooms: Contribution to children's expressive language growth. Child & Youth Care Forum, 40, 457–477.

Lonigan, C.J., Anthony, J.L., Bloomfield, B.G., Dyer, S.M., & Samwel, C.S. (1999). Effects of two shared-reading interventions on emergent literacy skills of at-risk preschoolers. Journal of Early Intervention, 22, 306–322.

Lowman, J., Stone, L.T., & Guo, J.G. (2018). Effects of interactive book reading for increasing children's knowledge of instructional verbs. Communication Disorders Quarterly, 39, 477–489.

Lyle, S. (2008). Dialogic teaching: Discussing theoretical contexts and reviewing evidence from classroom practice. Language and Education, 22, 222–240.

Makhdum, F.N., Khanam, A. & Batool, T. (2023). Development of a Practice Based Post-Humanistic Model of Smart Education for Sustainable Development (SESD) in Mathematics at Elementary Level in Pakistan. (PhD Country Director Number: 31367) [Doctoral Thesis, Retrieved August 29, 2024, from the department of STEM Education, Lahore College for Women University Lahore Pakistan].

Mashburn, A.J., Pianta, R.C., Hamre, B.K., et al. (2008). Measures of classroom quality in prekindergarten and children's development of academic, language, and social skills. Child Development, 79, 732–749.

Mayesky, M. (2014). Creative activities and curriculum for young children. 11th edition. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Mol, S.E., Bus, A.G., De Jong, M.T., & Smeets, D.J.H. (2008). Added value of dialogic parent–child book readings: A meta-analysis. Early Education and Development, 19, 7–26.

Ong, J. (2017). A case study of classroom discourse analysis of teacher's fronted reading comprehension lessons for vocabulary learning opportunities. RELC Journal, 50, 118–135.

Opel, A., Ameer, S.S., & Aboud, F.E. (2009). The effect of preschool dialogic reading on vocabulary among rural Bangladeshi children. International Journal of Educational Research, 48, 12–20.

Petchprasert, A. (2014). The influence of parents' backgrounds, beliefs about English learning, and a dialogic reading program on Thai kindergarteners' English lexical development. English Language Teaching, 7, 50–62.

Sadler, T.D., & Fowler, S.R. (2006). A threshold model of content knowledge transfer for socio scientific argumentation. Science Education, 90, 986–1004.

Scarpati, S.E., Wells, C.S., Lewis, C., & Jirka, S. (2009). Accommodations and item-level analyses using mixture differential item functioning models. The Journal of Special Education, 45, 54–62.

Schleppegrell, M.J., & Moore, J. (2018). Linguistic tools for supporting emergent critical language awareness in the elementary school. In Harman, R. (Ed.), Bilingual learners and social equity: Critical approaches to systemic functional linguistics (pp. 23–43). Cham: Springer International.

Schmitt, N. (2014). Size and depth of vocabulary knowledge: What the research shows. Language Learning, 64, 913–951.

Sénéchal, M. (1997). The differential effect of storybook reading on preschoolers' acquisition of expressive and receptive vocabulary. Journal of Child Language, 24, 123–138.

Spencer, M., Muse, A., Wagner, R.K., et al. (2015). Examining the underlying dimensions of morphological awareness and vocabulary knowledge. Reading and Writing, 28, 959–988.

Strom, C.H., & Neuman, S.B. (2016). Seizing the sounds: Considering phonological awareness in the context of vocabulary instruction. In Schiff, R., & R.M. Joshi (Eds.), Interventions in learning disabilities: A handbook on systematic training programs for individuals with learning disabilities (pp. 105–118). Cham: Springer International.

Tong, X., & Deacon, S.H. (2017). Understanding poor comprehends in different orthographies: Universal versus language-specific skills. Journal of Research in Reading, 40, 119–124.

Wasik, B.A., & Hindman, A.H. (2014). Understanding the active ingredients in an effective preschool vocabulary intervention: An exploratory study of teacher and child talk during book reading. Early Education and Development, 25, 1035–1056.

Wasik, B.A., Hindman, A.H., & Snell, E.K. (2016). Book reading and vocabulary development: A systematic review. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 37, 39–57.

Wells, G. (1999a). Dialogic inquiry: Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wells, G. (1999b). Language and education: Reconceptualizing education as dialogue. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 19, 135–155.

Whitehurst, G.J., Epstein, J.N., Angell, A.L., et al. (1994). Outcomes of an emergent literacy intervention in Head Start. Journal of Educational Psychology, 86, 542–555.

Williams, K.T. (2007). Expressive Vocabulary Test. 2nd edition. Minneapolis, MN: Pearson.

Wong, S. W.L., Chow, B. W.-Y., Ho, C. S.-H., Waye, M. M. Y., & Bishop, D. V. M. (2014). Genetic and environmental overlap between Chinese and English reading-related skills in Chinese children. Developmental Psychology, 50, 253–2548.

Zevenbergen, A. A., & Whitehurst, G. J. (2003). Dialogic reading: A shared picture book reading intervention for preschoolers. In A. Van Kleeck, S. A. Stahl, & E. B. Bauer (Eds.), On reading books to children: Parents and teachers (pp. 177–200). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.