METHODOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPING STUDENTS' DIALOGIC AND POLILOGUE SPEAKING SKILLS IN ENGLISH

M.R. Olimova
Doctoral student of Namangan state university
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18399151

Abstract. *This study investigates the methodological approaches to developing students' dialogic and polilogue speaking skills in English language teaching. Building upon the communicative approach, the study employs interactive teaching methods, role-plays, and collaborative group discussions to enhance oral communication competence. The experimental results demonstrate that these methods significantly improve students' fluency, lexical richness, and ability to participate effectively in multi-party communication. The study also provides pedagogical recommendations for the systematic integration of dialogic and polilogue activities in English courses.*

Keywords: *dialogic speaking, polilogue speaking, communicative competence, interactive methodology, oral communication, English language teaching.*

INTRODUCTION

Dialogic and polilogue speaking abilities are essential components in students' holistic development — encompassing personal, academic, and social dimensions. Contemporary pedagogical paradigms prioritize not only language knowledge but also the cultivation of communicative competence as a fundamental learning outcome. The educational phases of secondary and higher education provide optimal conditions to nurture these communicative skills, as students actively refine their cognitive, linguistic, and interpersonal capabilities [1]. In alignment with Hymes's construct, communicative competence is defined as the ability to employ language appropriately across social contexts, which is central to effective interaction [1]. Richards further asserts that interactive, task-based instruction facilitates learner engagement in both dyadic and group communications, enhancing fluency, confidence, and critical thinking skills [3].

Given globalization, English functions as both a linguistic medium and a strategic resource for academic and professional growth. Bygate emphasizes that interactive speaking tasks foster negotiation, turn-taking, and collaborative problem-solving aptitudes, which are indispensable for real-world communicative competence [6]. Uzbekistan's national educational policies—such as the 2023 "Program for Developing Socio-Communicative Skills in Education"—underscore the importance of embedding communicative and cooperative competencies into curricula, thereby establishing a framework for developing dialogic and polilogue oral abilities through contemporary pedagogies. This article aims to explore and analyze methodological approaches conducive to cultivating dialogic and polilogue speaking skills among English learners. It synthesizes global best practices and contextualizes them within local educational settings to provide actionable recommendations for enhancing oral communication capabilities in higher education.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

The development of dialogic and polilogue speaking has been widely acknowledged as a foundational aspect of communicative competence in foreign language education. Hymes (1972) pioneered the view that effective communication transcends grammatical knowledge to include sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies [1]. This framework necessitates teaching strategies that enable authentic interaction, spontaneous response, and effective management of conversational exchanges. Building on this, Canale and Swain (1980) identified grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic competencies as critical for communication success, thus providing a theoretical basis for emphasizing dialogic and polilogue speaking in instructional contexts [2].

Richards highlights the efficacy of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and task-based interactive methods—such as role-plays, simulations, and discussion sessions—in facilitating active language production and oral skill acquisition [3]. Bygate demonstrated that structured, task-based speaking activities notably improve fluency, lexical usage, and interaction management, especially in group settings [6]. Savignon added that engagement in multi-party discussions and cooperative tasks enhances polilogue capacity, negotiation skills, and communicative self-efficacy, contributing positively to academic and professional communication [9].

Table 1: previous studies on dialogic and polilogue speaking

Rsearcher	Focus of study	Methodology	Key findings
Hymes D.	Communicative competence in language use	Theoretical analysis	Emphasized that effective communication requires sociolinguistic, strategic, and discourse competence, not only grammatical knowledge [1]
Canale M., Swain M.	Components of communicative competence	Conceptual framework, case studies	Identified grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic competence as essential for successful communication; foundation for dialogic speaking studies [2]
Richards J.C.	Communicative Language Teaching	Literature review, classroom observation	Highlighted the effectiveness of task-based and interactive methods for developing oral skills, including dialogue and multi-party communication [3]
Bygate M.	Speaking skills development	Task-based instruction, role-plays, peer interaction	Demonstrated that structured speaking tasks improve fluency, vocabulary use, and interaction strategies, particularly in multi-person discussions [6]
Savignon S.	Communicative competence in classroom settings	Classroom research, observation	Showed that multi-party discussion and collaborative tasks enhance students' polilogue abilities, negotiation skills, and confidence in oral communication [9]

This study employed a mixed-method approach incorporating analytical literature review, systematic classroom observations, surveys, interviews, and a quasi-experimental design.

Analytical methods involved critical synthesis of relevant theoretical frameworks related to communicative and group speaking. Observational data captured learner participation in dyadic and group-based communicative tasks including role-plays. Surveys and interviews with teachers and students assessed affective and behavioral dimensions such as communicative confidence and motivation. The experimental design involved an intervention group exposed to interactive methodologies contrasted with a control group receiving traditional grammar-focused instruction. Pre- and post-intervention assessments, coupled with observational checklists, objectively measured changes in dialogic and polilogue speaking abilities, ensuring a rigorous blend of theoretical underpinning and empirical validation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1.The experimental cohort exhibited statistically significant improvements across all measured domains. Dialogic speaking proficiency rose by 35 percentage points, indicating enhanced capabilities for spontaneous and coherent dyadic communication. Polilogue participation increased by 37 percentage points, reflecting improved management of multi-party interactions and responsiveness to diverse interlocutor perspectives. Vocabulary knowledge and speech fluency showed concomitant growth, signaling comprehensive gains in lexical repertoire, pronunciation, and syntactic accuracy.

2. Statistical Analysis

Paired sample t-tests were conducted to evaluate the significance of pre- and post-test differences. The results revealed that all gains in the experimental group were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), while improvements in the control group, though present, were comparatively modest and not statistically significant in all indicators. This outcome reinforces the advantage of communicative, task-based methods over traditional grammar-focused instruction in promoting active oral engagement and real-life communication competence.

3. Qualitative Observations

In addition to numerical data, classroom observations and student reflections provided insight into behavioral and cognitive changes. Students in the experimental group:

Initiated and sustained conversations more confidently;

Asked and answered questions spontaneously;

Showed increased willingness to participate in group discussions;

Demonstrated effective turn-taking, negotiation of meaning, and clarification strategies;

Applied new vocabulary in context accurately and appropriately.

These qualitative findings support the quantitative results, illustrating that interactive methods not only improve measurable language skills but also enhance learner confidence, motivation, and communicative competence.

4. Comparative Insights

The control group, which followed traditional teaching methods, displayed some improvements in speaking skills, particularly in structured pair activities. However, these improvements were limited and less consistent across indicators. This suggests that passive, grammar-based teaching approaches do not provide sufficient opportunities for authentic oral interaction, highlighting the necessity of incorporating dialogic and polilogue activities to achieve meaningful communicative competence.

Table 2: Development of Dialogic and Polilogue Speaking Skills (%)

Indicator		***Experimental Group (Pre)***	***Experimental Group (Post)***	***Control Group (Post)***
1	Dialogic speaking activity	44%	79%	53%
2	Polilogue participation	36%	73%	48%
3	Vocabulary knowledge	49%	81%	59%
4	Vocabulary knowledge	41%	76%	50%

The results of this study indicate that the systematic integration of dialogic and polilogue activities significantly enhances students' oral communication competence in English. Students in the experimental group demonstrated marked improvements in several key areas, including participation in conversation, fluency, lexical range, and the ability to manage multi-party interactions. These findings are consistent with previous research emphasizing the efficacy of communicative and interactive teaching methods in developing practical language skills (Richards, 2006; Bygate, 2005) [3; 6].

One of the most notable outcomes was the improvement in dialogic speaking skills, which involve direct interaction between two participants. Through pair discussions, question-and-answer sessions, and short role-plays, students developed the ability to respond spontaneously, clarify meaning, and maintain a coherent conversation. The interactive format encouraged active engagement and minimized hesitation, allowing learners to apply grammatical and lexical knowledge in meaningful contexts rather than in isolated exercises. This aligns with Hymes' (1972) concept of communicative competence, where the effective use of language in social interaction is a central component [1].

In terms of polilogue speaking, the study revealed that structured group discussions, debates, and collaborative problem-solving tasks enabled students to engage with multiple interlocutors simultaneously. This type of activity not only required students to express their opinions but also to listen attentively, negotiate meaning, and integrate the perspectives of others. Such experiences foster critical thinking, negotiation strategies, and cooperative communication skills, which are essential in academic and professional settings (Savignon, 2002; Littlewood, 2004) [8; 9].

The teacher's role emerged as a critical factor in the success of the methodology. In the experimental group, instructors acted as facilitators rather than mere knowledge transmitters. They provided guidance, scaffolded difficult tasks, and offered constructive feedback, encouraging students to take initiative in communication. This student-centered approach aligns with contemporary pedagogical theories, highlighting the importance of learner autonomy and active engagement in the language acquisition process (Ur, 2012; Scrivener, 2011) [10; 11].

Moreover, the study suggests that feedback and reflection are crucial in consolidating gains in both dialogic and polilogue skills. Observational notes, peer assessment, and self-reflection activities allowed students to identify strengths and areas for improvement, enhancing metacognitive awareness of their communicative strategies. Regular formative assessment ensured

that students remained motivated and could track their progress effectively, which is consistent with the principles of task-based language teaching (Bygate, 2005; Nunan, 1991) [6; 7].

It is also important to note that while the control group showed some improvement in speaking skills, the magnitude of change was significantly lower compared to the experimental group. This finding reinforces the limitations of traditional, grammar-focused teaching approaches in developing real communicative competence. Passive learning environments, which emphasize memorization and written exercises, often fail to provide opportunities for spontaneous language use and interaction, resulting in slower development of oral proficiency.

From a pedagogical perspective, these findings have several implications:

1. Curriculum design should incorporate structured dialogic and polilogue activities that reflect authentic communication scenarios.

2. Teacher training must focus on interactive teaching strategies, facilitation techniques, and methods for providing effective formative feedback.

3. Assessment frameworks should prioritize oral performance, communicative strategies, and interactional competence rather than solely written examinations.

4. Integration of reflective practice encourages students to self-monitor, develop critical thinking skills, and take ownership of their learning.

CONCLUSION

This investigation confirms that dialogic and polilogue speaking skill development is a critical element in fostering overall communicative competence in English language education. The evidence suggests that learner engagement in interactive, task-based, and role-play activities significantly enhances their capacity for authentic communication. The marked progress observed in fluency, lexical diversity, dialogic interaction, and multi-party communication within the experimental group corroborates the superior effectiveness of communicative methods relative to traditional grammar-centered approaches.

Furthermore, the study highlights the importance of integrating multi-level interactive activities into the curriculum. Dialogic activities, such as question-and-answer exercises and pair discussions, encourage students to respond spontaneously, articulate ideas clearly, and develop confidence in oral expression. Polilogue activities, including group debates and collaborative problem-solving tasks, promote higher-order communication skills, such as negotiation, argumentation, perspective-taking, and cooperative decision-making. Such experiences help students navigate complex multi-party interactions, which are essential for academic, social, and professional contexts [6; 9]. Another key insight is the role of teacher facilitation. The teacher's function shifts from simply delivering knowledge to guiding interactions, providing constructive feedback, and encouraging students to take initiative in communication. This student-centered approach not only enhances oral proficiency but also fosters learner autonomy, motivation, and critical thinking skills. The study also underscores the significance of systematic assessment and feedback. Regular observation, formative assessment, and reflective activities allow students to monitor their progress, identify areas for improvement, and develop strategies for effective communication. The combination of practical exercises with reflective learning ensures that gains in dialogic and polilogue competence are sustained over time.

In conclusion, the research confirms that a communicative, interactive, and task-based methodology is highly effective for developing dialogic and polilogue speaking skills among English learners. Implementing these strategies in English courses contributes not only to improved oral performance but also to the broader development of students' critical thinking,

collaboration, and confidence in real-life communication scenarios. These findings provide valuable pedagogical implications for curriculum design, teaching practice, and future research in foreign language methodology.

Ultimately, fostering dialogic and polilogue speaking competence equips students with the skills necessary to actively participate in diverse communication settings, enhancing their academic success, professional readiness, and lifelong language learning abilities.

REFERENCES

1. Hymes, D. Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972, pp. 12-18.
2. Canale, M., Swain, M. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. Applied Linguistics, 1980, pp. 1-47.
3. Richards, J.C. Communicative Language Teaching Today. Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 50-56.
4. Bygate, M. Speaking. Oxford University Press, 2005, pp. 35-42.
5. Harmer, J. The Practice of English Language Teaching. Pearson, 2015, pp. 120-145.
6. Ur, P. A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory. Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. 78-102.
7. Scrivener, J. Learning Teaching. Macmillan, 2011, pp. 88-110.
8. Littlewood, W. Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction. Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 60-75.
9. Savignon, S.J. Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice. McGraw-Hill, 2002, pp. 45-60.
10. Nunan, D. Language Teaching Methodology. Prentice Hall, 1991, pp. 22-40.
11. Frost, D. Language as a Tool for Growth. Routledge, 2020, pp. 45-67.
12. Maxwell, J. Leadership in Early Education. Cambridge Press, 2021, pp. 12-35.
13. Mutalov, S. Liderlik va Yoshlar. Toshkent: O‘zMU nashriyoti, 2023, pp. 90-120.
14. Walker, S. Teaching Leadership Skills. Oxford University Press, 2022, pp. 78-110.
15. Vygotsky, L.S. Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard University Press, 1978, pp. 56-78.
16. Gardner, H. Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences. Basic Books, 1983, pp. 101-130.
17. Goleman, D. Emotional Intelligence. Bantam Books, 2006, pp. 112-140.
18. Brown, H.D. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. Pearson, 2014, pp. 25-48.
19. Dewey, J. Democracy and Education. Macmillan, 1916, pp. 200-225.
20. Rogers, C.R. Freedom to Learn. Charles Merrill, 1969, pp. 45-75.