

03. The Role of Dynamic Assessment in Improving The Speaking Skills of Intermediate-Level EFL Students and Teachers ¹

Entesar HAFEDH ² & Kadriye Dilek BACANAK ³

APA: Hafedh, E. & Bacanak, K. D. (2026). The Role of Dynamic Assessment in Improving The Speaking Skills of Intermediate-Level EFL Students and Teachers. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (54), 39-52. **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22654571>

Abstract

This qualitative case study examines how students and their teacher experienced dynamic assessment in English speaking lessons at a public middle school in Ankara, Türkiye. The study draws on sociocultural theory and focuses on mediation, participation, and the practical demands of classroom implementation. One intact class of 24 students and their regular English teacher participated in a six-week implementation. The description of learners as intermediate reflected teacher judgement and school records rather than a placement test. Twelve students were purposively selected for individual interviews, and the teacher was interviewed after implementation. Six classroom observations provided contextual evidence. The interview and observation materials were examined through thematic analysis. Students described immediate feedback as helpful for noticing difficulties and attempting self-correction. They also reported feeling more confident, participating more readily, and finding it easier to continue speaking. These accounts concern perceived change; they do not demonstrate independently measured gains in fluency or proficiency. The teacher valued the opportunity to adjust assistance but described difficulties in distributing attention and allowing enough time for individual support. Initial hesitation and differing support needs qualified the positive accounts. The findings offer a situated account of how mediated support was experienced in one classroom. Their interpretation is limited by the absence of baseline speaking measures, the overlap between interview prompts and themes, and the teacher's dual role as implementer and interview participant.

Keywords: Dynamic assessment, EFL speaking, mediation, student perceptions, qualitative case

¹ **Statement (Thesis / Paper):** It is declared that scientific and ethical principles were followed during the preparation process of this study and all the studies utilised are indicated in the bibliography. This article has been produced within the scope of the master's degree thesis titled "The role of Dynamic Assessment in improving the speaking skills of Intermediate Level EFL Students".

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest is declared.

Funding: No external funding was used to support this research.

Copyright & Licence: The authors own the copyright of their work published in the journal and their work is published under the CC BY-NC 4.0 licence.

Ethics: This article has received an ethical compliance report from the Gazi University Ethics Committee, dated June 31, 2026, and numbered 41, with unanimous agreement.

Source: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles were followed during the preparation of this study and all the studies used are stated in the bibliography.

Similarity Report: Received – Turnitin /Ithenticatge, Rate: 1 %

Ethics Complaint: editor@rumelide.com

Article Type: Research article, Article Registration Date: 02.08.2026-**Acceptance Date:** 07.09.2026-**Publication**

Date: 08.09.2026; **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22654571>

Peer Review: Two External Referees / Double Blind

² YL Öğrencisi (Sorumlu Yazar), Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı / Master's Student (Corresponding Author), Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Foreign Languages Education - English Language Teaching (Ankara, Türkiye) **e-mail:** intizaro60618@gmail.com **ORCID ID:** <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5631-5281> **ROR ID:** <https://ror.org/054xkpr46>

³ Prof. Dr., Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı / Professor, Gazi University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Department of Foreign Languages Education - English Language Teaching (Ankara, Türkiye) **e-mail:** kadriyedilek@gazi.edu.tr **ORCID ID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3755-3560> **ROR ID:** <https://ror.org/054xkpr46>

study

Ortaokul İngilizce Konuşma Derslerinde Dinamik Değerlendirmeye İlişkin Öğrenci ve Öğretmen Görüşleri: Nitel Bir Durum Çalışması ⁴

Öz

Bu nitel durum çalışması, Ankara'daki bir devlet ortaokulunda öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin İngilizce konuşma derslerindeki dinamik değerlendirme deneyimlerini incelemektedir. Sosyokültürel kurama dayanan araştırma; aracılık, derse katılım ve sınıf içi uygulama süreçlerine odaklanır. Altı haftalık uygulamaya 24 kişilik bir sınıf ve sınıfın kendi İngilizce öğretmeni katılmıştır. Öğrencilerin "orta düzey" olarak belirlenmesi bir sınava değil, okul kayıtlarına ve öğretmen değerlendirmesine dayanmaktadır. Veriler; amaçlı örneklem yoluyla seçilen 12 öğrenci ve öğretmenle yapılan görüşmeler ile altı sınıf gözleminden elde edilmiş, ardından tematik analizle incelenmiştir. Bulgulara göre öğrenciler, anında verilen geri bildirimin konuşma sırasında karşılaştıkları güçlükleri fark edip kendi hatalarını düzeltmelerine yardımcı olduğunu belirtmiştir. Ayrıca özgüvenlerinin arttığını, etkinliklere daha istekli katıldıklarını ve İngilizce konuşmayı daha rahat sürdürdüklerini ifade etmişlerdir. Öğretmen ise sağladığı desteği öğrenciye göre uyarlamayı faydalı bulmuş; ancak zaman yönetimi ve tüm sınıfın dikkatini canlı tutma konularında zorlandığını dile getirmiştir. Öğrencilerin başlangıçtaki çekingenliği ve birbirinden farklılaşan destek ihtiyaçları da sürecin diğer zorlukları olarak öne çıkmıştır. Araştırma bulguları, aracılı desteğin tek bir sınıfta nasıl deneyimlendiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Ancak çalışmanın bazı sınırlılıkları bulunmaktadır: Öncelikle öğrencilerin ifade ettiği bu olumlu kazanımlar yalnızca kendi algılarına dayanmakta olup, konuşma akıcılığında bağımsız testlerle ölçülmüş somut bir gelişimi kanıtlanamamaktadır. Bunun yanı sıra, sürecin başında konuşma seviyesini gösteren temel ölçümlerin bulunmaması, görüşme soruları ile temaların birbiriyle örtüşmesi ve öğretmenin hem uygulayıcı hem de araştırmaya katılan kişi olması elde edilen sonuçların yorumlanmasını sınırlandırmaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Dinamik değerlendirme, İngilizce konuşma, aracılık, öğrenci görüşleri, nitel durum çalışması

⁴ **Beyan (Tez/ Bildiri):** Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur. Bu makale "The role of Dynamic Assessment in improving the speaking skills of Intermediate Level EFL Students" isimli yüksek lisans tezi çalışması kapsamında üretilmiştir.

Çıkar Çatışması: Çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir.

Finansman: Bu araştırmayı desteklemek için dış fon kullanılmamıştır.

Telif Hakkı & Lisans: Yazarlar dergide yayınlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler ve çalışmalarını CC BY-NC 4.0 lisansı altında yayımlanmaktadır.

Etik: Bu makale için Gazi Üniversitesi, Etik Komisyonu tarafından 31.06.2026 tarih ve 41 sayılı kararlar ve oybirliğiyle etik uygunluk raporu verilmiştir.

Kaynak: Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.

Benzerlik Raporu: Alındı – Turnitin, Oran: % 1

Etik Şikayeti: editor@rumelide.com

Makale Türü: Araştırma makalesi, **Makale Kayıt Tarihi:** 02.08.2026-**Kabul Tarihi:** 08.09.2026-**Yayın Tarihi:** 09.09.2026; **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22654571>

Hakem Değerlendirmesi: İki Dış Hakem / Çift Taraflı Körleme

Introduction

Speaking requires learners to retrieve vocabulary, organise meaning, and respond to others while an interaction is still unfolding. Knowledge that is available in a written exercise may be harder to use in conversation. Speaking instruction therefore needs opportunities for interaction as well as support when learners encounter difficulty (Richards, 2008; Thornbury, 2005).

Dynamic assessment (DA) brings assessment and instruction into the same interaction. Instead of evaluating only a completed response, the teacher considers how a learner responds to assistance during a task. A difficulty can then guide the choice of a prompt, question, or explanation (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004; Poehner, 2008). This approach draws on Vygotsky's (1978) account of learning within the Zone of Proximal Development. The distinction between independent and assisted performance directs attention to what a learner can do with support. In speaking lessons, mediation may involve thinking time, repetition requests, hints, guiding questions, or modelling. The amount of help is adjusted to the learner's response rather than fixed in advance (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004; Poehner, 2008).

Feuerstein et al. (1988) describe mediated learning as purposeful assistance that directs attention and encourages problem solving. In L2 dynamic assessment, the concern is not only whether a response becomes correct, but also how the learner makes use of mediation. This distinction matters when interpreting self-correction: completing an utterance with help does not establish that the learner can manage a comparable task independently.

Studies of speaking DA examine different outcomes and should not be treated as interchangeable evidence. Safdari and Fathi (2020) found a significant benefit for speaking accuracy but no significant benefit for fluency. Ghahderijani et al. (2021) examined complexity, accuracy, and fluency, whereas Kafipour and Khoshnood (2023) investigated speaking development in a quasi-experimental design. Ebadi and Asakereh (2017) followed two learners and examined their responsiveness to mediation..

Qualitative studies by Fahmi et al. (2020) and Harahap et al. (2024), each involving four university learners, describe positive speaking experiences and reduced anxiety. These findings concern participants' accounts, not a formal measure of willingness to communicate. Gilani et al. (2021) reviewed five international studies and concluded that dynamic assessment promotes the development of learners' speaking skills and elicits positive responses when applied in EFL classrooms. However, that review does not establish the absence of research in Turkish middle schools. The present study therefore offers a bounded classroom account rather than claiming a gap established through a systematic literature search.". It examines the following questions:

How do students describe their experiences of teacher mediation and participation in DA speaking activities?

How does the classroom teacher describe the use of mediation and students' responses during implementation?

What practical constraints do students and the teacher identify in implementing DA during regular speaking lessons?

Method

Research Design

A qualitative case study was used to examine participants' accounts of DA in one classroom. The case was bounded by an intact class, its regular English teacher, and a six-week implementation during the second semester of the school year. Interviews and observations addressed experiences and classroom processes. They did not constitute a test of effectiveness or a comparison of speaking proficiency before and after implementation (Creswell, 2014; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Yin, 2018).

Student interviews, the teacher interview, and classroom observations provided different perspectives on the same implementation. Interviews concerned how participants understood their experiences; observations concerned mediation, responsiveness, participation, and the classroom environment. Comparing these sources served a contextual purpose (Denzin, 1978). Agreement between accounts and observation summaries was not treated as independent confirmation of speaking improvement.

Research Setting and Participants

The study took place at a public middle school in Ankara, Türkiye. The class consisted of 24 students aged approximately 13–14 and their regular English teacher. “Intermediate” was a local description based on teacher judgement and school records; no placement test or CEFR classification was used. The teacher held a bachelor's degree in English Language Teaching and had experience in Turkish public schools. The intact class formed the accessible case. Within that class, 12 students were purposively selected for interviews to capture a diverse range of reactions to dynamic assessment. Based on classroom observations, they were categorized into three participation levels: highly active students who frequently volunteered ($n = 4$), moderately active students ($n = 4$), and reluctant students who rarely participated ($n = 4$). The teacher participated in one interview. All 24 students took part in the lessons, but the student interview counts refer only to the 12 interviewees.

Table 1. Participants and involvement in the study

Participants	n	Selection	Role in the Study
Intact class	24	Accessible classroom case	Lessons and classroom observations
Interviewed students	12	Purposive	Participated in semi-structured interviews
English language teacher	1	Teacher of the selected class	Implemented DA and participated in an interview

Dynamic Assessment Implementation

DA was incorporated into regular English-speaking lessons for six consecutive weeks. Before implementation, the researcher met with the teacher to discuss graduated prompting, guiding questions, modelling, encouragement, and immediate feedback. They also reviewed the observation checklist and collection procedures. This was preparation for the classroom activities; its duration and a separate assessment of implementation fidelity are not documented.

The activities included pair discussions, role plays, picture descriptions, information-gap tasks, guided

dialogues, and short oral presentations aligned with the curriculum. When a learner encountered difficulty, the teacher first allowed thinking time or requested repetition. If the learner still needed help, verbal cues, guiding questions, and hints were used, followed by examples, modelling, or brief explanations where necessary. Learners were encouraged to attempt self-correction, and support was adjusted in response to their attempts. This responsive use of graduated assistance has interactionist features; it is not presented here as a validated regulatory scale or a standardised intervention protocol.

Data Collection Instruments and Procedure

Before the procedure parents' consents were taken since they are young learners. The 12 student interviews lasted approximately 15–20 minutes each; the teacher interview lasted approximately 35–45 minutes. They took place individually in a quiet room at the school after implementation. Interviews were conducted in Turkish so participants could describe their experiences in their native language. Follow-up questions were used when clarification was needed. With permission, interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. The researcher translated the Turkish transcripts into English for analysis and reporting. The expert reviewed translated extracts and thematic interpretations; an ELT expert also checked the English versions, and discrepancies were discussed and revised. The checking roles are not separately documented. Recordings were used for transcription, not discourse or conversation analysis, and were deleted after transcript verification.

The researcher observed one speaking lesson per week producing six observations of approximately 40 minutes each. The researcher-developed checklist covering teacher mediation, learner responsiveness, classroom participation, and classroom environment. She recorded classroom processes, not speaking achievement scores. Field notes were written after each lesson, typed, and arranged chronologically. The researcher and two ELT experts reviewed the instruments for clarity, relevance, organisation, alignment with the research questions, and suitability for the learners. Minor revisions followed their comments. The English interview guides and checklist items appear in Appendices A–C. Expert review and pilot testing are distinct stages of guide development (Kallio et al., 2016); no pilot procedure is reported.

Data Analysis and Trustworthiness

The researcher conducted the analysis manually using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six phases: familiarisation, initial coding, construction of candidate themes, review, definition and naming, and reporting. Descriptive labels were assigned to relevant interview and observation passages. Related labels were grouped, and candidate themes were reviewed against the material before selecting extracts for reporting. For example, teacher guidance, mediation, and immediate feedback were grouped as aspects of teacher support; confidence, willingness to communicate, and reduced anxiety informed an affective category. Observation material was considered within the four checklist domains and used to contextualise interview themes.

The criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability informed the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Alongside comparison of the interview and observation accounts, an experienced ELT specialist reviewed the completed checklists, field notes, and preliminary observation interpretations. The review considered whether interpretations matched recorded classroom events, and minor suggestions were incorporated. Coding and thematic organisation were discussed with the supervisor. These checks provide a reported review process, but the underlying records are not reproduced here as an audit trail. The six weekly visits also limit the extent of classroom engagement. Although the analysis

was described as inductive, the guides already emphasised confidence, feedback, participation, and self-correction; the resulting themes need to be read in relation to those prompts.

Ethics Information

Participation was described as voluntary, with consent from the teacher and parents or guardians and information provided to students about declining questions or withdrawing. Codes were used instead of participant names. These reported safeguards do not document ethics committee approval: the approval letter, committee details, date, and decision number are unavailable. Prior ethics approval therefore cannot be confirmed.

Results

The findings concern students' experiences, the teacher's account of mediation, and practical constraints. Table 2 brings together the student counts previously repeated across several tables. The unit is a student referring to a category, not the number of utterances; the denominator is 12. Categories overlap, so counts are not additive. They are retained from the thesis, not recalculated from transcripts, and do not indicate effect size or change over time.

Students' experiences of mediation and speaking

The student accounts centred on feedback, confidence, participation, perceived ease of speaking, and self-correction. Table 2 includes the reported classroom atmosphere and practical difficulties, so that positive and less favourable experiences can be considered together.

Table 2. Categories reported in the student interviews (n = 12)

Interview category	Students
Immediate feedback	11
Confidence in speaking	10
Classroom participation	9
Perceived ease of sustaining speech	8
Self-correction and independence	9
Positive classroom atmosphere	8
Willingness to speak	8
Limited lesson time	5
Initial hesitation	4
Differing support needs	3

Immediate feedback was reported by 11 students. Their accounts concerned the opportunity to notice a difficulty and attempt a repair while speaking. One learner stated, "The teacher did not only tell us the

correct answer. She helped us think about it first, so I felt that I learned by myself” (S8).

Ten students reported feeling more confident. They associated this with receiving help without being criticised for mistakes. As S4 explained, “At first I was afraid to speak because I thought I would make mistakes. After the teacher started helping us during the activities, I felt more confident and wanted to speak more.”

Nine students described greater participation, and eight felt that speaking had become easier to sustain. They linked their readiness to speak to the availability of help when difficulties occurred. S5 noted, “I could speak for a longer time because the teacher encouraged me to continue.” The perceived fluency category refers to experiences of continuing an utterance or conversation; speech rate, pause length, and other fluency measures were not assessed.

Nine students associated the activities with self-correction and reduced reliance on direct answers. S7 stated, “The teacher gave me hints instead of the answer, so I corrected my mistake by myself.”

Teacher’s Perceptions of Classroom Implementation

The teacher discussed participation, confidence, the use of immediate feedback, and the time needed to distribute assistance. These observations come from another teacher who implemented DA and had an interest in its classroom use.

The teacher attributed students’ readiness to speak to their expectation of support: “Students gradually became more confident because they understood that they would receive support instead of criticism when they experienced difficulties” (T1).

The teacher also described a preference for prompting over supplying an answer: “Instead of giving the correct answer immediately, I tried to help students reach the answer themselves. After a few weeks, many students needed less help than before” (T1).

Immediate feedback was valued because a communication difficulty could be addressed before the task ended. At the same time, the teacher described a practical tension: helping one learner could extend an activity and make it harder to keep classmates involved. Adjusting assistance required attention to both the individual response and the rest of the class.

Practical constraints and differing experiences

The positive accounts were accompanied by limitations in time, initial hesitation, and differing support needs. Eight students described a more positive classroom atmosphere and eight reported greater willingness to speak. These categories reflect interview accounts, not a standardised measure of willingness to communicate.

Some learners were initially reluctant to respond to prompts because they expected direct correction. Others needed more explicit guidance before continuing. These experiences qualify the general account of supportive mediation: the same prompt was not equally useful to everyone, and assistance did not remove all difficulty.

Five students identified limited lesson time, four described initial hesitation, and three referred to

differing support needs. The teacher additionally raised the problem of maintaining whole-class attention during individual mediation; the thesis gives no student count for that category. These concerns are retained as constraints in their own right. The number of positive categories is not used to conclude that benefits outweighed difficulties.

Classroom Observation Findings

The study summarises teacher mediation and a supportive environment in six of six observed lessons, and learner responsiveness and participation in five of six. These are aggregate domain summaries. The checklist offered Observed, Partially Observed, and Not Observed ratings, but the rule for converting item ratings into the reported domain frequencies is not specified. The summaries therefore provide context without establishing a measured trajectory. They cannot show which learners changed, how much their performance changed, or what happened in the lesson without a positive domain summary.

Discussion

For students, the value of mediation lay in being able to continue a speaking task when they encountered difficulty. For the teacher, it lay in choosing assistance while listening to a response. These accounts place assessment within interaction, as described by Lantolf and Poehner (2004) and Poehner (2008), while leaving independent performance untested. Vygotsky's (1978) distinction between assisted and independent performance is particularly relevant to that limit.

Confidence was tied to the expectation that mistakes would receive help rather than criticism. This resembles the confidence and enthusiasm reported by Yılmaz Yakışık and Çakır (2017). It should not be recast as a demonstrated effect on willingness to communicate: neither the present interview categories nor that comparison supplies a formal measure of the construct. The lower anxiety reported in the small university studies by Fahmi et al. (2020) and Harahap et al. (2024) offers a comparison of experiences across settings, not evidence that the same outcome must occur in middle school.

The student extracts also distinguish correction supplied by a teacher from a repair attempted after a hint. Ebadi and Asakereh's (2017) account of two learners is relevant to examining such responsiveness. However, the present material does not show whether a learner later managed a comparable difficulty without assistance. The broader idea of purposeful mediation (Feuerstein et al., 1988) helps interpret the classroom support, but cannot fill that evidentiary gap.

Claims about fluency require particular restraint. Eight students felt able to speak for longer or continue more easily, but no speaking measure was collected before and after the implementation. Safdari and Fathi (2020) reported different results for accuracy and fluency, illustrating why gains in one dimension cannot stand for gains in another. The measured outcomes examined by Ghahderijani et al. (2021) and Kafipour and Khoshnood (2023) address a different question from the participant experiences reported here.

The teacher's account points to a tension between responsive assistance and available lesson time. A prompt that is sufficient for one learner may leave another waiting for further explanation. The classroom activities were therefore experienced through differences in support needs, not simply through a shared positive response. Pair work and teacher attention formed part of the same practical problem: how to offer help without interrupting other students' opportunities to speak.

Siwathaworn and Wudthayagorn (2018) examined speaking DA with tertiary learners, while Şükür et al. (2023) compared mediation in face-to-face and mobile settings. Their small-scale implementations provide contextual comparisons, but they are not direct evidence for whole-class attention or time management in this middle school. Those constraints are findings of the present teacher and student accounts.

The contribution is a description of how support was experienced in one class. Students' accounts explain why they valued hints and immediate feedback; the teacher's account identifies the demands of providing that support. The apparent agreement between sources should be read cautiously because the interview guides and observation checklist foregrounded similar topics. This shared focus can produce agreement without independently validating an effect.

Implications for practice and further research

The accounts suggest that teachers considering DA should attend to how learners respond to a prompt and to the time needed for further assistance. Beginning with a hint and offering more explicit guidance when necessary reflects the procedure used in this case. It is a practice illustrated here, not a tested recommendation for all classrooms.

Further classroom studies could preserve dated mediation episodes and examples of responses that do not fit the dominant themes. Less leading interview questions would allow learners to describe experiences beyond confidence, improvement, and benefits. If the aim is to establish speaking development, comparable speaking tasks, defined scoring criteria, and independent ratings would be needed; these were not part of the present study.

Limitations

The case is limited to one class, one implementing teacher, and six weeks. There were no baseline speaking measures, independent ratings, comparison class, or delayed assessment. The teacher's investment in DA and students' wish to give acceptable answers may have influenced interviews. The researcher introduced the study, discussed procedures with the teacher, and observed lessons, so being a non-participant observer did not remove possible researcher influence. Several interview questions presume benefit, and teacher item 5 is an affirmative statement rather than a question. The original Turkish guides and transcripts, translation decisions, dated observation records, and coding history are not available for independent checking. The thesis describes English translations prepared for analysis and reporting, but does not specify how Turkish and English versions were consulted during coding. Without the coding records and translation decisions, that process cannot be checked independently.

Conclusion

Students and their teacher described mediation as useful when a speaking task became difficult. Their accounts emphasised the availability of help, opportunities for self-correction, and a less threatening experience of speaking. Time pressure, hesitation, and unequal support needs qualified those accounts. The study documents perceptions of classroom assistance; it does not demonstrate an improvement in speaking proficiency.

Declarations

This article is derived from a master's thesis. Identifying author contributions and acknowledgements have been withheld from this review copy. Funding: no financial support was reported.

Conflict of interest: the authors report no conflict of interest.

Ethics documentation: the approval letter, committee details, date, and decision number are unavailable; prior approval cannot be confirmed. Consent and confidentiality statements do not replace that documentation.

AI-assisted revision

OpenAI ChatGPT was used for language editing, structural revision, comparison with the study and review reports, correction of citation-to-claim relations, and formatting. The assistance affected the title, abstracts, main text, references, and appendices. This revision was prepared on 30 August 2026. It did not generate participant statements, observation episodes, or new analyses of raw data. Exact model/version information and the history of AI use in the study and earlier drafting are not documented here. Source comparison during this revision used the supplied materials; it is not a completed verification by the authors against original records and publications.

References

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Ebadi, S., & Asakereh, A. (2017). Developing EFL learners' speaking skills through dynamic assessment: A case of a beginner and an advanced learner. *Cogent Education*, 4(1), Article 1419796. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1419796>
- Fahmi, F., Pratolo, B. W., & Zahrani, N. A. (2020). Dynamic assessment effect on speaking performance of Indonesian EFL learners. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(3), 778–790. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i3.20466>
- Feuerstein, R., Rand, Y., & Rynders, J. E. (1988). *Don't accept me as I am: Helping "retarded" people to excel*. Plenum Press. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-6128-0>
- Ghahderijani, B. H., Namaziandost, E., Tavakoli, M., Kumar, T., & Magizov, R. (2021). The comparative effect of group dynamic assessment (GDA) and computerized dynamic assessment (C-DA) on Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners' speaking complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). *Language Testing in Asia*, 11, Article 25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-021-00144-3>
- Gilani, S. A., Mohamed Ismail, N. F., Mohammed Kassim, R. R., Yawen, J., & Dan, M. (2021). A comprehensive analysis of research on dynamic assessment in EFL speaking context. *AJELP: Asian Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 9(1), 65–79. <https://doi.org/10.37134/ajelp.vol9.1.6.2021>
- Harahap, D. I., Usuar, Y., Syafitri, W., Agustina, L., & Sanjaya, D. (2024). An investigation of dynamic assessment on EFL learners' speaking performance. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(1), 121–134. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n1p121>
- Kafipour, R., & Khoshnood, A. (2023). Effect of feedback through dynamic assessment on EFL field-dependent and field-independent learners' speaking skill development. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, Article 1049680. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1049680>
- Kallio, H., Pietilä, A.-M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 72(12), 2954–2965. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031>
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2004). Dynamic assessment of L2 development: Bringing the past into the future. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 49–72. <https://doi.org/10.1558/japl.1.1.49.55872>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting L2 development*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-75775-9>
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Safdari, M., & Fathi, J. (2020). Investigating the role of dynamic assessment on speaking accuracy and fluency of pre-intermediate EFL learners. *Cogent Education*, 7(1), Article 1818924. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1818924>
- Siwathaworn, P., & Wudthayagorn, J. (2018). The impact of dynamic assessment on tertiary EFL students' speaking skills. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 142–155. <https://caes.hku.hk/ajal/index.php/ajal/article/view/514>

- Şükür, M., Yılmaz Yakışık, B., & Yangın Ekşi, G. (2023). Mediation moves and reciprocity behaviors in face-to-face and mobile-assisted dynamic assessment. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Sciences*, 16(2), 423–453. <https://doi.org/10.30831/akukeg.1172583>
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Pearson Education.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Yılmaz Yakışık, B., & Çakır, A. (2017). Dynamic assessment of prospective English teachers' speaking skills. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 22–53. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.260205>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE.

Appendix A. Student interview guide

English version of the student guide reproduced from the thesis, p. 103. The wording is retained, including questions that presume benefit. The interviews themselves were conducted in Turkish.

1. How did you feel about speaking English before the Dynamic Assessment activities? What are you feeling now?
2. How did the teacher's guidance and feedback help you in the speaking activities?
3. Can you give an example of a time when the teacher's questions or hints helped you improve your answer?
4. Do you think that Dynamic Assessment helped you develop your speaking skill? Why or why not?
5. What effect did the teacher's instant feedback have on your confidence to speak in English?
6. Did Dynamic Assessment motivate you to be more active in speaking activities? Please clarify?
7. Did you correct your own mistakes better when doing speaking activities? How?
8. What did you like best about Dynamic Assessment?
9. What difficulties, if any, did you experience with the Dynamic Assessment activities?
10. Would you like your English teacher to continue using Dynamic Assessment in next speaking lessons? Why?

Appendix B. Teacher interview guide

English version of the teacher guide reproduced from the thesis, p. 104. Item 5 is retained as an affirmative statement, as it appears in the thesis.

1. What is your overall experience of using Dynamic Assessment in your speaking lessons?
2. What were the students' reactions to mediation in speaking activities?
3. What changes did you notice in the students' confidence to speak during the implementation?
4. How did you see the students' participation in class change?
5. Immediate feedback was very effective during speaking activities.
6. Did you observe any progress in the students' ability to correct themselves? Please explain.
7. Which mediation approaches worked best for you?
8. What difficulties did you encounter in implementing Dynamic Assessment?
9. What benefits of Dynamic Assessment do you think are better than traditional instruction in speaking?
10. Would you recommend the use of Dynamic Assessment in other EFL speaking classes? Why?

Appendix C. Observation checklist

Content of the observation instrument reproduced from the thesis, pp. 105–107. Each item offered Observed (O), Partially Observed (PO), and Not Observed (NO), with space for comments. The list below contains the instrument items, not completed observation results.

Teacher mediation

1. The teacher encouraged students to respond independently before providing assistance.
2. The teacher used graduated prompts or guiding questions during speaking activities.
3. The teacher provided appropriate hints when students experienced communication difficulties.
4. The level of mediation was adjusted according to students' needs.
5. The teacher encouraged students to reflect on and self-correct their responses.
6. Immediate mediation and feedback were provided during speaking tasks.

Learner responsiveness

1. Students attempted to solve problems before requesting teacher assistance.
2. Students responded positively to teacher mediation.

3. Students demonstrated increasing independence during speaking activities.
4. Students used teacher feedback to improve subsequent responses.
5. Students showed evidence of self-correction following mediation.

Classroom participation

1. Students actively participated in speaking activities.
2. Students volunteered to answer questions or express ideas.
3. Students interacted with classmates using English during speaking tasks.
4. Most students remained engaged throughout the lesson.
5. Students demonstrated willingness to communicate despite making mistakes.

Classroom environment

1. The classroom atmosphere was supportive and encouraging.
2. Students appeared confident when speaking English.
3. The teacher created opportunities for meaningful interaction.
4. Speaking activities encouraged collaboration among students.
5. Dynamic Assessment principles were implemented consistently throughout the lesson.

The accompanying form contains fields for the date, lesson topic, duration, description of the speaking activity, examples of teacher mediation, examples of students' responses, significant classroom events, and the researcher's reflective notes.