Mediational Moves and Reciprocity Behaviors in Face-to-Face and Mobile-Assisted Dynamic Assessment

Yüz Yüze ve Mobil Destekli Dinamik Değerlendirmede Aracılık Hareketleri ve Karşılıklılık Davranışları

Murat ŞÜKÜR* iD **Burçak YILMAZ-YAKIŞIK**** iD **Gonca YANGIN-EKŞİ***** iD

ABSTRACT: Research on dynamic assessment (DA) has been conducted on the efficiency of either face-to-face (F2F) or mobile-assisted (MA) DA sessions. However, studies investigating the difference between these sessions conducted in the foreign language learning context are scarce. Thus, this study aims to explore the differences between F2F- and MA-DA sessions in terms of the mediator's mediational moves and learners' reciprocity behaviors. To this end, F2F- and MA-DA sessions were held with four tertiary-level learners. Then the mediational moves and reciprocity behaviors employed in these sessions were explored through qualitative descriptive analysis. The results showed that the DA interactions between the mediator and the learner in F2F and MA contexts were generally not much different in terms of the mediational moves and reciprocity behaviours. However, it is noteworthy that the learners made more inaccurate responses and used L1 more in F2F-DA sessions. In contrast to this, the learners made more careful attempts in MA-DA sessions. Moreover, the teacher as a mediator tended to give more approval to the learners' responses to eliminate the disadvantage of the restricted context of MA-DA. In light of these findings, pedagogical implications were suggested for both language teachers and researchers.

Keywords: Dynamic assessment, mobile-assisted language learning, mediational moves, reciprocity behaviors.

ÖZ: Dinamik değerlendirme (DD) üzerine araştırmalar yüz yüze (YY) veya mobil destekli (MD) DD oturumlarının etkililiği üzerine yürütülmüştür. Ancak, yabancı dil öğrenme ortamlarında gerçekleştirilen bu iki oturum arasındaki farkı araştıran çalışmalar yetersizdir. Bu nedenle, bu çalışma, YY ve MD DD oturumları arasındaki farklılıkları aracının aracılık hareketleri ve öğrenenlerin karşılıklılık davranışları açısından araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla, dört üniversite öğrencisiyle YY ve MD DD oturumları gerçekleştirildi. Daha sonra, bu oturumlarda kullanılan aracılık hareketleri ve karşılıklılık davranışları nitel betimsel analiz yoluyla ortaya çıkarıldı. Sonuçlar, arabulucu ve öğrenci arasında YY ve MD bağlamlarda meydana gelen etkileşimlerin arabuluculuk hareketleri ve karşılıklılık davranışları açısından genel olarak çok farklı olmadığını göstermiştir. Ancak, öğrencilerin YY DD oturumlarında daha fazla hatalı yanıtlar vermesi ve ana dili daha fazla kullanması dikkat çekicidir. Bunun aksine, öğrenciler MD DD oturumlarında daha dikkatli girişimlerde bulunmuşlardır. Ayrıca, arabulucu olarak öğretmen, MD DD'nin kısıtlı bağlamının dezavantajını ortadan kaldırmak için öğrencilerin yanıtlarına daha fazla onay verme eğiliminde olmuştur. Bu bulgular ışığında hem dil öğretmenleri hem de araştırmacılar için pedagojik çıkarımlar önerildi.

Anahtar kelimeler: Dinamik değerlendirme, mobil destekli dil öğrenimi, aracılık hareketleri, karşılıklılık davranışları.

---

* *Corresponding Author*: Res. Asst., Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University, Niğde, Türkiye, murat.sukur@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1327-5703
** Assoc. Prof. Dr., Gazi University, Ankara, Türkiye, yyburcak@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5008-9988
*** Prof. Dr., Gazi University, Ankara, Türkiye, ygonca@gazi.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3555-7258

Today's foreign language learning context has become increasingly characterized by technology-facilitated instruction. Growing numbers of teachers integrate technology into the learning and teaching environment instead of interacting with learners through traditional educational tasks. Mobile-assisted (MA) learning is a powerful tool that enables teachers to create learning tasks for digital natives (Prensky, 2001). In addition, assessing learners' achievement through digital technologies has also been growing recently.

Methods and approaches for language instruction and language testing and assessment have evolved over time. Dynamic assessment (DA) is a new approach to assessment that differs from the traditional static testing methods. It sees teaching and assessment as unique rather than separate activities (Poehner, 2008; Shrestha, 2020). In other words, DA views assessment as a part of the learning process rather than a standalone evaluation. DA, which is the central theme of this study, is based on Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (SCT) and Feuerstein's mediated learning experience (MLE), integrating instruction and assessment (Poehner, 2008). SCT posits that human learning and functioning are shaped by culture and society rather than being purely individual. This means that social interaction and the use of cultural and symbolic tools play a key role in shaping how humans think and behave (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004). Within SCT and DA, two important concepts are mediation and the zone of proximal development (ZPD). Mediation involves providing support and guidance to help individuals develop their abilities, both those that are already developed (zone of actual development) and those that are still in the process of development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978). ZPD, which is another key concept for SCT, is defined as the distance between the actual level of development and the level of potential development under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers (Vygotsky, 1978). Besides, it necessitates mediated teacher-student dialogue throughout the assessment procedure.

Focusing on both process and product, DA has been an issue taking the attention of researchers in the field of foreign language learning. For example, some researchers investigated the use of DA in face-to-face (F2F) learning environments (Ableeva, 2010; Ableeva & Lantolf, 2011; Çetin-Köroğlu, 2019; Davin, 2013; Lantolf & Poehner, 2011; Poehner, 2005; Yılmaz-Yakışık & Çakır, 2017). In addition, the impacts of MA-DA on the development of language skills also drew attention of the researchers and they conducted experimental research studies by comparing the effects of various MA-DA conditions with the ones of non-dynamic or static assessment (Andujar, 2020; Ebadi & Bashir, 2021; Rad, 2021; Rassaei, 2020; Rezaee et al., 2019; Torang & Weisi, 2023). Although these studies revealed valuable findings regarding the impacts of different types of DA and the procedures employed by the mediators and the mediatees, they generally focused on just one type of context, such as F2F or mobile. Moreover, there is a dearth of research comparing which mediational moves and reciprocity patterns are employed in different DA contexts. Therefore, this study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the mediational moves employed in the F2F- and MA-DA sessions conducted in an EFL context?

1.1. Are there any differences between F2F- and MA-DA in terms of the frequency of the mediational moves employed?

2. What are the reciprocity behaviors employed in the F2F- and MA-DA sessions conducted in an EFL context?

2.1. Are there any differences between F2F- and MA-DA in terms of the frequency of reciprocity behaviors employed?

3. What are the attitudes of the participants toward the F2F- and MA-DA?

The findings of this research are expected to reveal to what extent the DA sessions held in the F2F and MA contexts are the same or different in terms of the mediational moves and reciprocity behaviours employed during the DA sessions.

Dynamic Assessment

Vygotsky's SCT, and Feuerstein's MLE are the theories on which DA is based. The first theory, SCT, asserts that "the human mind is mediated by using symbolic or psychological and physical tools to interact with world" (Ebadi, 2016, p. 17). Mediation, regulation, ZPD, and internalization are some of the salient constructs related to DA based on SCT. Of these, mediation is a core concept differentiating DA from static or conventional assessment (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004; Rezaee et al., 2019), and it means "the process through which humans deploy culturally constructed artifacts, concepts, and activities to regulate (i.e., gain control over and transform) the material world or their own and each other's social and mental activity" (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 79). In this mediation, humans play a significant role as well as the physical and symbolic artifacts (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004) and language, as a symbolic artifact, is one of the most influential elements used in the cognitive development process.

Regulation, which is a form of mediation, refers to the ability of an individual to manage their own behavior. This construct has three stages, which are ranked from least to full autonomy: object-, other-, and self-regulation (Lantolf et al., 2015). Object regulation involves the people adopting the materials in their environment for making cognitive changes in their minds, and they can be such objects as computers, dictionaries, books, or audio (Özturan & Uysal, 2022). Other regulation is the stage where an individual is exposed to mediation from others who are more competent teachers or peers (Shrestha, 2020). Lastly, self-regulation is the situation of independently managing physical or psychological behaviors without the existence of mediation from a source like a human or an object.

As for the ZPD, it refers to the distance between an individual's actual developmental level as determined by his or her capability to solve problems on their own and the degree of potential growth as determined by the capability to solve problems when receiving adult guidance or working with more advanced peers (Vygotsky, 1978). To unfold an individual's potential level of development, in this regard, the learning support called mediation should be provided to that person by more capable others in social interactions by taking that individual's needs of learning into consideration (Leung, 2007). Regarding effective intervention to an individual's ZPD, Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) refer to three characteristics of mediation: graduated, contingent, and dialogic. Graduated mediation means the provision of mediation in line with the required help, and it is given progressively by starting from the most implicit to the most explicit according to the responsiveness of the mediatee. In addition, the mediation should be given as needed and withdrawn gradually as the learner or mediatee becomes self-regulated. That is to say, it should be contingent. Lastly, dialogic

interaction is necessary to unfold an individual's ZPD, and it occurs between the mediator, who is a more capable person, and the mediatee, who is a novice needing help to carry out an activity or a task.

Internalization is a construct related to regulation, and Vygotsky (1978) calls it "the internal reconstruction of an external operation" (p. 56). It refers to an individual's ability to perform complex cognitive and physical tasks by relying primarily on self-regulation rather than other-regulation (Tzuriel, 2000). For the emergence of internalization, an individual should be exposed to external mediation from social resources, and then the need for this exposure decreases, and s/he is able to self-regulate his or her own physical and psychological behaviors through internal mediation (Lantolf et al., 2015). That is to say; there is "a transformation of an interpersonal process into an intrapersonal one" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 57).

MLE by Feuerstein is another theory closely related to DA. Emerging as a result of Reuven Feuerstein's studies with children having "massive intellectual and academic dysfunctioning" (Feuerstein & Feuerstein, 1999, p. 4), MLE asserts that humans' cognitive functioning is modifiable, and this modification can be achieved with the help of MLE (Feuerstein et al.,1988; Shrestha, 2020). During the MLE, the human mediator, who will usually be a knowledgeable adult, intervenes between the stimuli and the organism (i.e., learner) and between the responses of the organism and the stimuli (Feuerstein et al., 1988). Like SCT, MLE also emphasizes the importance of mediation through humans who are more knowledgeable and symbols that will attract the attention of the mediatee (Poehner & Wang, 2021; Shrestha, 2020).

In this regard, the DA process based on MLE theory involves a teacher and student interaction for attaining self-regulation and favours mediation instead of quantitative measurements (Lantolf, 2009). According to MLE, an interaction should have three universal parameters to be labelled as mediational: intentionality and reciprocity, transcendence, and mediation of meaning (Feuerstein, 2000). Of these, intentionality means the mediator deliberately makes changes to the stimuli as compatible with the needs of the mediatee during the interaction (Feuerstein, 2000; Mentis et al., 2008; Poehner, 2008), while reciprocity refers to the learner playing an active role during the interaction and co-constructing knowledge together with the mediator (Poehner, 2008). Transcendence, which is called "the most humanizing" of the MLE components (Feuerstein et al., 1988, p. 65), involves the mediator providing mediation that goes beyond the immediate needs and enables the child to transfer and adapt his or her knowledge into other situations (Feuerstein et al., 1988; Tzuriel, 2011). As for the mediation of meaning, it is about the worth, significance, and emotional value attributed to the stimuli by the mediator (Tzuriel, 2001) and answers "why, what for, and other questions related to the causal and teleological relationship reasons for something to happen or to be done" (Feuerstein & Feuerstein, 1999, p. 24). In light of the preceding discussions of DA, it can be concluded that it provides a wealth of information about an individual's abilities and contributes to their development by providing instruction or mediation during assessment tasks. Therefore, in DA, the emphasis is on the process rather than the products of learning. (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004, Lidz & Gindis, 2003). In other words, DA is a type of assessment that integrates instruction and assessment (Antón, 2012). It aims to detect the learner's actual level of learning and enhance this level to its potential degree (Antón, 2012; Lidz & Gindis,

2003) by the interventions made by a knowledgeable source like a teacher or a computer (Bakhoda & Shabani, 2019; Poehner & Wang, 2021; Yang & Qian, 2019). In contrast to traditional types of assessment, DA supports the view that assessment and instruction should not be separated during the assessment process (Poehner, 2005; Rassaei, 2021).

The implementation of DA has been researched extensively across various language domains and skills, with studies focusing on listening, reading, writing, and oral skills. Ableeva (2010) and Wang (2015), for instance, investigated the effect of DA sessions on listening skills. Kozulin and Garb (2002), Teo (2012), and Yang and Qian (2019) studied DA in relation to reading abilities. Özturan and Uysal (2022), Shrestha and Coffin (2012), and Rad (2021) demonstrated an interest in DA writing applications. As for communication skills, DA research was conducted by Ebadi and Asakereh (2017), Poehner (2005), Swithaworn and Wudthayagorn (2018), and Yılmaz-Yakışık and Çakır (2017).

To conclude, this study will delve deeper into the use of DA to enhance speaking skills, focusing on mediational moves. The section below discusses the role of DA in promoting speaking skills.

Dynamic Assessment for Promoting Speaking Skills

In many research studies (Antón, 2009; Çetin-Köroğlu, 2019; Davin, 2013; Hill & Sabet, 2009; Jia et al., 2023), DA sessions have been implemented to assess learners' development of speaking skills. However, Poehner's (2005) study, which investigated how learners progress their oral skills, has pioneered other studies in this field. His study is a good example of an interactionist approach to DA, as he carried out oral interviews with university students and dynamically assessed their ability to use the two types of past tenses in French (imparfait and passé composé) when narrating a movie. In order to construct a ZPD, Poehner (2005) provided flexible mediation, which was determined by the mediator in consideration of the learner's needs of assistance during the conversation rather than in a predetermined way, and found that the learners' difficulties were resolved through mediation. As a result of the findings of this research, Poehner (2005) created typologies for mediation and learner reciprocity, as in the following table.

Table 1

Poehner's Mediation and Learner Reciprocity Typology

Mediational Typology	Learner Reciprocity Typology
Helping move narration along	Unresponsive
Accepting response	Repeats mediator
Request for repetition	Responds incorrectly
Request for verification	Requests additional assistance
Reminder of directions	Incorporates feedback
Request for renarration	Overcomes problem
Identifying specific site of error	Offers explanation
Specifying error	Uses mediator as a resource
Metalinguistic clues	Rejects mediator's assistance
Translation	
Providing example or illustration	
Offering a choice	
Providing correct response	
Providing explanation	
Asking for explanation	

Note. (Poehner, 2005)

Another study that investigated the learners' potential to improve their speaking skills was conducted by Siwathaworn and Wudthayagorn (2018). Through the elicited imitation tasks, learners' speaking skills were assessed in terms of fluency, vocabulary, syntax, and pronunciation. The results yielded that DA had a positive impact on learners' speaking skills. Participants became more engaged and self-directed learners. The interview and diaries also displayed those learners had positive attitudes toward DA procedures. It is also significant that DA was found to have promising potential as a classroom practice, particularly for low-proficient students.

There is also research investigating the applicability of the DA approach to assessing speaking skills in large classes. Yılmaz-Yakışık and Çakır (2017) carried out speaking tests in experimental and control groups. Each group consisted of 18 English language teacher trainees, employing both non-dynamic and DA sessions in the sandwich format, namely, pre-test, training, and post-test. The results indicated that the learners in the experimental group who received mediation during DA and took a training program between pre- and post-tests outperformed the learners in the control group in terms of the development of speaking skills.

Moreover, the studies conducted by Antón (2009), Davin (2013), and Jia et al. (2023) focused on the implementation of DA in contexts where Spanish or Chinese was learned as a foreign or a second language. Of these, Antón (2009) adopted the interventionist approach to DA and found that DA provided rich and deep descriptions of learners' actual and potential levels of development. Similarly, Davin (2013) also employed the interventionist DA, and integrated it with the instructional conversations. As the findings, the research revealed that DA and instructional conversations were compatible for developing the learners' ZPD in a classroom setting. Different from these studies, the investigation carried out by Jia et al. (2023) was an experimental study comparing the effects of DA and explicit feedback on the acquisition of a Chinese grammatical structure. And the research found that the DA was more effective on acquiring the target structure and enhancing the learning potential.

Interventionist and Interactionist Approaches to DA

The studies mentioned above highlight two different approaches to DA: interventionist and interactionist (Ebadi & Saeedian, 2016; Ebadi & Latif, 2015; Lantolf & Poehner, 2004), which "differ in their flexibility of the mediation provided to learners during the procedure" (Yang & Qian, 2023, p. 21). Of these, the interventionist DA, which "better aligns with the preference in many conventional assessments for standardized administration procedures" (Tang & Ma, 2023, p. 46), involves the scripted mediation hierarchically ranging from implicit to explicit (Kushki et al., 2022; Yang & Qian, 2023). In this vein, the quantification of assistance required for achieving the predetermined goal is an aspect of the interventionist approach to DA (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004). The results obtained through this quantification are used to make comparisons among the individual learners and groups (Poehner, 2008). Regarding the interventionist approach, which is usually implemented by adopting a pre-test, implementation, and post-test design (Ebadi & Latif, 2015), Poehner (2005) states that it explicitly aims "to increase the predictive validity of current testing procedures" (p. 83). In addition, pre-specified prompts and hints are used during the interventionist DA process (Andujar, 2020), and this can negatively affect the mediator's ability to respond

appropriately to the learners' problems that emerge during the assessment process (Poehner, 2005). However, despite its discrepancy with the general view that every learner has his or her own characteristics and needs, the interventionist approach also has some advantages in terms of implementation. For example, the interventionist approach enables the teachers to give mediation to a large group of learners. Moreover, the implementation of interventionist DA does not require as much time and effort as one-on-one or interactionist DA does (Poehner & Lantolf, 2010). To illustrate how the interventionist DA is conducted, the following excerpt from Andujar (2020, p. 12) involves the prompts which are scripted before the DA session.

Figure 1

A Sample Excerpt for the Interventionist DA

Example 3: Topic: Food and restaurants	
18:36	A: "What's the best tapas bar in your opinion?"
18:40	J: "There are much bars in Almería with great food"
18:40	A: "I think the best ones are in the city centre"
19:01	T: (emoticon indicating the person is thinking) **(Prompt n1)**
19:04	A: "any mistake teacher?"
19:05	T: "There are much bars in Almería with great food?" **(Prompt n2)**
19:05	J: "mm … yes … "
19:06	T: "There are much bars?" **(Prompt n3)**
19:07	J: "I think that is 'many' bars."
19:07	T: "That's correct Judit many for countable nouns."

As for the interactionist approach to DA, it is "more open-ended and conversational" (Kushki et al., 2022, p. 2) and involves the provision of mediation adjusted according to the responsiveness of the learner during the interaction (Lantolf, 2009). In other words, the mediation is not provided according to a pre-specified script (Davin, 2013; Lantolf & Poehner, 2004; Shrestha, 2020), and the importance is given to development rather than the amount of assistance and the predetermined goal (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004). In this regard, the interactionist DA is more sensitive to the learner's ZPD (Kushki et al., 2022). Although it is not as standardized as in the interventionist DA, the mediation in interactionist DA "does typically proceed along a continuum of implicit to explicit depending upon learner needs and responsiveness as these become apparent during the interaction" (Poehner & Wang, 2021, p. 475). Moreover, the interactionist DA does not involve the quantitative scores, and MLE is mentioned as one of the most prominent types of interactionist DA (Davin, 2013; Shrestha, 2020). In the study by Özturan et al. (2023, p. 68), interactionist dialogic mediation was provided to the learners based on the texts they wrote, as given in the excerpt below.

Figure 2

A Sample Excerpt for the Interactionist DA

Excerpt 1: (T: Teacher, M: Mia)

   T: Can you please read it again? **(Mediational move 1—existence of an error)**
   M: It has four windows that has a curtain ((she is reading the sentence))
   T: four windows that ↑has **(Mediational move 2—location of an error)**
   M: yes **(Reciprocity act 1—no response)**
   T: that have **(Mediational move 3—providing the correct form)**
   M: yeah, that have. Windows are plural **(Reciprocity act 2—partial autonomy)**

Mobile-Assisted Language Learning and Assessment

The increasing popularity of mobile-assisted language learning in English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL) education can be attributed to the facilitative nature of mobile-based language learning in enhancing the quality of learning and teaching. Internet connectivity, interactivity, portability, multimedia capabilities, universality, convenience, and cost-effectiveness are some of the primary advantages of mobile-assisted language learning (Ally & Samaka, 2016). These benefits of MALL can increase the amount of time spent learning outside of the classroom (Burston, 2015), and these advantages have encouraged researchers to investigate mobile-based language learning as an effective method for enhancing language learning.

Mobile-assisted dynamic assessment (MA-DA) and mobile-assisted formative assessment (MA-FA) are two different assessment types used in mobile learning environments. Although both types of assessment favour the development of the learners' abilities in time, they differ in terms of some aspects, which are, in fact, mentioned as the divergence between DA and FA (Leung, 2007). Of these, the first is that the MA-DA is based on the theoretical background provided by SCT and MLE about cognitive development, while the MA-FA lacks such a theory to draw on. Secondly, while the MA-DA intends to develop the learners' ZPD and make long-term effects on their learning capacity, the MA-FA is more inclined to assist the learners in overcoming challenges germane to specific tasks. In addition, the MA-DA involves less risk of erroneous evaluation because it allows the provision of contingent feedback adjusted according to the learner's needs (Poehner & Lantolf, 2005). To conclude, the MA-DA is a type of assessment that aims to identify learners' potential for growth, whereas the MA-FA is a type of assessment that aims to facilitate learning by providing learners with ongoing feedback.

Although there are some studies investigating the differences between mobile-assisted language learning and face-to-face settings, such as the research conducted by Aliakbari and Mardani (2022), the focus of the studies conducted on MA-DA and F2F-DA was mostly on investigating the advantages of one form of DA. The study conducted by Aliakbari and Mardani (2022), for example, explored that EFL students who participated in mobile learning classes improved their speaking abilities more than those who took face-to-face classes. The privacy afforded by mobile learning and the ability to access and utilize vast amounts of content on the internet have been identified

as major contributors to this achievement. The study found that students were more content with mobile learning classes than face-to-face classes because mobile learning classes offered greater flexibility and personalized settings; therefore, mobile learning classes increased student motivation and engagement.

Another study investigating the possible advantages and disadvantages of mobile-assisted language learning is conducted by Chinnery (2006). In this study, the researcher discusses the potential advantages and difficulties of employing mobile technologies for language learning. Although mobile technologies are readily available and frequently less expensive than standard equipment, their portability presents obstacles such as smaller screen size and poor audiovisual quality. In addition, their availability may be restricted, and connection issues may occur. Furthermore, it might pose problems such as inadequate nonverbal communication and cultural context. However, the advantages of mobile-assisted language learning (MALL) are substantial, including its potential to increase social inclusion by enabling students to study at their own pace and in any location.

Merzifonluoğlu and Takkaç-Tulgar (2022) explored the relationship between self-directed technology use and learners' success in vocabulary development. The results were insignificant, and the possible factors that could have contributed to this outcome could be the learners' limited self-directed learning abilities, the duration and scope of the intervention, limited resources, technical and software problems, and the exam format. Their study also highlights the need for clear instruction and modeling on how to use applications and websites effectively in and out of the classroom.

There is more research arguing the advantages of mobile-assisted language assessment. In the study by Tarighat and Khodabakhsh (2016), the speaking proficiency of EFL learners was assessed through portfolios. WhatsApp application was the main instrument for collecting data in this research. The participants recorded a two-minute speech, shared the recording, and finally received peer feedback and teacher feedback on grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and overall performance during the process of Mobile-Assisted Language Assessment (hereafter MALA), which was coined by these researchers. The researchers reported the striking finding that MALA, which involves the operation of assessment and instruction simultaneously, was found fairer by the participants than the static tests, and they commented that it could be adopted along with other assessment methods. Additionally, MALA helped to boost EFL learners' ZPD. It is also observed that the MALA was quite compatible with DA principles, and the DA procedures could be implemented through telecommunication strategies.

Mobile-Assisted Dynamic Assessment

The literature provides empirical studies on MA-DA in the area of language learning. For instance, Rezaee et al. (2019) investigated the effects of MA-DA via WhatsApp on EFL learners' oral fluency development. In this experimental research, the participants in the experimental groups were exposed to DA via either voice-chat or text-chat. The study results revealed that the learners in the experimental groups outperformed the ones in the control group.

Phetsut and Waemusa (2022) examined the efficacy of the mobile-assisted language assessment intervention on the oral accuracy of Thai EFL learners using WhatsApp. The results demonstrated that the MALA had a significant impact on the

improvement of the learners' oral accuracy, shedding light on how to maximize the use of mobile devices in the classroom. The MALA-based intervention provides Thai EFL learners with an opportunity to practice speaking through interaction with the teacher, and WhatsApp functions as a mediator to be utilized in MALL while supporting the DA process. However, a large class may increase the teacher's workload, and limitations regarding a stable internet connection in some local contexts should be considered for future planning.

Another study pointing out the issue of teacher workload in these innovative methodologies of assessment is conducted by Rad (2021). This researcher has introduced a new term, which is hybrid dynamic assessment (HDA), and used mobile-mediated HDA applications to assess language proficiency in L2 learners, which allowed for individualized learning and addressed challenges found in earlier research on HDA. The study found that learners were able to comprehend language errors faster and compose more target-like forms by the end of the interaction. The mobile-mediated HDA approach developed an environment that supported dialogic mediation and converted in-class time into an individualized source of L2 input and feedback. However, according to the researcher, practical suggestions such as decreasing teacher workload may be necessaryfor some instructional settings.

The research conducted by Rassaei (2021) compared the effects of three conditions on the learning of request forms: mobile-mediated DA, non-DA mobile-mediated explicit correction, and control condition. Rassaei (2021) found that mobile-mediated DA was significantly more effective than the other two conditions. Moreover, he qualitatively analyzed the reciprocity patterns occurring in the DA sessions and reported that the learners reciprocated to the mediation more in the later DA sessions.

Reviewing the literature, one can obviously find out that the research generally focused on the effectiveness of DA on the acquisition of various language sub-skills in comparison to non-dynamic assessment procedures. In these studies, the DA was implemented either in F2F or MA contexts. However, to the best of the researchers' knowledge, which mediational moves and reciprocity behaviors are employed in the F2F and MA-DA procedures have not been investigated so far. Therefore, this research aims to fill this gap in the literature.

Method

Research Design

This research is based on a qualitative descriptive design (Sandelowski, 2000), where the researchers collected data to discover the differences in mediational moves and reciprocity behaviors between F2F- and MA-DA sessions. Nassaji (2015) reports that qualitative and descriptive research is well-adjusted for foreign language teaching, which takes place in EFL classrooms. Lambert and Lambert (2012) also use the term 'qualitative descriptive design', which is driven by natural inquiry, and report that a qualitative descriptive study does not produce a theory from the data; however, the objective is to obtain cases rich in information and to present a detailed description of the existing situation. More specifically, they state "there is no pre-selection of study variables, no manipulation of variables, and no prior commitment to any one theoretical view of a target phenomenon" (Lambert & Lambert, 2012, p. 255).

Participants

For the present study, convenience sampling, which involves the participants who are available to the researchers, was employed (Fraenkel et al., 2023). In this vein, the second author of this article reached 45 tertiary-level EFL learners who were the students taking the general English course taught by the researcher. Then they were given an online proficiency test (DIALANG) in order to detect their proficiency in terms of the correct use of syntax and vocabulary in English. After obtaining the test results, four learners, two male and two female, whose ages ranged between 18-20, were randomly selected among the ones whose level was A2 according to the DIALANG test results. The learners at A2 level were selected because the researcher observed that the students with lower English levels had some significant problems communicating in English because of their inadequate knowledge of grammar and vocabulary.

As for the mediator in the research, she is one of the researchers in this study and the instructor teaching the participants. She has a Ph.D. degree from English language teaching. Previously, she has studied DA procedures in language classes, and her doctoral dissertation is about the effectiveness of DA on the improvement of tertiary-level learners' speaking skills.

Instruments

Three instruments were used to conduct this research: YouTube videos for narration, WhatsApp application, and a written interview form. Furthermore, the F2F-DA sessions were audio-recorded by the mediator's phone, while the MA-DA ones were video-recorded on WhatsApp.

YouTube Videos for Narration

The participants were asked to watch five-minute-long animated YouTube videos in which a moral lesson was involved, and then they were asked to narrate the events in past tenses. These videos were operated by the mediator during the F2F-DA sessions. On the other hand, for the MA-DA sessions, the links to the videos were shared with the participants just before the sessions, and they were asked to take short notes while they were exposed to the stories in the videos.

WhatsApp Application

In the present research, WhatsApp Application was selected to use in MA-DA sessions. This application was preferred for two reasons. The first one was that it was available and free for all the participants to easily use it. The second reason was that it provided us with opportunities for text or voice messages as well as video talk.

Written Interview Form

A written interview form was prepared to get the participants' views regarding these issues: difficulties encountered during the F2F- and MA-DA sessions, preferences about the contexts of the DA sessions, stress levels of the F2F- and MA-DA sessions, and the ideas about the benefits of DA sessions. In this vein, five questions (see Appendix) were asked in the participants' native language (Turkish) in order to enable them to express their opinions easily.

Procedures and Data Collection

After the participants were selected, they were given information about two contexts of assessment, which were F2F and MA, with the aim of raising the students' awareness about the procedures. While describing the framework of the study, the researcher informed the participants that they would get assistance from the mediator when they had difficulty narrating the stories. Moreover, in order to make the students feel secure the mediator stated that their performance would not be scored. It was also ensured that the participants had an internet connection since MA sessions would be held through WhatsApp application. During the data collection process, the mediator held F2F-DA sessions at Gazi University campus, while MA-DA sessions were implemented according to the participants' convenience. In this context, two participants (Aycan and Cem) initially received F2F mediation from the mediator, while the other two participants (Filiz and Okan) got synchronous online mediation from the same mediator via WhatsApp application. Then, the participants changed the context of the interaction. That is to say, the students who received F2F mediation in the first session received MA mediation in the second session, while those who received MA mediation at first were exposed to F2F mediation later. Each pair had a one-week interval between the F2F- and MA-DA sessions. Table 1 illustrates how the context of the DA sessions changes according to the pair of learners.

Table 1

The Contexts of Dynamic Assessment Sessions

Session	Face-to-face	Mobile -assisted
The First session	Aycan-Cem	Filiz-Okan
The Second session	Filiz–Okan	Aycan-Cem

Note. (*Pseudonyms were used.*)

All the students participated in both F2F- and MA-DA sessions throughout the data collection process. During these sessions, the participants first watched short animated films and then narrated these stories F2F or on WhatsApp. The reasons for using these films were that they would provide the necessary prompt for the interaction between the learner and the mediator and allow the learners to use the target language while narrating them. Furthermore, each session involved the mediation provided by the mediator to the various points of the interaction, such as content, flow, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary choice. The reasons for this are that focusing on a specific point, particularly a grammatical structure, may hamper the natural flow of the interaction (Kang, 2010), and the participants face some challenges in narrating a story because of their low English proficiency. The participants receiving this mediation, on the other hand, could or could not reciprocate it in various ways.

Each interaction between the mediator and the participants was audio-recorded for analysis, and 148 minutes of verbal data were collected at the end of the DA process. Furthermore, the participants' views regarding the F2F- and MA-DA were obtained through a written interview form. In this form, the questions were asked and answered in Turkish in order to get more detailed answers.

Data Analysis

To achieve the aims of the study, qualitative data analysis was employed. First, the oral data obtained from the F2F and MA interactions between the mediator and each learner were first transcribed verbatim. Then, content analysis was performed on the collected data from these interactions. Content analysis involves coding for themes, examining patterns, and making interpretations to draw conclusions about common themes (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). In the analysis process, both deductive and inductive content analysis approaches were adopted. The researchers first read the whole dataset in order to get familiar with it and detect the prominent and recurrent codes. Then they repeatedly read the data in detail and checked the initial codes, and assigned the new ones. While analyzing the data, the researchers focused not only on language-related episodes (Swain, 2001) but also on other aspects of the interaction where the mediator provided mediation, and the participant could or could not reciprocate this mediation.Moreover, it is noted that the typology suggested by Poehner (2005) was used, and new codes were also assigned for the data that could not be labelled with this typology. After coding the whole data separately, the researchers came together and discussed the discrepant codes until reaching a common decision. At the end of this process, new mediational moves and reciprocity behaviors emerged. All these themes, namely the typologies previously explained by researchers and the new typologies that emerged during the content analysis, were defined by two researchers and finalized with feedback on the reliability of the qualitative analysis. Another critical researcher with a doctorate and expertise in the qualitative analysis was asked to evaluate these mediational typologies proposed by the researchers.

As for the data collected through written interview form, the participants' answers to the open-ended questions were also content analyzed by both researchers; themes and subthemes were drawn, and the discrepancies were discussed with the feedback of a third researcher who had expertise in the field.

Ethical Procedures

Ethical approval for the research was taken from Gazi University Ethics Committee with the number E-77082166-604.01.02-342542 and date 05.04.2022. After getting the ethical approval, the participants were asked to sign a consent form indicating that they were voluntarily participating in the study.

Findings

The primary focus of this research was to distinguish between the F2F- and MA-DA sessions in terms of mediational moves and reciprocity behaviors. For this reason, the content analysis of the dialogs between the participants and the mediator was done, and some important findings were obtained. However, before presenting the findings and answering each research question, it should be noted that not only was Poehner's typology (2005) used as a reference during the analysis of the conversations, but some additional moves and behaviors were also identified. Furthermore, explaining the emerging moves and behaviors in F2F- and MA-DA sessions is necessary. These were called "emerging moves and behaviors" by the researchers as they emerged as natural consequences of the dialogs aiming to result in student progress. Furthermore, they were

classified and provided with examples from the dialogs between the mediator and the participants.

Table 2

Emerging Mediational Moves

Move	Explanation	Excerpt
	Dialogical Moves	
Positive reinforcement	Encouraging the learner by referring to the success of the learner	Filiz: Imm. She told her achievement to her friends. Mediator: *Very good*. (Filiz MA DA 1)
Asking for translation	Asking the learner to translate what s/he tries to say	Mediator: Mindy didn't show. Cem: Show… much Mediator: What do you mean? What didn't she show? Cem: For celebrity. For mate. Mediator: *Ne demek istedin? In Turkish, can you tell me what you mean? Tamam Türkçe söyle.* (Cem F2F DA 1)
Asking further question for details	Asking about some details of the story	Ozan: Made a surprise. Mediator: Okay. For Tim. Made a surprise for Tim. Ozan: Yes. Mediator: *What was the surprise?* (Okan F2F DA 2)
Asking for clarification	Asking the learner to clarify what s/he says	Filiz: And grandpa answered him: "No they always expect to you" Mediator: *Do you mean Stephan's question? I mean Stephan's question. What was the question? What about?* (Filiz F2F DA 1)
	Implicit	
Recasting	Providing the correct form implicitly	Aycan: He went to shopping. Mediator: Okay. Alright. *He went shopping*. Hı hı. Aycan: Hı hı. His mom Mediator: Hı hı. *With his mom*. (Aycan MA DA 1)

Table 3

Emerging Reciprocity Behaviors

Behavior	Explanation	Excerpt
	Demanding Help	
Asking for explanation	Requesting explanation from the mediator	Mediator: Shirt okay. Do we say he wanted to t-shirt or he wanted to buy a t-shirt? Aycan: *I don't understand*. (Aycan MA DA 1)
Asking for translation	Requesting translation from the mediator	Ozan: But Ilyn didn't accept. Mediator: Okay. Ozan: Didn't want accept. Because his birthday party's invited. Sorry. Was going to invite Tim. *Katılıyor olaca*k. (Okan F2F DA 2)
	Moves Resulting in Inaccuracy	
Hesitating	Pausing	Mediator: A brave person? Cem: No. *Celeb…* Mediator: Do you mean? Ha. Celebrity. Do you mean famous person? (Cem F2F DA 1)
Using L1	Narrating in the mother tongue	Filiz: He res res… *Dinlenmesi gerekiyor.* Mediator: He had to rest. Filiz: Yes. He had to rest. (Filiz MA DA 2)
Unclear narration	Ambiguity in the narration	Mediator: Yes there are some events. Cem: Then *he came your home. Maybe then they at lunch.* Mediator: They what? What did they do at lunch? (Cem F2F DA 1)
Inadequate answer	Failure to complete the sentence	Mediator: Okay. It has different colors or it had different colors? Ozan: *It had a ….* Mediator: Had different colors. Hı hı. And shapes. (Okan F2F DA 1)

Mediational Moves Employed in the F2F- and MA-DA Sessions

In this research, "mediational moves" refer to what the mediator does to facilitate the learners' language development during DA. Drawing on this definition, the mediational moves have been detected and divided into three main categories: dialogical moves, implicit mediation, and explicit mediation. Here, it is to note that all of these categories involve both the moves in Poehner's (2005) typology and the moves

emerging from the data. Moreover, as this is a qualitative descriptive research study, the overall frequency scores have been analyzed, and the total scores of each context have been compared.

Firstly, when the frequencies of the categories are compared regardless of the contexts, the study reveals that the category of dialogical moves (f= 329) involving the moves which are employed for maintaining the conversation by the mediator has the highest frequency. This means that although the two contexts (F2F and MA) are different in terms of their affordances, both of them require the interlocutors to participate in the conversation in various ways, such as asking questions or repeating the previous expressions. On the other hand, the category of implicit moves (f= 163), including the moves regarding the mediator's indirect help to the learner during the conversation, is the second most frequent one, while the explicit moves (f= 76) are the least frequent ones in total. However, the mediator also provided explicit mediation to the learners when there was not any other way to maintain the conversation.

Secondly, if the mediational moves are compared with regard to the contexts, it is obvious that F2F and MA interactions differ in terms of allowing the mediator to use some mediational moves. For example, F2F-DA allowed the mediator to employ more dialogical moves in comparison to MA-DA (f= 175 in F2F, f= 154 in MA-DA). Moreover, helping move narration along (f= 67), requesting for verification (f= 30), and asking further questions for details (f= 20) are the prominent moves of F2F-DA sessions, and they are more frequently used in these sessions than the ones in the interactions on WhatsApp. Helping move narration along, accepting responses, and requesting for repetition, on the other hand, are the most prominent and frequent moves in MA-DA sessions.

As for the implicit category, the summative frequency of it indicates that the mediator provided more implicit mediation to the participants during the F2F-DA sessions (f= 87 in F2F, f= 76 in MA-DA). Although offering choice (f= 26 in F2F, f= 24 in MA-DA) and recasting (f= 31 in F2F, f= 16 in MA-DA) are the most prominent moves for both F2F- and MA-DA sessions, they are obviously different in terms of the frequency of recasting move. That is to say, the mediator provided more recasts in the F2F interactions.

Finally, the category of explicit moves referring to the situations that the mediator directly provided the mediation to the learner also indicates the difference between the F2F- and MA-DA sessions. When the summative frequency of the explicit mediational moves employed in these sessions is compared, it is obvious that the MA-DA sessions involve more explicit moves (f= 32 in F2F, f= 44 in MA-DA). However, it should also be noted that the interactions occurring in both of the contexts involve providing the correct response (f= 15 in F2F, f= 25 in MA-DA) as the most frequently used move, and this means that the mediator gave the correct response when she thought that there was not any other way to help the learner to overcome the problem.

Table 4

Mediational Moves Employed in F2F-DA

Moves	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Dialogical Moves									
Helping move narration along	5	4	16	3	9	6	12	12	67
Approving	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	6
Accepting response	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Requesting for verification	2	3	11	1	1	1	5	6	30
Positive reinforcement	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	5
Requesting for repetition	2	1	3	3	0	3	2	4	18
Asking for explanation	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	2	10
Requesting for renarration	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Asking for translation	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Asking further question for details	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	10	20
Asking for clarification	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	1	9
T0TAL									175
Moves	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Implicit Mediation									
Identifying site of error	3	1	0	3	0	0	1	3	11
Offering choice	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	4	26
Recasting	1	1	5	5	5	4	3	7	31
Metalinguistic clues	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	8
Specifying error	3	0	1	1	1	0	2	3	11
Reminder for directions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL									87
Moves	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		

	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Explicit Mediation									
Providing correct response	1	1	0	1	0	5	3	4	15
Providing explanation	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	4	9
Providing translation	0	1	2	0	2	1	2	0	8
TOTAL									32

Table 5

Mediational Moves Employed in MA-DA

Moves	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Dialogical Moves									
Helping move narration along	1	6	13	6	7	5	11	5	54
Approving	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Accepting response	0	0	0	0	4	3	17	10	34
Requesting for verification	1	1	2	1	1	3	8	2	19
Positive reinforcement	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	2	6
Requesting for repetition	2	5	4	1	2	1	7	4	26
Asking for explanation	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	5
Requesting for renarration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asking for translation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asking further question for details	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
Asking for clarification	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
TOTAL									154
Moves	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Implicit									
Identifying site	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	4

of error									
Offering choice	2	3	5	4	5	2	2	1	24
Recasting	4	1	0	0	2	1	3	5	16
Metalinguistic clues	0	1	3	1	2	1	5	0	13
Specifying error	2	2	1	1	4	2	1	0	13
Reminder for directions	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	6
TOTAL									76

Moves	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Explicit									
Providing correct response	3	3	4	3	3	5	2	2	25
Providing explanation	0	3	4	1	2	0	2	0	12
Providing translation	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	0	7
TOTAL									44

Reciprocity Behaviors Employed in the F2F- and MA-DA Sessions

In the present study, reciprocity behaviors refer to what the learners did during the DA sessions while interacting with the mediator. According to the findings of this research, these behaviors were classified under five major categories: *agentic behavior, demanding help, taking the mediator as a model, moves resulting in inaccuracy,* and *rejecting reciprocity*. In Table 5, the behaviors that each category involves are given with regard to the participants, DA sessions, and contexts.

Firstly, when the frequencies of these reciprocity behaviors are examined regardless of the contexts, it is obvious that some behaviors were more frequently deployed by the participants during the DA sessions. For example, *overcoming a problem* (f= 103) is the most frequent behavior. In contrast to this, *repeating mediator* (f= 62) is the second most frequent reciprocal behavior, and it is a sign that the participants were less independent. Moreover, *responding incorrectly* (f= 43) and *requesting additional assistance* (f= 28) are the third and fourth most frequent behaviors in sequence, and these are also evidence indicating that the participants need more mediation.

Secondly, when these reciprocal behaviors are compared with the contexts, F2F and WhatsApp, it is possible to detect some differences. For instance, the frequencies of the behaviors in the category of *agentic behavior* are different. Of these behaviors, *overcoming a problem* (f= 55 in F2F, f= 48 in MA-DA) in particular was more frequently deployed in F2F interactions for maintaining the conversation, indicating that the participants could successfully reciprocate the mediation and were more active. On

the other hand, the F2F interactions also involved more situations of inaccuracy in comparison to the ones on WhatsApp (*f*= 52 in F2F, *f*= 24 in MA-DA). *Using L1* and *responding incorrectly* are the prominent behaviors that are classified under the category of *moves resulting in inaccuracy*.

Table 6

Reciprocity Behaviors Employed in F2F-DA

Behaviors	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Agentic Behavior									
Overcoming a problem	10	6	2	5	3	5	6	18	55
Incorporating feedback	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
TOTAL									58

Behaviors	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Demanding Help									
Asking for explanation	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Asking for translation	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	1	6
Requesting additional assistance	0	1	0	1	2	2	4	4	14
TOTAL									22

Behaviors	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Taking Mediator as a Model									
Repeating mediator	2	0	5	2	1	8	6	8	32
Using mediator as a resource	1	0	2	1	0	2	0	1	7
TOTAL									39

Behaviors	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Moves Resulting in Inaccuracy									
Hesitating	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
Using L1	0	0	2	0	1	2	6	4	15
Responding incorrectly	0	1	7	2	0	1	4	10	25

Unclear narration	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Inadequate answer	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	5
TOTAL									52

Behaviors	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Rejecting Reciprocity									
Unresponsive	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
TOTAL									4

Table 7

Reciprocity Behaviors Employed in MA-DA

Behaviors	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Agentic Behavior									
Overcoming a problem	2	8	7	5	12	4	4	6	48
Incorporating feedback	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL									48

Behaviors	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Demanding Help									
Asking for explanation	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Asking for translation	0	1	1	0	3	3	3	0	11
Requesting additional assistance	0	1	3	0	3	5	1	1	14
TOTAL									28

Behaviors	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Taking Mediator as a Model									
Repeating mediator	1	2	6	2	4	6	7	2	30
Using mediator as a resource	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
TOTAL									31

Behaviors	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total

Moves Resulting in Inaccuracy									
Hesitating	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Using L1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	4
Responding incorrectly	1	2	2	3	2	2	4	2	18
Unclear narration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Inadequate answer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL									24

Behaviors	Aycan		Cem		Filiz		Okan		
	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	DA1	DA2	Total
Rejecting Reciprocity									
Unresponsive	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
TOTAL									4

The Students' Attitudes toward F2F-DA and MA-DA Sessions

The participants' answers to the written questions involved some common ideas about the affordances of F2F- and MA-DA. For example, Aycan, Filiz, and Cem stated they had some difficulties expressing their opinions in English during the F2F-DA sessions, while Okan did not mention any challenges. Aycan expressed that: "*I could understand everything I watched, but I had difficulty while conveying what I knew because of my lack of word knowledge*". As for the MA-DA sessions, Okan and Cem stated that they did not face any difficulties. In contrast, Aycan pointed out she had some challenges because of the poor internet connection. Filiz also expressed she felt more stressful during the MA-DA sessions than the F2F ones, as in this sentence: "*I felt more comfortable meeting face-to-face, but the meetings being on the internet made me a bit nervous.*" Furthermore, all of the participants preferred the F2F-DA by accentuating various reasons such as preparing the learners for real life more, expressing themselves more easily, and feeling safer and more relaxed. However, as a response to the question of during which sessions they felt more stressful, just two of the participants chose one of the contexts, while the other two pointed out they had not felt stressful. Of these participants, Cem mentioned the F2F sessions were more stressful, while Filiz called the MA-DA sessions more stressful for herself. Finally, all the participants stated the mediation provided during the sessions was very beneficial and helped them maintain the conversation.

Discussion and Conclusion

Initially, when comparing face-to-face and mobile-assisted language assessment processes for speaking skills, it was assumed that the face-to-face assessment process would be more effective for students. However, the growing popularity of digital tools in the field of education and the pandemic process requiring the evaluation process to be online necessitated the comparison of these two processes. Furthermore, the benefits of dynamic assessment, whose tenets are based on the constructivist approach, integrating

both learning and assessment, cannot be denied, leading to thestudy's goal of comparing F2F- and MA-DA in an EFL setting. Dialogical moves between the mediator and the language learners were analyzed using the qualitative research design to reach conclusions. Before discussing the results, it is essential to note that there are no studies comparing F2F- and MA-DA sessions in EFL settings. Thus, the previous studies cited here are limited to those that examined the efficacy of a single assessment session.

As the findings revealed, the mediator frequently used dialogical moves in both contexts. This finding is consistent with the natural flow of the conversation because the interlocutors usually employ actions that allow the other interlocutor to continue the conversation by taking the floor again (Sidnell, 2010). Moreover, it was found that the implicit mediational moves were more frequently used than the explicit ones in both contexts. This indicates that the mediator preferred to give mediation more implicitly than in an explicit way, and this is compatible with the procedure that is usually followed in the DA process and allows the learners to make corrections on their own and develop their ZPD (Davin & Donato, 2013; Poehner & Lantolf, 2013).

When the F2F- and MA-DA sessions were compared, the research found that the mediator employed the dialogical and implicit moves for mediation more frequently during the F2F interactions. In contrast, the MA-DA sessions involved more frequent use of explicit moves compared to the F2F sessions. Considering these findings, it can be deduced that the conversational channel was rather restricted in MA-DA sessions. In line with this, Çakmak (2019) refers to the challenges of MALL and explains that some dimensions in environmental design, such as mobility, connectivity, and spatial and temporal dimensions, can cause disruptions if a problem occurs in these dimensions. Furthermore, regarding the more frequent provision of recasts in F2F sessions, it can be stated that the participants could consider recasting to be mere repetition, and this attempt might not result in accuracy. This finding is in line with what Lyster and Saito (2010) report. They argue that recasts tend to be ambiguous for grammatical errors. Therefore, students might not distinguish the mismatch between the correct and incorrect forms of the target language. However, in F2F-DA sessions, thanks to nonverbal parameters such as body language, gestures, and mimics, the mediator relied more on recasting since these nonverbal parameters could eliminate misinterpretations.

It is important to note that in each F2F- and MA-DA session, the mediation presented to the students was different for two reasons. First, the ZPD was different for each student. Second, the nature of F2F- and MA-DA sessions guided the mediator to provide the appropriate mediational move. For instance, the mediator employed more implicit feedback, such as recasting, in F2F-DA sessions while using more explicit feedback in MA-DA sessions. Rezaee et al. (2019) argue that mediation is not standardized but adjusted to the students' responses in an interactionist approach. In this study, both the students' responses and the nature of the two contexts (F2F- and MA-DA) determined the mediational moves and reciprocity behaviors. In this vein, the mediator offered more prompts for accepting responses during MA-DA sessions due to the restricted nature of the context in mobile learning. In F2F-DA sessions, both the mediator and the students utilized the advantage of turn-taking. For example, the mediator asked further questions for details more frequently in F2F-DA session. Hence, the F2F interaction increased the dialogic activity making the conversation flow smoothly. Moreover, when the reciprocity behaviors were analyzed, it was remarkable

that students tended to use L1, and they gave more responses that resulted in inaccuracy. This can be explained by saying that the ease of F2F interaction caused the students to act more comfortably and carelessly.

As for the reciprocity behaviors, the participants frequently employed *overcoming a problem*, *repeating mediator*, *responding incorrectly,* and *requesting additional assistance* behaviors. Of these, *overcoming a problem* is the most frequent behavior used in both contexts, and this indicates that the participants were able to solve the problems by efficiently using the mediation and were less dependent on the mediator (Shrestha & Coffin, 2012). On the other hand, the other three behaviors show us that the participants were less independent in the process of developing their ZPD. Therefore, they still needed mediation.

When the contexts are compared in terms of the reciprocity behaviours, it is obvious that the participants overcame more problems during the F2F interactions. The reason for this might be that the participants felt less anxious while interacting F2F with the mediator and made more attempts to solve the language-related problems in their speech. In contrast to this, it also seems that the F2F interactions involved more inaccurate attempts. When this is considered with regard to the participants, it can be called an individual case because it is obvious that Okan made more unsuccessful attempts during the F2F-DA sessions. Although he was initially exposed to DA on WhatsApp, Okan made more errors in the later F2F sessions. However, this is not an unusual case for the DA since there can be regressions in the learners' ZPD throughout the development process (Vygotsky, 1978).

As for the participants' attitudes toward F2F- and MA-DA, they found mediational moves beneficial as these helped them to correct their mistakes, overcome problems, and maintain the conversation. This corroborates the findings reported by previous studies (Çetin-Köroğlu, 2019; Ebadi & Asakereh, 2017). Despite this, the two participants pointed out that they either had connection problems or felt anxious while interacting with the mediator on WhatsApp. Similarly, a lack of connectivity may cause disruption during mobile activities (Chinnery, 2006; Merzifonluoğlu & Takkaç-Tulgar, 2022), which may result in anxiety. However, the general attitude toward the F2F- and MA-DA sessions was positive since DA in both contexts helped them learn while being assessed. This finding also supports the study by Siwathaworn and Wudthayagorn (2018). The participants in their study stated that they could correct their mistakes with individualized support, and therefore they were not afraid of speaking in the DA sessions.

The findings of this study suggest both theoretical and pedagogical implications. Theoretically, this research made contributions to the fields of EFL learning and teaching, DA, and MALL. This study revealed the applicability of MA-DA sessions in online educational settings since they were successfully implemented like F2F-DA sessions. The effectiveness of MA-DA has been investigated and found to be helping learners' oral accuracy (Phetsut &Waemusa, 2022; Rad, 2021); however, more research could be done on mobile technologies revealing their effectiveness in language learning and teaching. Besides, this study contributed to the field of mobile-based assessment, and it can be implied that these technologies might be employed along with the paper or computerized tests.

The study also has pedagogical implications for language teachers, teacher trainers, and researchers. Of these, language teachers can conduct MA-DA to assess their students' oral accuracy outside the classroom. The likelihood of pandemics has led language teachers and educational reformists to develop new technologies to integrate into language courses. MA-DA sessions can be regarded as one of these latest technologies enabling the mediator to diagnose students' linguistic problems and then scaffold the students to overcome these problems and eventually advance their learning. Aliakbari and Mardani (2022) also support this view by revealing that students in mobile learning classes performed better than those in F2F classes. Mobile learning classes significantly increasedstudents' motivation to participate in class discussions. Trainers of language teachers can also benefit from the results of this study as they should tap into the significance of personalized learning, learner-centered classes, mediation, ZPD, and individual differences. Besides, they can organize in-service training sessions about how MA-DA sessions can be conducted. Finally, EFL researchers could also investigate mobile assessment facilities in the field of language assessment.

The findings of this study may pave the way for language instructors, EFL students, and researchers by highlighting the significance of DA and emphasizing that MA-DA can be implemented as effectively as F2F-DA for enhancing speaking skills. The results of this study can be used to justify combining online and F2F approaches as well as F2F-DA and MA-DA procedures. Similar to other studies, this one is limited by the research setting and the number of participants. The research was conducted at a single state school, and the number of participants was limited to four A2-level students. Consequently, the low proficiency level and the small sample size may have limited the interpretability and generalizability of the study's findings.

Statement of Responsibility

All authors have equal responsibility for conducting and reporting this research.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

Author Bios:

Murat Şükür is a research assistant at Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University. He is a PhD candidate. Assessment of language skills, language assessment literacy, teacher education, and language acquisition are among his research interests.

Burçak Yılmaz Yakışık is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education, Gazi University. She did her PhD on dynamic assessment. Her research interests are teacher education, dynamic assessment, and technology use in language teaching.

Gonca Yangın Ekşi is a professor in English language teaching department at Gazi University. She had studies on teacher education, technology use in language teaching, and teaching English to young learners which were published in national and international journals.

References

Ableeva, R. (2010). *Dynamic assessment of listening comprehension in second language learning* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The Pennsylvania State University.

Ableeva, R., & Lantolf, J. (2011). Mediated dialogue and the microgenesis of second language listening comprehension. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 18*(2), 133-149. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2011.555330

Aliakbari, M., & Mardani, M. (2022). Mobile-assisted language learning and its effects on learners' speaking development. *Education Research International,* 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/9043326

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(4), 465-483.

Ally, M., & Samaka, M. (2016). Guidelines for design and implementation of mobile learning. In Information Resources Management Association (Ed.), *Blended learning: Concepts, methodologies, tools, and applications* (pp. 443-458). Hershey: IGI Global.

Andujar, A. (2020). Mobile-mediated dynamic assessment: A new perspective for second language development. *ReCALL, 32*(2), 178-194. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344019000247

Antón, M. (2009). *Dynamic assessment of advanced second language learners*.

Bakhoda, I., & Shabani, K. (2019). Enhancing L2 learners' ZPD modification through computerized-group dynamic assessment of reading comprehension. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *13*(1), 31-44. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2017.1286350

Burston, J. (2015). Twenty years of MALL project implementation: A meta-analysis of learning outcomes. *ReCALL, 27*(1), 4-20. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344014000159

Chinnery, G. M. (2006). Going to the MALL: Mobile assisted language learning. *Language Learning & Technology, 10*(1), 9-16. http://dx.doi.org/10125/44040

Çakmak, F. (2019). Mobile learning and mobile assisted language learning in focus. *Language and Technology, 1*(1), 30-48.

Çetin-Köroğlu, Z. (2019). Interventionist dynamic assessment's effects on speaking skills testing: Case of ELT teacher candidates. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 10*(3), 23-31. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.10n.3p.23

Davin, K. J. (2013). Integration of dynamic assessment and instructional conversations to promote development and improve assessment in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 17*(3), 303-322. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813482934

Davin, K. J., & Donato, R. (2013). Student collaboration and teacher-directed classroom dynamic assessment: A complementary pairing. *Foreign Language Annals, 46*(1), 5-22. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12012

Ebadi, S. (2016). Mediation and reciprocity in online L2 dynamic assessment. *CALL-EJ, 17*(2), 16-40.

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*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1419796

Ebadi, S., & Bashir, S. (2021). An exploration into EFL learners' writing skills via mobile-based dynamic assessment. *Education and Information Technologies, 26,* 1995-2016. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10348-4

Ebadi, S., & Latif, S. V. (2015). Dynamic assessment of EFL learners' listening comprehension via computerized concept mapping. *Journal of Educational Technology, 12*(2), 29-41.

Ebadi, S., & Saeedian, A. (2016). Planning future instructional programs through computerized L2 dynamic assessment. *Teaching English with Technology, 16*(4), 12-32.

Ellis, R. & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Feuerstein, R. S. (2000). Dynamic cognitive assessment and the instrumental enrichment program: Origins and development. In A. Kozulin & Y. Rand (Eds.), *Experience of mediated learning: An impact of Feuerstein's theory in education and psychology* (pp. 147–165). New York: Pergamon.

Feuerstein, R. & Feuerstein, S. (1999). Mediated learning experience: A theoretical review. In R. Feuerstein, P. Klein, & A. J. Tannenbaum (Eds.), *Mediated learning experience (MLE): Theoretical, psychosocial, and learning implications* (pp. 1-50). London: Freund.

Feuerstein, R., Rand, Y., & Rynders, E. J. (1988). *Don't accept me as I am: Helping "retarded" people to excel*. New York: Plenum.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. H. (2023). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Hill, K., & Sabet, M. (2009). Dynamic speaking assessments. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(3), 537-545.

Jia, L., Cai, J., & Wang, J. (2023). Promoting learning potential among students of L2 Chinese through dynamic assessment. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 20*(1), 66-87. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2022.2156870

Kang, H. S. (2010). Negative evidence and its explicitness and positioning in the learning of Korean as a heritage language, *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(4), 582-599. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01093.x

Kozulin, A. & Garb, E. (2002). Dynamic assessment of EFL text comprehension of at-risk students. *School Psychology International, 23*, 112-127.

Kushki, A., Nassaji, H., & Rahimi, M. (2022). Interventionist and interactionist dynamic assessment of argumentative writing in an EFL program. *System, 107,* 1-13.

Lambert, V. A., & Lambert, C. E. (2012). Qualitative descriptive research: An acceptable design. *Pacific Rim International Journal of Nursing Research, 16*(4), 255-256.

Lantolf, J. P. (2009). Dynamic assessment: The dialectic integration of instruction and assessment. *Language Teaching, 42*(3), 355-368.

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.v1i1.647

Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2010). Dynamic assessment in the classroom: Vygotskian praxis for second language development. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(1), 11–33. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810383328

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., Thorne, S. L., & Poehner, M. E. (2015). Sociocultural theory and second language development. In Bill V., & Jessica, W. (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 207-226). Routledge.

Leung, C. (2007). Dynamic assessment: Assessment for and as teaching? *Language Assessment Quarterly, 4*(3), 257-278.

Lidz, C. S., & Gindis, B. (2003). Dynamic assessment of the evolving cognitive functions in children. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev, & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 99-116). Cambridge University Press.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 265-302. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520

Mentis, M., Dunn-Bernstein, M. & Mentis, M. (2008). *Mediated learning: Teaching, tasks, tools to unlock cognitive potential (2ⁿᵈ ed.)*, CA: Corwin Press.

Merzifonluoğlu, A., & Takkaç-Tulgar, A. (2022). Are digital technologies effective for the improvement of L2 vocabulary at tertiary level? *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, *22*(1), 56-72.

Nassaji, H. (2015). Qualitative and descriptive research: Data type versus data analysis. *Language Teaching Research, 19*(2), 129-132. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815572747

Özturan, T., & Uysal, H. H. (2022). Mediating multilingual immigrant learners' L2 writing through interactive dynamic assessment. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, *15*(2), 307-326.

Özturan, T., Uysal, H. H., & Shrestha, P. N. (2023). An investigation into EFL learners' perspectives towards dynamic assessment. In S. W. Chong, & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Innovation in learning-oriented language assessment*, (pp. 63-80). Palgrave Macmillan.

Phetsut, P., & Waemusa, Z. (2022). Effectiveness of mobile assisted language learning (MALL)-based intervention on developing Thai EFL learners' oral accuracy. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, *5*(4), 571-585. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.271

Poehner, M. E. (2005). *Dynamic assessment of oral proficiency among advanced L2 learners of French* [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Pennsylvania State University.

Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting second language development*. Springer.

Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2005). Dynamic assessment in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 9*(3), 233-265.

Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2010). Vygotsky's teaching-assessment dialectic and L2 education: The case for dynamic assessment. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 17*(4), 312-330. https://doi.org/10.1080/10749030903338509

Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2013). Bringing the ZPD into the equation: Capturing L2 development during computerized dynamic assessment (C-DA). *Language Teaching Research, 17*(3), 323-342. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813482935

Poehner, M. E., & Wang, Z. (2021). Dynamic assessment and second language development. *Language Teaching, 54(4),* 472-490.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon, 9*(5), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424843

Rad, H. S. (2021). Exploring use of mobile-mediated hybrid dynamic assessment in improving EFL learners' descriptive writing skills. *Computer Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal*, *22*(1), 111-132.

Rassaei, E. (2020). Effects of mobile-mediated dynamic and non-dynamic glosses on L2 vocabulary learning: A sociocultural perspective. *The Modern Language Journal, 104*(1), 284-303. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12629

Rassaei, E. (2021). Implementing mobile-mediated dynamic assessment for teaching request forms to EFL learners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-31.

Rezaee, A. A., Alavi, S. M., & Razzaghifard, P. (2019). The impact of mobile-based dynamic assessment on improving EFL oral accuracy. *Education and Information Technologies, 24*(5), 3091-3105. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-019-09915-1

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health, 23*(4), 334-340.

Shrestha, P. (2020). *Dynamic assessment of students' academic writing.* Springer International Publishing. Shrestha,

P., & Coffin, C. (2012). Dynamic assessment, tutor mediation and academic writing development. *Assessing Writing, 17*(1), 55-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2011.11.003

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.

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.

Swain, M. (2001). Examining dialogue: Another approach to content specification and to validating inferences drawn from test scores. *Language Testing, 18*(3), 275-302. https://doi.org/10.1177/026553220101800302

Tang, Y., & Ma, X. (2023). An interventionist dynamic assessment approach to college English writing in China. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 20*(1), 44-65.

Tarighat, S., & Khodabakhsh, S. (2016). Mobile-assisted language assessment: Assessing speaking. *Computers in Human Behavior, 64*, 409-413. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.07.014

Teo, A. (2012). Promoting EFL students' inferential reading skills through computerized dynamic assessment, *Language Learning and Technology, 16*(3), 10-20.

Torang, P., & Weisi, H. (2023). Providing synchronous mobile-mediated dynamic glosses: is it effective for novice EFL learners to understand the meanings of unfamiliar words?. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2164776

Tzuriel, D. (2000). Dynamic assessment of young children: Educational and intervention perspectives. *Educational Psychology Review, 12*(4), 385-435.

Tzuriel, D. (2001). *Dynamic assessment of young children.* New York: Springer.

Tzuriel, D. (2011). Revealing the effects of cognitive education programmes through dynamic assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 18*(2), 113-131.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press.

Wang, P. (2015). The effect of dynamic assessment on the listening skills of lower-intermediate EFL learners in Chinese technical college: A pilot study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 6(*6), 1269-1279.

Yang, Y., & Qian, D. D. (2019). Promoting L2 English learners' reading proficiency through computerized dynamic assessment. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 33*(5-6), 628-652.

Yang, Y., & Qian, D. D. (2023). Enhancing EFL learners' reading proficiency through dynamic assessment. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 20*(1), 20-43.

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

Appendix

Written Interview Form

1. Did you encounter any difficulties during the face-to-face meetings you held throughout the study process? If you had, could you explain these difficulties in detail?

2. Did you encounter any difficulties during the interviews you made via WhatsApp throughout the study process? If you had, could you explain these difficulties in detail?

3. Do you prefer to participate in face-to-face or WhatsApp activities that require summarizing stories, similar to the practices you did throughout the study process? Why?

4. Which of the meetings, face-to-face or via WhatsApp, you had throughout the study process was more stressful for you? Why?

5. Do you think that your teacher communicating with you during the meetings throughout the study process is beneficial for language learning? Why?