



Please cite this paper as follows:

Kazemi, A., Bagheri, M., S., & Rassaei, E. (2021). Impact of Interventionist Dynamic Assessment on Iranian EFL Learners' L2 Reading Comprehension and Classroom Engagement. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 9 (39), 67-79.

## Research Paper

### Impact of Interventionist Dynamic Assessment on Iranian EFL Learners' L2 Reading Comprehension and Classroom Engagement

Akram Kazemi<sup>1</sup>, Mohammad Sadegh Bagheri<sup>2\*</sup>, Ehsan Rassaei<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English Language, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran

*Aky.kazemi@gmail.com*

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Department of English Language, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran

*bagheries@gmail.com*

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor, Department of English Language, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran

*ehsanrassaei@yahoo.com*

#### Abstract

The current study investigated the impact of an interventionist model of dynamic assessment, using a repetitive process of pretest-teach-posttest design, on Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension and classroom engagement. To this end, 40 intermediate participants were selected through convenient sampling from among the English majors of a university in Kerman, Iran, and assigned to two control and experimental groups, each including 20 students. Then, during 4-month period, the experimental group was exposed to reading comprehension class, using an interventionist model of DA, while the control group did not receive any dynamic assessment program. At the end of the treatment, the participants' scores on the pretest and post-test were statistically compared. The obtained results revealed that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group on the scales of reading comprehension skill. A change was also observed in the classroom engagement of the experimental group, but not for the control group. Indeed, the results showed that dynamic assessment can boost participants' performance in a practical and effective way, not only in terms of reading performance but also in terms of motivating more classroom engagement among EFL learners. This finding has implications for teachers to design more efficient courses which are the ultimate goal of education.



**Keywords:** *Interventionist Dynamic Assessment, reading comprehension, classroom engagement*

### Introduction

According to Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994), Dynamic Assessment (DA) has become of the growing interest of scholars as a way through which two vital aspects of the process of teaching and learning; that is, instruction and assessment, being conventionally isolated, become integrated and unified to promote learners' language development. They believe that DA can be regarded as a continuum through which the learner firstly is mediated by the teacher employing implicit forms of assistance and increasingly shifting to explicit ones if needed by the learner. Moving across this continuum is an indicator of a learner's zone of proximal development (ZPD), defined as the distance between what an individual can accomplish independently and what one can accomplish with more expert assistance (Lantolf and Poehner (2004). It means that as the learner moves forward, the types of prompts being employed by the teacher (i.e. implicit or explicit) and the frequency being needed overtime will be changed revealing the fact that the learner is shifting from a reliance on other-regulation to self-regulation and is achieving a greater degree of independence and increased control of the language (Aljaafreh and Lantolf, 1994; Lantolf, 2012). DA, therefore, provides opportunities through which both instruction and assessment go forward hand in hand.

Experts of dynamic assessment (e.g., Anton, 2009; Haywood, 2012) believe that DA does not essentially help students to get better scores; rather, it is aimed at diagnosing their ZPD. They state that to have a deeper diagnosis of the learners' ability, the mediated score that learners get shows the amount of mediation that they undergo and respond to in the ZPD (Poehner et al., 2015; Vygotsky, 1986). The diagnosis of developmental processes (Poehner and van Compernelle, 2020) predicts individuals' performance where instruction and assessment are seamlessly merged into one unified activity to the extent that such diagnosis helps ultimately perform solo. However, learners sometimes do not profit much from mediation and, therefore, it cannot be helpful to much more learning, especially when their ZPD is well developed and the ability is already matured. When learners with an actual low ability fail to make great leaps in getting higher scores in the mediated performance, this puts into question the efficiency of using DA (Hidri, 2019). Tzuriel (2001) mentions that "DA originated from both theoretical conceptions and practical needs to introduce new diagnostic measures for learners who for any reasons do not show their full capacities in conventional tasks" (p. 5). Tzuriel (2001) continues that dynamic assessment has bloomed because the static assessments did not report enough information about the differences between individuals' learning processes, how they change ideas to actions, and assign them to appropriate educational contexts. Indeed, with the implementation of dynamic assessment, teachers can assess the learning processes rather than the products.

The integration of DA in L2 settings indicates the effective exploration of DA implementation and L2 English reading comprehension (Naeini and Duvall, 2012; Hamavandi, Rezai, and Mazdayasna, 2017), speaking (Davison, Leung, Hill and Sabet, 2009), writing (Nassaji and Swain, 2000), grammar (Sadeghi and Khanahmadi, 2011), and vocabulary (Hessamy and Ghaderi, 2014). Naeini and Duvall (2012), for example, using DA among English university learners, reported a significant progress in reading comprehension of the participants. In the same line, in 2017, Hamavandi, Rezai, and Mazdayasna, implementing DA, showed that DA functions as a better predictor of learners' reading comprehension than a traditional

assessment. The present study seeks to reconfirm these findings and, thus, answer the following research questions:

**RQ1.** Does the implementation of DA affect EFL learners' reading comprehension?

**RQ2.** Does the implementation of DA affect EFL learners' classroom engagement?

### **Review of Literature**

Haywood and Lidz (2000) believe that dynamic assessment is a form of interaction in which a teacher or assessor help learners extend their performance beyond levels they could reach independently. DA has been employed primarily in the context of standardized testing, and support has taken the form of carefully scripted hints and prompts. In the field of second/ foreign language learning, DA has been more prevalent in classroom settings, where it typically unfolds dialogically. Lantolf and Poehner (2004) describe dynamic assessment as an approach that combines evaluation with instruction in order to construct the development of learners through appropriate forms of mediation. In Russia, Vygotsky and in Israel, Feuerstein both created an alternative to the conventional methods of IQ testing. Although the terminology used by both researchers is slightly different, their concepts are nevertheless very much alike (Lantolf and Poehner, 2009). Whilst Feuerstein considered linking assessment with intervention as a means to measure one's ability to benefit from mediation, Vygotsky investigated the potential development of an individual through the analysis of his or her independent and mediated performance (Sternberg and Grigorenko, 2002).

Different researchers have proposed different definitions for the concept of "dynamic assessment". Lussier and Swanson (2005) define dynamic assessment as a "procedure that attempts to modify performance, via examiners' assistance, in an effort to understand learning potential"(p.66). According to Beak and Kim (2003), DA requires the interaction between tester and student. If a student finds it difficult to solve a problem or address a question, the tester seeks to shift the student from failure to success by changing the format, presenting additional examples or experiments, modeling a suitable method for success or giving ever more precise indicators or prompts. Stanley (1993, as cited in Beak and Kim, 2003) presented dynamic assessment procedures in a very concrete form. First, the examiner measures the learner who works alone (static mode) to provide a competency assessment on a task to set a benchmark. Second, as the child works on a comparable job, the examiner provides a guided protocol of assistance and guidance (dynamic mode). Third, a post-test is given with an alternate form of the original measurement while the learner works alone (static mode) on the task. Fourth, the examiner compares the test and retest measurements to establish the learners' zone of proximal development (ZPD, Vygotsky, 1978). Fifth, the examiner analyzes the learner's performance on both product and process.

Dynamic assessment (DA) is generally defined as an approach that simultaneously combines the teaching and evaluation activities. In other words, DA conceives instruction and assessment as two sides of the same coin that are not separable in the sense that good instruction requires assessment, and that good evaluation requires instruction. So, instruction and assessment are two complimentary aspects of methodology which should optimally result in true learning. Since DA offers individuals an opportunity to learn, it gives important information about learners' learning and thinking process, learners' strategies and ways in which these strategies may be enhanced. Therefore; it offers potentially useful suggestions about teaching. According to Poehner and Lantolf (2005), the goal of dynamic evaluation is not only to help the learners get through a specific task but also to help the learners with their future tasks through mediation that is negotiated between the instructor and the learners.

### Empirical Studies on Dynamic Assessment

As Poehner (2008) rightly argued, while there is increasing interest among applied linguists in Vygotskian theory, few studies have explored how DA concepts can be used in L2 contexts (e.g. Ajideh and Nourdad, 2012; Antón, 2009; Kozulin and Garb, 2002; Poehner, 2008). Group-based and one-to-one DA procedures follow the same general principle of offering learners' mediation to help them co-construct a ZPD, but they differ in that that Group DA must also take account of the group's ZPD.

Ableeva (2008) used DA with six students studying French in a broad university environment. Ableeva wrote that this experience exposed the problem areas of the learners that centered on the inability to recognize recognized terms and the inability to assess the meaning of new lexical objects. She concluded, "it should be emphasized that the problem areas were revealed only on the basis of participants' performance throughout the DA stage, during which a flexible mediator learner interaction was involved" (p.73). Antón (2009) also conducted a study in which examined the usefulness of DA in promoting the speaking and writing ability of five Spanish majors university students. The mediation protocol used in this study, similar to Ableeva (2008)'s study was non-standardized. Students were permitted to review a dictionary and grammar manual, and ask questions from the mediator. The mediator answered questions by "adjusting action to what is required in each particular case in order to complete the assignment and demonstrate the full potential of the skill of the learners" (p.592). Antón concluded that DA provided a better appreciation of the talents of the students.

Sadeghi and Khanahmadi (2011) investigated the impact of the DA on the production of grammar for Iranian EFL learners. To that end, in their research, they used a pre-test post-test method. Finally, they reported a significant impact of DA on the grammar knowledge formed by participants. This study is similar to our study in the sense that both have investigated the effect of DA on Iranian EFL learners' grammar. Modarresi and Alavi (2014) explored the learners of DA and non-DA group' perceptions of DA and found the following common factors: novelty (20.7%), more opportunities (19.1%), feeling comfortable (15.4%), reaction to scores (8%), motivation (6.8%), and test timing (5.9%). According to the study results, as a result of using computerized DA, learners enjoy an emotionally safe environment, their stress, anxiety, and concerns about the consequences of their failure are reduced and their self-esteem and self-concept are increased.

Tavakoli and Nezakat-Alhossaini (2014) examined the effectiveness of implementing corrective feedback in light of DA techniques on the learning of reported speech structures by foreign language learners. Two English language classes were chosen as the experimental group and control group in a language center in Iran each having 15 students. The experimental group provided therapy with DA, while the control group only adopted the language center routines. The participants took two post-tests, i.e. one immediately after the treatment and another one after two weeks. The researchers concluded that the combination of DA treatment and corrective feedback was effective in enhancing the participants' learning reported speech structures. Davoudi and Ataie-Tabar (2015) investigated the effect of a computerized dynamic test of writing (CDTW) on Iranian EFL students' L2 writing performance, using an interventionist approach. It was concluded that CDTW could be used to assess students' writing development. Also, the results showed that students' performance was improved in terms of the development of four major sub-skills of writing. Effectiveness of CDTW was also supported in the participants' attitudes. A major point of interest of this study is investigation of sub-skills of writing in an attempt to spot the detailed writing problems of the students. Computerized taste of the study also

adds to novelty of the topic. Ashraf, Motallebzadeh, and Ghazizadeh (2016) investigated the impact of the electronic-based DA on Iranian EFL learners' listening skills. The findings showed an important impact of SCT-based electronic teaching on the listening skills of the Iranian EFL learners. This research is very similar in context as well as in process to the analysis by Ebadi and Latif (2015). Accordingly, the points mentioned on Ebadi and Latif's (2015) study is also true about this one.

Poehner (2005) investigated the effect of dynamic assessment on the speaking skills of the learners. After watching short videos, participants were asked to orally create a collection of narratives from past-tense. The learners had to create the first narrative independently, while they received some mediation from the teacher in a second narrative. They concluded that providing mediation would improve the learners' awareness and result in speaking more accurately. According to Poehner, "DA is an effective means of understanding learners' abilities and helping them to overcome linguistic problems. The approach is especially relevant to L2 classrooms as a method for rendering formative assessment practices more systematic" (p. iv). Hessels (2009) used a dynamic measure to validate the Hessels Analogical Reasoning Test (HART), a standardized test of children's learning potential and concluded that: (a) young children need to be familiarized with a test to be able to respond to the item in the way that is expected; (b) the HART posttest measure is a better predictor of learning than the static pretest; and (c) dynamic measures of learning are preferred to static measures.

Ableeva (2010) conducted a study on the effect of DA on improving the listening comprehension of students learning French as a foreign language, and compared the results to a regular test of listening. The findings showed that DA clarifies the causes of the learners' bad output, which were unclear during typical evaluations. The results also indicated that DA revealed not only the actual level of learners' listening ability but also their potential level of development while simultaneously enhancing this development. Lantolf and Poehner's (2011) study showed the positive effect of DA in the fourth and fifth grade Spanish classrooms. In this study, the mediator (teacher) used organized mediation prompts to assess noun/adjective agreement in Spanish. Sadeghi and Khanahmadi (2011) investigated the role of DA based versus non-DA based activities in learning L2 grammar of Iranian EFL learners. The findings mainly showed that the form of instruction based on DA (mediation) has made a big difference in Iranian EFL learners learning grammar. Using teacher mediation within a DA system to support business students in open and distance learning contexts conducted by Shrestha, and Coffin (2012). The study revealed the role and positive effect of teacher mediation, following the DA, in the development of academic writing among undergraduate business students studying open and distance learning. In a study, Kao (2020) indicated that DA outperformed the NDA group in terms of promoting improvements in the speaking performance of college students. The interactive mediation provided through DA assisted advanced learners' content development in speaking and assisted beginning learners' control of grammatical structures.

A plethora of the studies covering the domain of DA has taken either computer-only mediation or human-only mediation (e.g. Poehner and van Compernelle, 2020) or human-computer mixture into account. In this regard, the interaction between a single individual learner and one teacher on whose basis the latter provides Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)-attuned assistance to the former to develop his/her emerging abilities is termed interactionist approach to DA (Ableeva, 2008; Anton, 2009) which is the human-only mediation. The computer-only mediation, on the other hand, is termed the interventionist approach to DA which consists of computerized studies on DA (Poehner and Lantolf, 2013; Poehner, Zhang, and Lu, 2015) along with the classroom-conducted DA inquiries. In previous studies, the use of computer, once on its



own and once by the researcher's simultaneous provision of assistance, was not considered. As an example, Poehner (2007) focused on transcendence – tracking the sustainability of the development of learners in novel and more complex contexts – using one-on-one interactions (i.e. human-only mediation). In a computer-only instance, Teo (2012) carried out an action study to promote the reading skills of 68 Taiwanese freshmen through a software program called View let Quiz 3 (i.e. computerized dynamic assessment). Likewise, some studies have utilized the mixture of computer and human, Tzuriel, Poehner and Lantolf (2013), and Poehner, Zhang, and Lu (2015), to strengthen their findings. So far, a consensus has been reached by Tzuriel and Poehner and Lantolf (2013) on the useful applicability of the human mediator presence in case the mediation provided by computer fails to reach a desired response. However, these have not used computers separately (i.e. once by their own and once by the simultaneous provision of assistance from researchers). Ebadi and Saeedian (2016) explored the learners' development in L2 reading comprehension in novel and increasingly more complex situations through computerized DA. The results confirmed the significant effect of increased task complexity on the learners' reading comprehension development. They concluded that transcendence impacts the growth of the learners. Since the use of technology has recently become a hot issue in language teaching, this study will make a major contribution to achievements in our field.

To sum up, a brief overview of the few studies carried out in the field of dynamic assessment (DA), particularly in the context of education, reveals the usefulness of this approach in helping learners to achieve higher levels of learning.

## **Methodology**

### **Design**

A quasi-experimental research design with two intact classes was used in the present study to see the effect of using dynamic assessment (independent variable) on EFL learners' reading comprehension, reading motivation and metacognitive awareness (dependent variables). The design was actually a sequential one, meaning that qualitative data was used to enrich quantitative data: QUAN+ Qual.

### **Participants**

The 40 participants of this study were selected through convenience sampling from among 70 English majors of a university in Kerman, Iran, and homogenized through Longman Placement Test (LPT) as intermediate EFL learners (21 males and 29 females), with the age range of 18 to 25 years. At the time of the study; that is, during COVID-19 pandemic lockdown, all these learners enrolled in an online English reading comprehension course. They had not received any strategy-based reading instruction before. They were randomly assigned to a control group without implementation intentions and an experimental group with implementation intentions that were related to the DA intervention. They were assured that there was no evaluation of their academic performance and participation or non-participation in the study did not influence their course grades.

### **Instruments**

To collect the required data before and after the program, the researcher utilized a language proficiency test, a reading comprehension test and a questionnaire as the instruments of the study. The description of each instrument is presented below. They were used at the beginning and at the end of the study respectively.

### Longman Placement Test (LPT)

To choose homogenous participants in terms of language proficiency, a criterion-referenced measure developed by Pearson Longman ELT (2006), was used. This test (LPT) contained 100 written multiple questions and places students as follows:

- 00-20 Below Elementary
- 21-35 Elementary
- 36-60 Pre-intermediate
- 61-85 Intermediate
- 86-100 Upper-Intermediate

### Reading Comprehension Test

The participants' reading comprehension ability was evaluated through a reading comprehension test. This test comprised 4 reading passages with 40 multiple-choice teacher-made reading comprehension questions that measured how much the students had learned from the reading. Each reading passage was followed by three tasks: free recall, sentence completion, and multiple-choice questions. Free recall asked participants to write down in English as much as possible about the reading passage without looking back at the passage. The sentence completion task asked the participants to complete sentences according to the reading passages, and the multiple-choice questions asked the participants to select the one correct answer to the question from four choices. The test was piloted with 10 intermediate students and the reliability was calculated through Cronbach's alpha (0.797).

### Student Engagement Questionnaire

To assess the participants' classroom engagement, Lam et al. (2014) classroom engagement questionnaire (33 items) was used: a 3-item factor labeled affective engagement, behavioral engagement, and cognitive engagement. The affective engagement subscale (9 items) assesses students' feelings for learning and school. The behavioral engagement subscale (12 items) measures students' effort in learning and participation in school activities. The cognitive engagement subscale (12 items) evaluates students' use of meaningful information processing strategies in learning. The students were asked to indicate their agreement to the affective and behavioral engagement items on a 5-point scale, with 1 for *strongly disagree* and 5 for *strongly agree*. But for the cognitive engagement items, they were asked to indicate how frequently they did so on a 5-point scale, with 1 for *never* and 5 for *always*. This measure has demonstrated adequate internal consistency (.86) in the present study using Cronbach's alpha.

### Procedure

In order to find answers to the research questions of the study, after choosing appropriate participants by administering the language proficiency test and assigning them to control and experimental groups, the experimental group was taught through using an interventionist model of DA, and the control group was with no DA program. Actually, the participants in the control group were required to just read the texts silently and answer the related reading comprehension questions. With the experimental group, DA was regarded as a continuum through which they were initially mediated by the teacher employing implicit forms of assistance and increasingly

shifting to explicit ones if needed. Practically, here a repetitive process of pretest-teach-retest was performed; that is, a pretest was given to the participants to discover what information they already possessed. Then, the teacher let them try without assistance. A teaching time on the unknown material followed the pretest. Then, the teacher repeated the part of the statements where the mistakes were and asked a question that might provide the clue for the learners to realize the point. Later, the teacher directly pointed out the mistake(s) and gave explicit explanations. Finally, another similar test was given. After four months, the participants' progress was evaluated by comparing the reading comprehension results and classroom engagement of the control and experimental groups.

### Results

In order to examine the effect of DA on EFL learners' reading comprehension, independent-sample *t*-test, paired-sample *t*-test, and the effect size were run. The obtained results are as follows:

Tables 1 to 4 below reveal that participants of experimental group had significant gains in the reading test scores in the post-test, and the effect size was  $ES=2.48$  and  $r=0.778$ . Likewise, the control group participants demonstrated some gains in reading scores, and the effect size was  $ES=0.62$  and  $r=0.30$ .

**Table 1**

*Paired Sample t-test of reading comprehension (CG)*

Time	N	Mean	St. Deviation	<i>t</i> -Test	Df	<i>P</i> -Value
pretest	20	9.80	2.27	-5.53	19	0.0005
posttest	20	11.40	2.86			

**Table 2**

*Paired Sample t-test of reading comprehension (EG)*

Time	N	Mean	St. Deviation	<i>t</i> -Test	Df	<i>P</i> -Value
Pretest	20	9.32	2.74	-16.68	19	0.0005
Posttest	20	15.83	2.53			

**Table 3**

*Independent T-test of reading comprehension (pre-test)*

Group	N	Mean	St. Deviation	<i>t</i> -Test	Df	<i>P</i> -Value
				0.53	38	0.6



<b>Control</b>	20	9.80	2.27
<b>Experimental</b>	20	9.32	2.74

**Table 4***Independent t-test of reading comprehension (post-test)*

				<b>t-Test</b>	<b>Df</b>	<b>P-Value</b>
<b>Group</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Deviation</b>	-4.50	38	0.0005
<b>Control</b>	20	11.40	2.86			
<b>Experimental</b>	20	15.83	2.53			

The results in tables 5 to 8 below reveal that the participants from the EG group had significant gains in the classroom engagement in the post-test, and the effect size was  $ES=3.82$  and  $r=0.886$ . But, the control group participants demonstrated no gains in classroom engagement to.

**Table 5***Paired Sample t-test of Classroom Engagement (CG)*

<b>Time</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Deviation</b>	<b>t-Test</b>	<b>Df</b>	<b>P-Value</b>
<b>Pretest</b>	20	44.40	12.91	0.29	19	0.8
<b>Posttest</b>	20	43.87	7.60			

**Table 6***Paired Sample t-test of Classroom Engagement (EG)*

<b>Time</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Deviation</b>	<b>t-Test</b>	<b>Df</b>	<b>P-Value</b>
<b>pretest</b>	20	39.47	14.43	-9.06	19	0.0005
<b>posttest</b>	20	85.0	9.39			

**Table 7***Independent t-test of Classroom Engagement (pre-test)*

				<b>t-Test</b>	<b>Df</b>	<b>P-Value</b>
<b>Group</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Deviation</b>			

<b>Control</b>	20	44.40	12.91			
<b>Experimental</b>	20	39.47	14.43	0.99	38	0.3

**Table 8***Independent t-test of Classroom Engagement (post-test)*

				<b>t-Test</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>P-Value</b>
<b>Group</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Deviation</b>	-13.19	38	0.0005
<b>Control</b>	20	43.87	7.60			
<b>Experimental</b>	20	85.0	9.39			

Generally-speaking, the results of the study tabulated above, did not show a significant difference in the mean scores for the pre-test and post-test of the control group, while the results strongly confirmed a significant difference in the mean scores for experimental group in the pre-test and post-test.

### Discussion

In this study, DA effects on the EFL learners' reading comprehension and classroom engagement were investigated. A significant finding of the study was its accentuation of the fact that using DA to boost participants' performance was practical and effective, not only in improving their reading performance but also in motivating more classroom engagement among the participants. In line with the findings of some other studies (e.g., Ahmadi and Barabadi, 2014; Hidri, 2014; Poehner and van Compernelle, 2020; Kozulin and Garb, 2002; Poehner, 2008; Ableeva, 2008, Pishghadam, Barabadi and Mehri Kamrood, 2011; Naeini and Duvall, 2012; Hamavandi, Rezai, and Mazdayasna, 2017), the findings of the present study reinforced the idea that DA creates a supportive atmosphere to highlight the learners' further learning and improvement by considering their ZPD. Thus, developing the learner ability is dependent not only on the past learning experience, but also on the assessment that the learner is engaged in. Anton (2009), believes that educators may misrepresent learners' abilities if they just consider the results of traditional assessments. According to Poehner and Lantolf (2005), the construct of ZPD imply that the potential development differs from the actual one, and this conveyed the truth of the premise that the latter cannot not be a predictor of the former. He adds that fairness in education necessitates providing appropriate mediation directed to learners' LP in that assessment should be able to assess this size and describe the learners' ever-changing ability to learn with mediation (Poehner and Lantolf, 2010). Indeed, DA creates an enjoyable learning environment, and causes instructional benefits to learners. In fact, traditional testing methods put the learner's development on hold, meaning that learning during testing is superficial at best (Naeini and Duvall, 2012). Traditional assessment-oriented approaches do not provide a direct benefit to the learner during the testing phase while dynamic assessment approaches are designed to do that and provide an immediate change in the learner's cognitive, psychological, and educational functioning. Thus, according to Caffrey (2006), dynamic assessment is an assessment tool to

measure current ability, predict future ability, and design interventions. Advocates of DA have confirmed that in traditional forms of assessment merely those abilities which have already developed are determined, while those abilities that are developing are naturally neglected and significant opportunities to mature our assessment are missing.

### Conclusion

The current study confirmed DA as an effective and practical support in EFL reading comprehension classrooms. Pedagogically, the value of DA is not just to scaffold learners so that they produce a correct answer but rather to help them arrive at new understandings that will in turn construct their future performances. In fact, DA is a systematic, development-oriented framework for teaching in EFL settings. The bidirectional nature of DA interaction is particularly well aligned to existing models and practices in the EFL/ESL classrooms. Unlike traditional assessments, the ultimate goals of dynamic assessment are promoting learning and motivation based on the mediations provided by the teachers following the most prominent concept of ZPD, developed by Vygotsky (cited in Rashidi and Bahadori Nejad, 2018). In short, it can be concluded that dynamic assessment provides suitable information about the problem source, development, and the potential ability of learners to help teachers in designing more efficient courses, which, based on Ajideh, Farrokhi, and Nourdad (2012), is the ultimate goal of education.

A final word and a number of suggestions are fitting here: dynamic assessment complements existing testing practices, and offers numerous avenues of progress for teachers, students, and researchers. As for suggestions, it should be stated that future research can use other types of DA rather than individual interventionist model of dynamic assessment used in this study. Also, evaluation of dynamic effects in other educational settings like institutes and universities with more participants can be done. Additionally, this study considered just English language reading comprehension. Future studies can cover other components of English language. A very interesting line of future research is to understand the impact of dynamic assessment in different cultures and various environments.

### References

- Ableeva, R. (2008). The effects of dynamic assessment on L2 listening comprehension. In J. P. Lantolf and M. E. Poehner (Eds.), *Socio-cultural theory and the teaching of second languages* (pp. 57-86). London, UK: Equinox.
- Ableeva, R. (2010). Dynamic assessment of listening comprehension in second language learning.
- Ajideh, P., Farrokhi, F., and Nourdad, N. (2012). Dynamic assessment of EFL reading: Revealing hidden aspects at different proficiency levels. *World Journal of Education*, 2, 102-111.
- Alavi, S. M., & Taghizadeh, M. (2014). Dynamic assessment of writing: The impact of implicit/explicit mediations on L2 learners' internalization of writing skills and strategies. *Educational assessment*, 19(1), 1-16.
- Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 465-483.
- Anton, M. (2009). Dynamic assessment of advanced second language learners. *Foreign Lang. Ann.* 42(3), 576-598.
- Ashraf, H., Motallebzadeh, Kh. and Ghazizadeh, F. The impact of electronic-based dynamic assessment on the listening skill of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 6(1), pp. 24- 3

- Beak, S., & Kim, K. (2003). Effect of dynamic assessment-based instruction on children's learning. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 4(2), 189-198.
- Davison, C., and Leung, C. (2009). Current issues in English language teacher-based assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(3), 393-415.
- Davoudi, M., & Ataie-Tabar, M. (2015). The effect of computerized dynamic assessment of L2 writing on Iranian EFL learners' writing development. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, 3(2), 176-186.
- Ebadi, S., & Saeedian, A. (2016). Exploring transcendence in EFL learners' reading comprehension through computerized dynamic assessment. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 4, 27-45.
- Ebadi, S., & Vakili Latif, Sh. (2015). Dynamic Assessment of EFL learners' listening comprehension via computerized concept mapping. *i-manager's Journal of Educational Technology*, 12(2), 29-41.
- Hamavandi, M., Rezai, M. J., and Mazdayasna, G. (2017). Dynamic assessment of morphological awareness in the EFL context. *Cogent Education*, 4(1), 1-14.
- Haywood, H.C. (2012). Dynamic assessment: a history of fundamental ideas. *J. Cognit. Educ. Psychol.* 11(3), 217-229.
- Hessamy, G., and Ghaderi, E. (2014). The role of dynamic assessment in the vocabulary learning of Iranian EFL learners. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 645-52.
- Hidri, S., 2019. Static vs. dynamic assessment of students' writing exams: a comparison of two assessment modes. *Int. Multidiscip. Res. J.* 13(4), 239-256.
- Kao, Y. A. (2020). Comparison Study of Dynamic Assessment and Nondynamic Assessment on EFL Chinese Learners' Speaking Performance: Transfer of Learning. *English Teaching & Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-019-00042-1>
- Kozulin, A., and Garb, E. (2002). Dynamic assessment of EFL text comprehension of at-risk students. *School Psychology International*, 23, 112-127.
- Lantolf, J. P., and Poehner, M. E. (2004). Dynamic assessment: Bringing the past into the future. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 49-74.
- Lantolf, J. P., and Poehner, M. E. (2011). Dynamic assessment in the classroom: Vygotskian praxis for second language development. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(1), 11-33.
- Lidz, C. S. (2000). The application of cognitive functions scale (ACFS): An example of curriculum-based dynamic assessment. In C. S. Lidz & J. G. Elliott (Eds.), *Dynamic assessment: Prevailing models and applications* (pp. 407-39). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Modarresi, Gh. & Alavi, S. M. (2013). A critical overview of computerized dynamic assessment software programs. *Elixir International Journal: Lang. & Testing* 65, 18-24.
- Naeini, J., and Duvall, E. (2012). Dynamic assessment and the impact on English language learners' reading comprehension performance. *Language Testing in Asia*, 2(2), 22-41.
- Nassaji, H., and Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness*, 9(1), 34-51.
- Poehner, M. (2008). *Dynamic assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting L2 development*. Berlin: Springer.
- Poehner, M.E., Lantolf, J. P. (2005). Dynamic assessment in the language classroom. *Lang. Teach. Res.* 9 (3), 233-265.

- Poehner, M.E., van Compernelle, R.A. (2020). Reconsidering time and process in L2 dynamic assessment. In: Poehner, M., Inbar-Lourie, O. (Eds.), *Toward a Reconceptualization of Second Language Classroom Assessment*. Springer, Cham, pp. 173–195.
- Poehner, M.E., Zhang, J., Lu, X. (2015). Computerized dynamic assessment (C-DA): diagnosing L2 development according to learner responsiveness to mediation. *Lang. Test.* 32 (3), 337–357.
- Sadeghi, K., and Khanahmadi, F. (2011). Dynamic assessment of L2 grammar of Iranian EFL learners: The role of mediated learning experience. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(2), 931–6.
- Shrestha, P., & Coffin, C. (2012). Dynamic assessment, tutor mediation and academic writing development. *Assessing writing*, 17(1), 55-70.
- Stanley, N. V. (1993). Gifted and the zone of proximal development. *Gifted Educational International*, 9, 78-81.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2002). *Dynamic testing: The nature and measurement of learning potential*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tavakoli, Mansoor., and Nezakat-Alhossaini, Marzieh (2014). “Implementation of corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language classroom through dynamic assessment.” *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(1), pp.211-232
- Teo, A. (2012). Social-Interactive writing for language learners. *CATESOL Journal*, 18 (1), 160-178.
- Tzuriel, D. (2001). *Dynamic assessment of young children*. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1986). *Thought and Language*. MIT Press.