



Please cite this paper as follows:

Safarpour, S., Mashhadi Heidar, D., & Rahimy, R. (2024). Interventionist Face-to-Face versus Web-Based Group Dynamic Assessment and Speaking Ability: A Case on Introverted/Extroverted Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 12 (50), 169-189. <http://doi.org/10.30495/IJFL.2023.703378>

Research Paper

## Interventionist Face-to-Face versus Web-Based Group Dynamic Assessment and Speaking Ability: A Case on Introverted/Extroverted Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners

Samaneh Safarpour<sup>1</sup>, Davood Mashhadi Heidar\*<sup>2</sup>, Ramin Rahimy<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English Language, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran  
[samaneh.safarpour2424@gmail.com](mailto:samaneh.safarpour2424@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of English Language, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekanon, Iran

[davoodm\\_tarbiatmodares@yahoo.com](mailto:davoodm_tarbiatmodares@yahoo.com)

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

[raminrahimy49@yahoo.com](mailto:raminrahimy49@yahoo.com)

Received: April 04, 2024

Accepted: June 17, 2024

### Abstract

The present study sought to investigate the effects of face-to-face and web-based group dynamic assessment (GDA) on the speaking skills of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. A total of 100 participants from Ariana Institute in Rasht were involved in the study, with 36 introverted and 36 extroverted learners selected based on their scores on the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) and Eysenck's Personality test. These participants were then divided into experimental and control groups. Each experimental group, comprising 12 participants, underwent either face-to-face or web-based GDA sessions, while the control groups received traditional instruction. The research design included a pretest, 15 treatment sessions, and a posttest to assess the progress of speaking abilities among the learners. The statistical analysis, which included paired samples t-test and one-way ANOVA, indicated significant enhancements in speaking skills among the learners who participated in the experimental GDA sessions compared to those in the control groups. Notably, introverted learners in the web-based GDA group exhibited superior speaking abilities, whereas extroverted learners showed more improvement in face-to-face GDA sessions. These results have important implications for English language educators and researchers in Iran, highlighting the significant influence of GDA delivery mode on the speaking proficiency of EFL learners, particularly in relation to their introverted or extroverted traits. Such findings can offer valuable insights for pedagogical approaches and theoretical frameworks in English language teaching in Iran.

**Keywords:** Face- to face group dynamic assessment, Extroverted learners, Introverted learners, Speaking skills, Web-based group dynamic assessment

پژوهش حاضر به دنبال بررسی تأثیر ارزیابی پویای گروهی چهره به چهره و مبتنی بر وب بر مهارت گفتاری زبان آموزان ایرانی زبان انگلیسی در سطح متوسط است. در مجموع ۱۰۰ زبان آموز از موسسه آریانا رشت در این مطالعه شرکت کردند که ۳۶ نفر درون‌گرا و ۳۶ نفر بیرون‌گرا بر اساس نمرات آنها در آزمون تعیین سطح آکسفورد (OPT) و آزمون شخصیت آیزنک (Eysenck) انتخاب شدند. سپس این شرکت کنندگان به گروه‌های آزمایش و کنترل تقسیم شدند. هر گروه آزمایشی شامل ۱۲ زبان آموز، تحت آموزش ارزیابی پویای گروهی حضوری و مبتنی بر وب قرار گرفتند، در حالی که گروه‌های کنترل از آموزش متداول برخوردار بودند. طرح تحقیق شامل یک پیش‌آزمون، ۱۵ جلسه آموزش و یک پس‌آزمون برای ارزیابی پیشرفت مهارت‌های گفتاری در بین زبان آموزان بود. نتایج حاصل از تجزیه و تحلیل آماری با استفاده از آزمون تی وابسته و آنالیز واریانس یک طرفه افزایش قابل توجهی را در مهارت‌های گفتاری در بین فراگیران آزمایشی نسبت به گروه‌های کنترل نشان داد. شایان ذکر است، زبان آموزان درون‌گرا در گروه آزمایشی ارزیابی پویای گروهی مبتنی بر وب و زبان آموزان بیرون‌گرا در گروه‌های ارزیابی پویای گروهی چهره به چهره توانایی‌های گفتاری فردی را نسبت به دیگر گروه‌ها نشان دادند. نتایج بدست آمده از این تحقیق مبنی بر تأثیر قابل توجه روش ارزیابی پویا بر مهارت گفتاری زبان آموزان انگلیسی با توجه به شخصیت‌های فردی درون‌گرا و بیرون‌گرا دست آورده‌های مهمی برای مربیان و محققان زبان انگلیسی در ایران در پی دارد. چنین یافته‌هایی می‌تواند بینش‌های ارزشمندی را برای رویکردهای آموزشی و چارچوب‌های نظری در آموزش زبان انگلیسی در ایران ارائه دهد.

واژگان کلیدی: فراگیران درون‌گرا، فراگیران بیرون‌گرا، مهارت گفتاری، مبتنی بر وب، ارزیابی پویا گروهی چهره به چهره



## Introduction

The aspiration to achieve fluency in spoken English is a common objective among the majority of EFL learners, as highlighted by Kazemi and Tavassoli (2020) and Teferi (2023). This goal has consistently been a primary focus for language learners, given that speaking is considered a productive skill that educators strive to enhance. By empowering EFL learners to produce meaningful statements during interactions, speaking encourages the active use of language (Azizi et al., 2020). Furthermore, speaking is acknowledged as an interactive, social, and contextualized form of communication. It plays a crucial role in establishing and nurturing social connections, expressing emotions, and conveying personal identities (Tridinanti, 2018). As noted by Mardiah (2022), achieving proficiency in speaking is often deemed the most critical aspect of learning a second or foreign language, with proficiency assessed by the ability to engage in discussions in the target language. However, speaking presents challenges for students as it requires proficiency in various aspects, such as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension (Ghafar & Raheem, 2023).

Additionally, to evaluate students' speaking skills in a specific instructional program, teachers can employ various methods. These methods include formative assessment, dynamic assessment, diagnostic assessment, performance assessment, and so on (Kazemi & Tavassoli, 2020). In this study, the preferred method was dynamic assessment (DA) involved a blend of instruction and assessment of the learners' speaking skills. Through the implementation of this educational system, teachers can accurately assess the overall abilities of the learners, thus obtaining a comprehensive understanding of their capabilities.

According to Özturan and Gürdal (2023), DA is a method that combines intervention with psychological or psychoeducational assessments to create an interactive assessment process. Its main objective is to evaluate a student's current performance level, known as the Zone of Actual Development, as well as their potential for learning with support, referred to as the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). As highlighted by Infante and Poehner (2019), by incorporating intervention during the assessment, DA aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of a student's abilities and their capacity to progress with assistance.

In the present study two types of DA has been utilized, face-to-face and web-based GDA. Ahmadi and Besharati (2017) defines face-to face GDA as an interactive and scaffolded evaluation process that surpasses the mere measurement of a student's individual performance. This methodology encompasses a pretest, instructional or intervention phase, and a posttest, which allows the evaluator to observe the student's reaction to the intervention (Şükür et al., 2023). As highlighted by Annandale et al. (2021), by classifying students into those who can independently solve a problem, those who can solve it with assistance, and those who are unable to solve it at all, face-to-face DA provides a more comprehensive understanding of the student's progress compared to solely assessing their independent performance. Similarly, Sarabi Asl et al. (2024) state that this assessment method proves particularly advantageous for students facing learning difficulties, cultural or linguistic diversity, or exhibiting poor performance on conventional tests. It empowers evaluators to identify specific cognitive or non-intellectual factors that may impede the student's performance and evaluate their responsiveness to targeted instruction (Annandale et al., 2021).

The notion of web-based GDA involves the amalgamation of DA principles with online group instruction and assessment to enhance language learners' language proficiency by providing interactive feedback within their ZPD in a digital setting (Fathi et al., 2023). Web-based GDA fosters collaborative and interactive feedback opportunities for learners to collaboratively

construct new knowledge within their ZPD, diverging from the more direct corrective feedback commonly associated with non-GDA approaches (Alemi et al. 2019). The incorporation of web-based GDA into language instruction provides practical advantages for educators aiming to enhance their online teaching methodologies with interactive and scaffolded assessment strategies. The automated features of online systems enable efficient and personalized delivery of feedback to learners (Ahmadi & Besharati, 2017).

Moreover, the integration of DA methods encompasses a combination of instructional and evaluative elements. Employing this pedagogical strategy can support educators in acquiring a thorough comprehension of students' capacities (Davin, 2013). In particular, administering assessments within ZPD allows teachers to understand learners' skills and facilitate their advancement through suitable guidance (Alsaadi, 2021).

Despite the existing body of research on dynamic assessment in various areas such as reading (Kushki & Nassaji, 2024; Kao & Wu, 2022; Mustiah et al., 2024) writing (Rezai et al., 2024; Shrestha & Shrestha, 2020), and listening skills (Zarei & Shishegarha, 2024; Zhang, 2023) there seems to be a limited focus on utilizing DA to enhance students' speaking proficiency (Ebadi & Asakereh, 2017; Son & Kim, 2017; Şükür et al., 2023). Furthermore, according to Shafipoor and Latif (2020), the effect of learners' personality traits on DA remains unexplored, despite its potential importance in both educational instruction and assessment. Estaji and Farahanynia (2019) stated that processes of teaching and assessment among these differences, the introversion-extroversion spectrum emerges as a significant characteristic that may necessitate further exploration within the realm of DA. Given that learners demonstrate diverse learning styles and preferences, recognizing these diversities within the context of DA could enhance evaluators' capacity to address DA in a more comprehensive manner (Radić-Bojanić, 2020; Shafipoor & Latif, 2020).

Consequently, this research gap has motivated the current study to explore this aspect further considering face-to-face and web-based GDA focusing on introversion and extroversion factors which has been rarely studied in the domain of speaking and DA.

### Literature Review

Initially introduced to Western educators and researchers by LuriiA (1966) who was influenced by Vygotsky's ZPD (Sharafi & Sardareh, 2016), DA has its roots in the concept of ZPD, which represents the gap between a learner's independent abilities and what they can achieve with assistance, in both assessment and educational contexts (kurt, 2022). Originally utilized in studies involving children experiencing learning challenges, DA has evolved over time to encompass broader educational settings, including general education and adult learners. It has been integrated into a comprehensive framework for second language pedagogy, suggesting that the principles of DA offer a systematic approach to engaging with second language learners, providing valuable insights into their language skills, and supporting their ongoing development (Le et al., 2023; Poehner et al., 2019).

Vygotsky (1978) posited that in DA research, teaching and assessment should be integrated rather than separated. The primary focus should be on facilitating the learning of students, which can be enhanced through student engagement in activities, peer interactions, and teacher guidance. By utilizing mediators, learners can attain greater independence in completing tasks (Abassy & Mashhadi Heidar, 2020). Meanwhile, Özturan and Gürdal (2023) state that dynamic testing is a method that considers individual characteristics and their impact on education,

emphasizing the role of mediation in the assessment process. These approaches prioritize the learning process over the final learning outcomes.

Despite the limited number of studies focusing on the comparison between face-to-face and web-based GDA in EFL speaking classes concerning introversion/extroversion, there has been a significant increase in research dedicated to investigating the implementation and benefits of DA in educational settings. The impact of DA on diverse student groups has been found to differ across various research studies. For example, Son and Kim (2017) explore the potential of DA in EFL speaking classes inspired by Vygotsky's (1978) theory. The results suggest that the feedback provided by the mediator and the learner's reactions progressed in harmony, leading to a decrease in direct guidance from the mediator and an increase in self-initiated actions by the learner. Furthermore, a detailed examination reveals a significant relationship between the learner's advancing language skills, the dynamic interactions, and the cognitive and collaborative strategies used in sense-making.

Similarly, Ahmadi Safa et al. (2016) conducted a study to examine the impact of different models of DA on the speaking abilities of Iranian EFL learners. The researchers recruited three groups of advanced English language learners who were exposed to interventionist DA, interactionist DA, and non-DA approaches. The results revealed that participants who received interactionist DA exhibited superior performance compared to those in the other groups. However, the study's reliance on purely quantitative data limited the depth of understanding regarding the cognitive processes of the participants. DA aims to capture the cognitive development of learners, necessitating a qualitative approach for a more comprehensive interpretation of the results.

Using a mixed-method design, Estaji and Farahanynia (2019) studied on the impact of two main methods of DA, namely the interventionist and interactionist, on learners' oral narrative performance and anxiety levels. The results, derived from analyzing the collected data after administering a posttest, indicated a significant improvement in the oral performance of both groups, along with a reduction in their anxiety levels. Additionally, a semi-structured interview was carried out, revealing that the Interactionist Group experienced increased anxiety levels, mainly attributed to feelings of disruption and loss of face.

Shafipoor and Latif (2020) carried out a research study focusing on investigating the impact of interventionist DA on the academic essay writing of introverted and extroverted English language translation students. Although the study's findings revealed a significant statistical influence of DA on the academic writing performance of both introverted and extroverted learners, extroverted learners showed higher scores in their posttests compared to their introverted peers, indicating a distinct response to the intervention. Furthermore, the results from the attitude questionnaire revealed that extroverted students had a more positive attitude towards the use of DA in academic writing tasks compared to introverted students. This difference in attitude towards the application of DA further emphasized the varying perceptions and responses of extroverts and introverts in the context of academic writing interventions.

In an explanatory sequential mixed-methods study, Fathi et al. (2023) investigated if web-based DA had any effect on the grammatical accuracy, autonomy, and attitudes of 60 male EFL learners. The outcomes of the ANCOVA and Mann-Whitney U test demonstrated a notable rise in the average scores for grammar accuracy and autonomy among the learners in the web-based DA group in comparison to those in the control group. Moreover, the outcomes of the interviews with the participants displayed a favorable perception towards the web-based dynamic assessment intervention. The qualitative information gathered from the semi-structured

interviews with the experimental group supported the quantitative results, offering a comprehensive insight into the impacts of web-based DA on the language skills and attitudes of the learners.

In their research, Kazemi and Tavassoli (2020) explored how dynamic and diagnostic assessments influenced the development of speaking abilities among Iranian EFL intermediate students. Two assessors evaluated both the speaking pretest and posttest, with the data being analyzed through a two-way ANOVA. The results showed an improvement in performance for all three groups from the initial test to the final one. Interestingly, while both the diagnostic and dynamic assessment groups showed significant progress, the difference in their advancements was not deemed statistically significant. Furthermore, Sarabi Asl et al. (2024) studied four sub-skills related to speaking proficiency in EFL learners: grammatical range and accuracy, vocabulary, fluency, and pronunciation. The results showed that both interactionist and interventionist DA models had a positive effect on speaking proficiency, with varying impacts on different sub-skills. The interactionist DA was more effective in improving grammatical range and accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary depth, while the interventionist DA was better at enhancing fluency and vocabulary breadth.

### **The Problem**

In the past, there was a prevailing belief that teaching and assessment were distinct entities, with an emphasis on maintaining their separation to accurately evaluate learners' abilities without any form of support (Quay et al., 2023). However, Vygotsky (1978) challenged this conventional perspective by introducing the novel concept that learning is a collaborative process occurring within a sociocultural framework (Kusmawan, 2023).

Despite participating in various speaking courses, Iranian EFL learners continue to express apprehensions regarding their spoken English proficiency, particularly in authentic language settings. English instructors have been urged to explore alternative pedagogical approaches to enhance students' speaking abilities in the classroom; however, these endeavors have often yielded unsatisfactory results (Bavandi-Savadkouhi & Mostafaei-Alaei, 2023; Kardoust & Saeedian, 2021, Salimi & Khazaei Kouhpar, 2024). The amalgamation of institutional, teacher-related, and learner-related factors such as their personalities, taking into account their individual characteristics, poses significant obstacles to the development of robust speaking skills among Iranian EFL students within the existing educational framework. Addressing these multifaceted challenges is imperative for enhancing speaking instruction and outcomes (Laila et al., 2023; Nasri et al., 2021; Omar, 2023).

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate how face-to-face and web-based GDA impact the speaking proficiency of Iranian intermediate EFL learners, while considering their introverted and extroverted personality characteristics. The researchers were driven by the need to address the existing gap in the literature and offer a viable solution to the challenges associated with teaching and learning speaking skills through the utilization of these underexplored GDA formats within the speaking domain.

### **Research Questions**

**RQ1.** Can the utilization of face-to-face interactionist GDA significantly affect the speaking abilities of Iranian intermediate EFL learners?

**RQ2.** Does web-based interactionist GDA impact the speaking ability of Iranian intermediate EFL learners?

**RQ3.** Are there any variations in the effects of face-to-face GDA compared to web-based GDA based on the introverted/extroverted traits of Iranian intermediate EFL learners?

## Method

### Design of the Study

The current investigation utilized a pre-test and post-test research design that was quantitative in nature, adhering to the scientific method by employing deductive reasoning to examine hypotheses and derive conclusions from the gathered data. The primary aim was to gather numerical data that could be objectively analyzed to reveal patterns, correlations, and cause-and-effect relationships (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In this study, the dependent variable (DV) under scrutiny was the speaking proficiency of intermediate EFL learners, with the objective of determining whether it could be influenced by the implementation of the independent variable (IV), which encompassed face-to-face and web-based GDA.

### Participants

The participants of the study, 72 out of 100 male and female students were selected from among Iranian intermediate EFL learners with the age range of 16-18 in Ariana institute in Rasht, Gilan, Iran.

### Material

#### The American English File 3rd Edition

The primary resource employed in this investigation was American English File 3. The selection of this educational material was based on its appropriateness for the research being conducted. Published in 2008 by Oxford University Press, the book authored by Christina Latham-Koenig, Clive Oxenden, and Jerry Lambert includes the Student Book, Work Book, Student's DVD, Mp3 CD, and Multi Rom DVD. Specifically designed for intermediate level learners in accordance with the CEFR international standard, American English File 3 consists of 7 lessons, concluding with a comprehensive review after the seventh lesson.

#### An Eysenck's Personality Inventory (EPI)

The Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) was created by Hans and Sybil Eysenck as a psychological evaluation tool. It focuses on measuring two fundamental traits outlined in Hans Eysenck's personality theory, namely extraversion and neuroticism. To address potential response biases, a 9-item Lie scale was added to the original 24-item measures. These traits are considered temperamental aspects of personality that are believed to be inherited and present from birth. As per the EPQ scoring guidelines, an E score falling within the range of 13-24 is labeled as extraverted, whereas a score below 12 is categorized as introverted. Those who score 12 are positioned in the intermediary range between extraversion and introversion (Heinemann, Corrigan & Moore, 2004).

### Speaking Pretest and Posttest

The speaking skills assessments utilized in this research were sourced from the review sections of American English File 3 consisting of 10 questions. To ensure uniformity, a separate group of participants with a comparable level of English proficiency to the primary participants were

enlisted to undertake the tests. The tests' reliability was assessed through the application of the KR-21 formula, yielding coefficients of 0.81 and 0.83, signifying adequate reliability for the study's objectives. Furthermore, the validity of the tests was scrutinized by experts, including two university lecturers. These experts meticulously analyzed various aspects of the tests, such as the test format, scoring system, distribution of choices, and item selection, affirming the content validity of the tests.

### **Skyroom Software**

Skyroom serves as an online conferencing platform that is specifically designed to facilitate a wide range of virtual events, including educational sessions, business meetings, and webinars. The platform is equipped with essential features such as live audio and video communication, presentation tools, a digital whiteboard, screen sharing capabilities, file transfer options, advanced chat features, and the ability to record sessions for future reference.

### **Group Dynamic Assessment (GDA)**

Dynamic Assessment is of great importance in Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (SCT), as emphasized by Poehner et al. (2024) who stressed the incorporation of testing and instruction rooted in Vygotsky's principles. Poehner (2009) elaborated on this by introducing the notion of GDA, underscoring the significance of incremental feedback from educators at the communal level to enrich learners' ZPD and enhance their proficiency.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

In order to gather data, an OPT was administered to 100 learners. Subsequently, 72 learners who scored one standard deviation below the mean were chosen. Following this, Eysenck's Personality Inventory Questionnaires were given to the selected 72 learners, who were then divided into two groups: 36 introverted intermediate learners and 36 extroverted intermediate learners. These learners were further categorized into 6 classes, each consisting of 12 learners. Among these classes, four were designated as experimental groups while the remaining two were control groups. Prior to commencing the teaching sessions, a pretest was conducted. One introverted and one extroverted experimental group were taught speaking skills through face-to-face GDA, while another introverted and extroverted experimental group were taught speaking skills through web-based GDA over a span of 15 sessions. The two control groups received conventional teaching methods for speaking skills.

During GDA classes, the learners engaged in the following procedures: Initially, they conducted research on the assigned topic prior to the class session. Subsequently, they were organized into 3 groups and collaborated in groups of 4 for a speaking activity. Following this, all learners in each group took turns discussing the topic while the others listened attentively. In instances where they encountered difficulty with a word, they were permitted to consult a dictionary, seek assistance from other group members, or request help from the teacher. Each group then posed a question related to the topic, to which the other groups provided answers. If there was any confusion regarding the question, the other groups clarified it, after which the teacher provided further explanation for better understanding. The teacher then validated their correct responses. The teacher documented the errors made by each group on a piece of paper to display on the board for further elaboration. Subsequently, the learners' mistakes were highlighted on the board to delve deeper into pronunciation, grammar, or other errors. The learners assisted the teacher in explaining the mistakes or errors, expressing their thoughts

without any pressure. Finally, the teacher summarized and presented key information about the topic on the board for the learners.

The intervention consisted of 15 sessions, with each session lasting approximately 90 minutes. Following the 15 sessions, all participants engaged in a speaking posttest, which included 10 speaking questions. The learners' responses were recorded and assessed using IELTS speaking band scores, focusing on pronunciation, grammatical range and accuracy, lexical usage, and fluency and coherence. Subsequently, the study's hypotheses were compared and analyzed based on the results.

### Data Analysis Procedure

Given the quantitative nature of the current investigation, it is imperative to adhere to both descriptive and inferential statistical methods in order to address the research inquiries. In order to tackle the first and second research questions, as well as evaluate the speaking abilities of the learners, paired samples t-test was implemented to compare the pretest and posttest of experimental and control groups. Furthermore, to address the third research question, a one-way ANOVA was utilized to examine the mean variances between groups categorized based on two independent variables across all posttests.

### Results

To maintain consistency in the proficiency level of the participants included in the research, the researchers conducted the OPT. Subsequently, the results of the test were evaluated based on the standards outlined in the OPT guidelines. The statistical overview of the groups' achievements in the proficiency evaluation is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*Descriptive Statistics of the Participants' Scores on OPT*

		N	M	SD	Std.Error	Min.	Max.
Introvert	Web-based	12	47.00	10.36	2.99	31.00	60.00
	Face-to-Face	12	43.33	8.64	2.49	30.00	56.00
	Traditional Teaching	12	45.08	7.83	2.26	34.00	60.00
Extrovert	Web-based	12	44.33	9.52	2.75	30.00	58.00
	Face-to-Face	12	49.16	8.64	2.49	35.00	60.00
	Traditional Teaching	12	47.75	7.12	2.05	35.00	59.00

The information provided in table 1 demonstrates that the scores of the different groups are between 35 and 59. As per Pollitt (2017) and his table on The Meaning of Oxford Placement Test Scores, the average scores of the groups suggest a proficiency level of around B1, indicating an intermediate level of English language proficiency.

**Table 2**

*Tests of Normality on the Proficiency Test Scores*

Skewness		Kurtosis		Kolomogrov-Smirnov		
Statistics	Std. Error	Statistics	Std. Error	Statistics	df	Sig.
-.119	.283	-1.101	.559	.084	72	.200

The results of the normality evaluation for the proficiency test groups' scores can be found in Table 2. The examination reveals that the skewness and kurtosis ratio is within the range of  $\pm 1$ ,



indicating that the data conforms to a normal distribution. Furthermore, the Kolmogrov-Smirnov test statistic surpasses the critical value of .05, signifying that the scores demonstrate a normal distribution. Therefore, it is appropriate to employ parametric tests for the data analysis, taking into account these results.

**Table 3**  
*Test of Homogeneity of Variances*

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.684	5	66	.638

The outcomes of the Levene's test for homogeneity of variances are presented in Table 3. The results indicate that there is no indication of unequal variances, as indicated by the statistical values:  $F(5, 66) = .684$ ,  $p = .638$ .

**Table 4**  
*Results of One-Way ANOVA for the Proficiency Scores*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	296.944	5	59.389	.775	.571
Within Groups	5058.167	66	76.639		
Total	5355.111	71			

The outcomes of calculating the one-way ANOVA on the groups' performance in the proficiency test are presented in Table 4. The findings indicate that there is no significant difference among the groups, as evidenced by the  $F(5, 66)$  statistic of .775 and p-value of .571. These results suggest that the sample shows consistency in their language proficiency.

**Table 5**  
*Descriptive Statistics of the Participants' Pretest and Posttest Scores on Speaking*

			N	M	SD	Min.	Max.
Introvert	Web-based	Pretest	12	11.7500	2.83244	4.00	14.00
		Posttest	12	16.7500	1.71226	14.00	19.00
	Face-to-Face	Pretest	12	12.5000	2.64575	9.00	17.00
		Posttest	12	16.5833	1.97523	13.00	19.00
	Traditional Teaching	Pretest	12	11.5833	2.81096	4.00	14.00
		Posttest	12	11.9167	2.27470	6.00	14.00
Extrovert	Web-based	Pretest	12	10.5000	1.73205	8.00	13.00
		Posttest	12	14.4167	2.42930	10.00	19.00
	Face-to-Face	Pretest	12	14.5000	2.35488	10.00	19.00
		Posttest	12	17.3333	2.18812	13.00	20.00
	Traditional Teaching	Pretest	12	10.1667	2.16725	6.00	13.00
		Posttest	12	10.7500	2.09436	7.00	14.00

The descriptive statistics presented in Table 5 illustrate the pretest and posttest scores of the participants. Upon examination of the data, a notable improvement in the performance of both groups is apparent from the initial assessment to the final evaluation.

**Table 6***Tests of Normality for the Groups' Pretest and Posttest Scores*

	Skewness	Kurtosis		Kolmogorov-Smirnov				
		Statistics	Std. Error	Statistics	Std. Error	Statistics	df	Sig.
Pretest	WB/Int	-2.144	.637	5.146	1.232	.285	12	.008
	WB/Ext	.063	.637	-1.026	1.232	.197	12	.200
	FF/Int	.075	.637	.526	1.232	.179	12	.200
	FF/Ext	.477	.637	-.323	1.232	.215	12	.133
	CG/Int	-2.051	.637	4.655	1.232	.309	12	.002
	CG/Ext	-0.385	.637	-.467	1.232	.136	12	.200
Posttest	WB/Int	-.448	.637	-.729	1.232	.255	12	.096
	WB/Ext	.190	.637	.280	1.232	.155	12	.200
	FF/Int	-.511	.637	-.902	1.232	.180	12	.200
	FF/Ext	-.488	.637	-.485	1.232	.194	12	.200
	CG/Int	-1.824	.637	3.601	1.232	.266	12	.200
	CG/Ext	-.387	.637	-.608	1.232	.214	12	.134

Note. WB/Int: web-based/introvert  
 WB/Ext: web-based/extrovert  
 FF/Int: face-to-face/introvert  
 FF/Ext: face-to-face/extrovert  
 CG/Int: control/introvert  
 CG/Ext: control/extrovert

The results presented in Table 6 show that the ratio of skewness to kurtosis falls below  $\pm 1$ , indicating that the data adheres to a normal distribution. Moreover, the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test exceed the significance level of .05, offering further support for the assumption of normal distribution in the scores.

### Results for the First Research Question

The first research question aimed to explore the impact of utilizing face-to-face interactionist group dynamic assessment on the speaking proficiency of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. Paired samples t-tests were conducted to determine the improvement in speaking skills from pretest to posttest within each group.

**Table 7***Paired Samples t-tests on the Participants' Scores Receiving the Face-to-Face GDA*

		Paired Samples Statistics			
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pretest	IntexpG	14.5000	12	2.35488	.67979
Posttest	IntexpG.	16.5833	12	1.97523	.57020
Pretest	ExtexpG.	12.5000	12	2.64575	.76376
Posttest	ExtexpG.	17.3333	12	2.18812	.63166

**Paired Samples Test**

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
IntexpG.	Pretest - Posttest	-2.83333	3.51188	1.01379	-5.06468	-.60199	2.795	11	.017
ExtexpG.	Pretest - Posttest	-4.08333	1.72986	.49937	-5.18244	-2.98423	8.177	11	.000

Note. IntexpG: Introvert experimental group; ExtexpG.: Extrovert experimental group

According to the findings presented in Table 7, there was a notable enhancement in the speaking abilities of introverted individuals who were part of the face-to-face GDA experimental group. The mean score increased significantly from the pretest ( $M = 14.5$ ,  $SD = 2.35$ ) to the posttest ( $M = 16.58$ ,  $SD = 1.97$ ), with a t-value of  $-2.795$  and a p-value of  $.017$ . Similarly, extroverted participants in the face-to-face GDA experimental group also demonstrated a significant improvement in their speaking skills, as indicated by the increase in mean score from the pretest ( $M = 12.5$ ,  $SD = 2.64$ ) to the posttest ( $M = 17.33$ ,  $SD = 2.188$ ). The t-value for this improvement was  $-8.177$ , with a p-value of  $.000$ .

**Results for the Second Research Question**

The second research question aimed to explore the impact of utilizing web-based interactionist group dynamic assessment on the speaking proficiency of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. Paired samples t-tests were conducted to determine the improvement in speaking skills from pretest to posttest within each group.

**Table 8**

*Paired Samples t-tests on the Participants' Scores Receiving the Web-Based GDA*

		Paired Samples Statistics				
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	
Pretest	IntexpG	11.7500	12	2.83244	.81766	
Posttest	IntexpG.	16.7500	12	1.71226	.49429	
Pretest	ExtexpG.	10.5000	12	1.73205	.50000	
Posttest	ExtexpG.	14.4167	12	2.42930	.70128	

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
IntexpG	Pretest - Posttest	-5.00000	1.85864	.53654	-6.18092	-3.81908	-9.319	11	.000

ExtexpG Pretest - Posttest	-3.91667	1.88092	.54298	-5.11175	-2.72158	-7.213	11	.000
----------------------------	----------	---------	--------	----------	----------	--------	----	------

According to the findings presented in Table 8, there was a notable enhancement in the speaking abilities of introverted individuals who were part of the web-based GDA experimental group. The mean score increased significantly from the pretest ( $M = 11.7500$ ,  $SD = 2.83$ ) to the posttest ( $M = 16.7500$ ,  $SD = 1.71226$ ), with a  $t$ -value of  $-9.319$  and a  $p$ -value of  $.000$ . Similarly, extroverted participants in the face-to-face GDA experimental group also demonstrated a significant improvement in their speaking skills, as indicated by the increase in mean score from the pretest ( $M = 10.5000$ ,  $SD = 1.73205$ ) to the posttest ( $M = 14.4167$ ,  $SD = 2.42930$ ). The  $t$ -value for this improvement was  $-7.213$ , with a  $p$ -value of  $.000$ .

### Results of Paired Samples t-test for the Control Groups

To find the comparison of the speaking pretest and posttest scores collected from introvert and extrovert control groups, paired samples  $t$ -tests were conducted to determine the improvement in speaking skills from pretest to posttest within control groups.

**Table 9**

*Paired Samples t-tests on the Participants' Scores Receiving the Traditional Method of Teaching*

Paired Samples Statistics								
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean			
Pretest	IntCG	11.5833	12	2.81096	.81146			
Posttest	IntCG	11.9167	12	2.27470	.65665			
Pretest	ExtCG	10.1667	12	2.16725	.62563			
Posttest	ExtCG	10.7500	12	2.09436	.60459			

  

Paired Samples Test								
Paired Differences								
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
				Lower	Upper			
IntCG Pretest - Posttest	-.33333	.65134	.18803	-.74717	.08051	-1.773	11	.104
ExtCG Pretest - Posttest	-.58333	.51493	.14865	-.91050	-.25616	-3.924	11	.002

Note. IntCG: introvert control group; ExtCG: extrovert control group

Table 9 presents the findings for the introvert and extrovert control groups. According to the data, there is no significant statistical increase in the introvert control group's score from the pretest ( $M = 11.5833$ ,  $SD = 2.81096$ ) to the posttest ( $M = 11.9167$ ,  $SD = 2.27470$ ),  $t(11) = -1.773$ ,  $p = .104$ . Similarly, there is no statistically significant improvement in the extrovert control group score from pretest ( $M = 10.1667$ ,  $SD = 2.16725$ ) to posttest ( $M = 10.7500$ ,  $SD = 2.09436$ ),  $t(11) = -3.924$ ,  $p = .002$ .

### Results for the Third Research Question

To identify which personality types could be impacted by the independent variables of the study in terms of improved speaking skills performance, one-way ANOVA and Scheffe Multiple Comparisons were employed to investigate whether significant variances existed among the groups.

**Table 10**

*Test of Homogeneity of Variances*

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.262	5	66	.932

The findings presented in Table 10 indicate that Levene's test for homogeneity of variance did not violate the assumption of equality of variance, as evidenced by  $F(5, 66) = .262, p = .932$ .

**Table 11**

*Results of One-Way ANOVA For the Six Groups' Speaking Abilities Posttest Scores*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	456.958	5	91.392	20.247	.000
Within Groups	297.917	66	4.514		
Total	754.875	71			

The results of the one-way ANOVA analysis on the groups' performance on the posttest are shown in Table 11. The data indicates a statistically significant distinction among the groups, with  $F(5, 66) = 20.247, p = .000$ . Furthermore, to determine which groups differ significantly, a Scheffe multiple comparison test was conducted.

**Table 12**

*Scheffe Multiple Comparisons*

(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)		Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
		Mean	Std. Error		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
WB/Intexp	WB/Extexp	2.33333	.86736	.219	-.6422	5.3089
	FF/Intexp	-.58333	.86736	.993	-3.5589	2.3922
	FF/Extexp	.16667	.86736	1.000	-2.8089	3.1422
	CG/Int	4.83333*	.86736	.000	1.8578	7.8089
	CG/Ext	6.00000*	.86736	.000	3.0244	8.9756
WB/Extexp	WB/Intexp	-2.33333	.86736	.219	-5.3089	.6422
	FF/Intexp	-2.91667	.86736	.058	-5.8922	.0589
	FF/Extexp	-2.16667	.86736	.297	-5.1422	.8089
	CG/Int	2.50000	.86736	.156	-.4756	5.4756
	CG/Ext	3.66667*	.86736	.006	.6911	6.6422

FF/Intexp	WB/Intex	.58333	.86736	.993	-2.3922	3.5589
	p					
	WB/Extex	2.91667	.86736	.058	-.0589	5.8922
	p					
	FF/Extexp	.75000	.86736	.980	-2.2256	3.7256
FF/Extexp	CG/Int	5.41667*	.86736	.000	2.4411	8.3922
	CG/Ext	6.58333*	.86736	.000	3.6078	9.5589
	WB/Intex	-.16667	.86736	1.000	-3.1422	2.8089
	p					
	WB/Extex	2.16667	.86736	.297	-.8089	5.1422
CG/Int	p					
	FF/Intexp	-.75000	.86736	.980	-3.7256	2.2256
	CG/Int	4.66667*	.86736	.000	1.6911	7.6422
	CG/Ext	5.83333*	.86736	.000	2.8578	8.8089
	WB/Intex	-4.83333*	.86736	.000	-7.8089	-1.8578
CG/Int	p					
	WB/Extex	-2.50000	.86736	.156	-5.4756	.4756
	p					
	FF/Intexp	-5.41667*	.86736	.000	-8.3922	-2.4411
	FF/Extexp	-4.66667*	.86736	.000	-7.6422	-1.6911
CG/Ext	CG/Ext	1.16667	.86736	.873	-1.8089	4.1422
	WB/Intex	-6.00000*	.86736	.000	-8.9756	-3.0244
	p					
	WB/Extex	-3.66667*	.86736	.006	-6.6422	-.6911
	p					
CG/Ext	FF/Intexp	-6.58333*	.86736	.000	-9.5589	-3.6078
	FF/Extexp	-5.83333*	.86736	.000	-8.8089	-2.8578
	CG/Int	-1.16667	.86736	.873	-4.1422	1.8089

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

According to the findings reported in Table 12, the analysis of Scheffe multiple comparisons reveals a significant disparity in the average scores between the experimental groups and the control groups ( $p = .000$ ). The results also indicated extrovert groups displayed a notable enhancement in posttest results in face-to-face GDA classes and the introvert groups outperformed all other groups in web-based GDA classes.

### Discussion

The objective of this research was to investigate the impact of face-to-face versus web-based interactionist group dynamic assessment on the speaking proficiency of Iranian EFL learners at an intermediate level, categorized based on their introverted and extroverted personality traits. The results of conducting paired samples t-tests indicated a significant and noteworthy enhancement in speaking abilities from pretest to posttest for participants who underwent face-to-face or web-based GDA, as opposed to those in the control groups. Moreover, the comparison of the impact of independent variables, introversion, and extroversion, was conducted through one-way Anova analysis, revealing that the introverted experimental group outperformed in web-

based and the extrovert group outperformed in face-to-face classes in terms of speaking ability improvement.

Consequently, it is evident that the students demonstrated improvements in their speaking abilities as a result of integrating GDA into the research. The results indicate that the use of these techniques was advantageous for both introverted and extroverted individuals, with only a slight variance in favor of extroverted students in terms of surpassing expectations, ultimately enhancing their speaking proficiency.

The results of the investigation align with the conclusions drawn by Harahap et al. (2024), indicating that the implementation of DA can have a significant positive impact on the speaking proficiency of EFL university students in Indonesia. Furthermore, the study conducted by Petersen et al. (2020) on the influence of DA on language accuracy in EFL settings corroborates the findings of the current research, highlighting the effectiveness of DA in evaluating language skills across diverse learner populations. Similarly, the outcomes of this study are consistent with the research conducted by Sohrabi and Safa (2020), illustrating that the integration of group dynamic assessment in EFL classrooms can enhance learners' oral production skills, boost their motivation, and reduce speaking-related anxiety. Additionally, the findings of QU and LIU (2022) support the notion that interactionist DA shows promise in enhancing oral communication abilities among EFL learners with low proficiency levels, when combined with regular EFL instruction. Moreover, the results of the present study are in agreement with the research by Ghahderijani et al. (2021), indicating that both group-based and computerized DA methods can improve the speaking proficiency of Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners, with computerized dynamic assessment showing superiority in enhancing specific aspects of speaking such as complexity and accuracy. Lastly, the study conducted by Sarabi Asl, et al. (2022) further supports the findings of the current research, suggesting that while both interactionist and interventionist dynamic assessment approaches can enhance Iranian EFL learners' speaking skills, the interactionist model may be more effective in improving fluency and complexity, whereas the interventionist model could lead to greater gains in accuracy. Additionally, learners expressed more positive perceptions towards the interactionist dynamic assessment approach.

The current study's findings align with prior research on the same topic (Ebadi & Bashir, 2021; Fathi et al., 2024; Makhachashvili & Semenist, 2022; Mustiah et al., 2023). However, there are studies that have presented conflicting results regarding specific models of team-teaching. For example, Kazemi and Tavassoli's (2020) investigation revealed that both web-based/mobile-mediated and face-to-face dynamic assessment methods were effective in enhancing the speaking skills of EFL learners compared to a control group. Nonetheless, the study did not find a significant difference in the effectiveness of these two assessment approaches. Furthermore, it was revealed that the use of both web-based and face-to-face interactionist dynamic assessment methods resulted in similar success in enhancing the argumentative essay writing skills of EFL learners. Both approaches showed positive outcomes when compared to a control group. Conversely, mobile-mediated dynamic assessment was determined to be more effective than face-to-face dynamic assessment in improving the writing fluency and strategy awareness of EFL learners (Kaveh & Rassaei, 2022).

### Conclusions

The study examined the effectiveness of face-to-face and web-based GDA in improving the speaking skills of introverted and extroverted students. The findings indicated that GDA had a significant impact on the speaking performance of both groups, with introverted students demonstrating better results in web-based while extroverted students performed better in face-to-

face GDA classes. Face-to-face assessment provides a more holistic view of student progress compared to evaluating individual performance in isolation. The incorporation of web-based GDA in language teaching offers practical advantages for educators seeking to enhance their online instructional techniques with interactive assessment tools. The automated functions of online platforms enable prompt and personalized feedback delivery to learners.

Moreover, the integration of assessment methods merges instructional and evaluative aspects. Adopting this educational approach can aid educators in gaining a deeper insight into students' capabilities. Additionally, the research underscores the importance of offering tailored support to introverted and extroverted students based on their learning preferences and strengths in speaking abilities. By considering students' personality traits and the characteristics of speaking evaluations, instructors can tailor teaching strategies to effectively boost students' speaking skills in EFL settings.

### **Implications**

The outcomes of the current research can be advantageous for both students and teachers. The utilization of interventionist face-to-face and web-based GDA techniques can effectively cater to the diverse learning styles and preferences of introverted and extroverted EFL learners. Educators must recognize the significance of employing a variety of assessment methods to address the individual needs of each student (Rashidi & Bahadori Nejad, 2018). Additionally, online GDA tools can be particularly helpful for introverted learners, as they may feel more comfortable expressing themselves through written or digital mediums (Fathi, et al., 2023). By integrating these tools, teachers can assist introverted students in boosting their confidence in speaking and promoting active participation in classroom activities. Conversely, extroverted learners typically thrive in social and collaborative environments. GDA approaches can play a crucial role in leveraging the strengths of these students by encouraging them to assume leadership roles during group assessments (Shafipoor & Latif, 2020). This method can enhance their speaking abilities and instill a sense of empowerment (Poehner & Leontjev, 2023). Offering personalized feedback and assistance to both introverted and extroverted learners is vital throughout the assessment process (Abdulaal, 2022). Educators should aim to establish a supportive and inclusive learning atmosphere that inspires students to step out of their comfort zones and enhance their speaking skills. By combining face-to-face interventionist techniques with web-based group dynamic assessment, teachers can create a more engaging and interactive learning setting for all EFL learners. This holistic approach can effectively foster the development of speaking skills in students with diverse personality traits and learning preferences (Ahmadi & Besharati, 2017; Şükür et al., 2023).

### **Suggestions for Further Research**

The research findings suggest that web-based and face-to-face GDA can have a positive impact on language skills like writing and grammar, but there is a lack of direct evidence comparing their effects on speaking abilities (Kuhi et al., 2023). Further investigation is necessary to determine which GDA type is more effective in enhancing the speaking abilities of EFL learners. Future studies can explore various forms of GDA to evaluate the speaking skills of introverted and extroverted EFL learners, including a comparison of collaborative and competitive assessment strategies and their influence on oral proficiency. The current research adopted a quantitative methodology, while upcoming researches can utilize qualitative or mixed-method approaches to analyze how individual learner characteristics such as attitudes, motivation,



anxiety, and learning style affect the efficacy of interventionist GDA in improving speaking abilities among EFL learners.

While the present study concentrated on one semester of teaching speaking skills, future investigations can investigate the lasting impacts of interventionist GDA on speaking proficiency and overall language skills, considering learners' personalities to determine the enduring implications of face-to-face and web-based assessment methods. Moreover, forthcoming research can identify any barriers or facilitators to the implementation of these methods. The current study contrasted face-to-face and web-based GDA, but future investigations can explore the advantages of integrating interventionist face-to-face and web-based GDA with other instructional methods to improve speaking skills among Iranian EFL learners with diverse personality traits. Furthermore, subsequent studies can concentrate on the potential synergies between these assessment methods and other pedagogical approaches like task-based learning and content-based instruction to enhance language skills effectively.

## References

1. Abassy, Sh., & Mashhadi Heidar, D. (2020). Computerized Group Dynamic Assessment and Listening Comprehension Ability: Does Self-Efficacy Matter? *Journal of Language and Education*, 6 (1 (21)), 157-172.
2. Abdulaal, M. A. AS., Alenazi, M. H., Tajuddin A. J. A., & Hamid, B. (2022). Dynamic vs. diagnostic assessment: Impacts of EFL learners' speaking fluency and accuracy, learning anxiety, and cognitive load. *Language Testing in Asia*, 12(32). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00179-0>
3. Ahmadi Safa, M., Donyaeei, S., & Malek Mohamadi, R. (2016). An investigation into the effect of interactionist versus intervention into the effect of interactionist versus interventionist models of dynamic assessment on Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill proficiency. *Journal Teaching English Language*, 9(2), 153-172.
4. Ahmadi, A., & Besharati, F. (2017). Web-based versus face-to-face interactionist dynamic assessment in essay writing classrooms – a comparative study. *The Journal of Language Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 1- 29. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/618225>
5. Alemi, M., Miri, M., & Mozafarnezhad, A. (2019). Investigating the Effects of Online Concurrent Group Dynamic Assessment on? Enhancing? Grammatical Accuracy of EFL Learners. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 9(2), 29–43.
6. Alsaadi, H. M. A. (2021). Dynamic Assessment in Language learning; An overview and the impact of using social media. *English Language Teaching*, 14(8), 73. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n8p73>
7. Annandale, M., Belkasim, S., Bunt, B. J., Chahine, I. C., De Beer, J., Jacobson, T. E., Jagals, D., Kamanga, E. M., Mackey, T. P., Olivier, J., Reyneke, E. M., & Van Tonder, G. (2021b). Learning through assessment: An approach towards Self-Directed Learning. In *NWU self-directed learning series*. <https://doi.org/10.4102/aosis.2021.bk280>
8. Azizi, Z., Namaziandost, E., & Ashkani, P. (2023). Active Learning as an Approach to Fostering EFL Learners' Speaking Skills and Willingness to Communicate: A Mixed-methods Inquiry. *Issues in Language Teaching*. Volume 11, Issue 2 December 2022 Pages 93-128 <https://doi.org/10.22054/ilt.2023.70542.744>
9. Bavandi-Savadkouhi, Z., & Mostafaei-Alaei, M., (2023). Pragmatic Failure in Cross-Cultural Communication: Scrutinizing the Causes and Challenges Involved in Iranian EFL



- Context. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 15(32), 58-78. DOI: 10.22034/elt.2023.58806.2576
10. Creswell, J. W. & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approach* (5th Edition). London: SAGE Publications.
  11. 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>
  12. 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), 1419796. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2017.1419796>
  13. Ebadi, S., & Bashir, S. (2021). An exploration into EFL learners' writing skills via mobile-based dynamic assessment. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26, 1995-2016.
  14. Estaji, M., & Farahanynia, M. (2019). The Immediate and Delayed Effect of Dynamic Assessment Approaches on EFL Learners' Oral Narrative Performance and Anxiety. *Educational Assessment*, 24(2), 135–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2019.1578169>
  15. Fathi, A., Aslrasouli, M., & Kuhi, D. (2023). The Effects of Web-based Dynamic Assessment on Grammatical Accuracy and Autonomy of Iranian EFL Learners and Their Attitudes to Web-based Dynamic Assessment. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 12(1), 205-236. doi: 10.22054/ilt.2023.67266.688
  16. Ghahderijani, B. H., Namaziandost, E., Tavakoli, M., Kumar, T., & Magizov, R. (2021). The comparative effect of group dynamic assessment (GDA) and computerized dynamic assessment (C-DA) on Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners' speaking complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). *Language Testing in Asia*, 11, 1-20.
  17. Ghafar, Z. N., & Raheem, B. R. (2023). Factors Affecting Speaking Proficiency in English Language Learning: A general overview of the speaking skill. *Journal of Social Science*, 2(6), 507–518. <https://doi.org/10.57185/joss.v2i6.107>
  18. Harahap, D. I., Uswar, Y., Syafitri, W., Agustina, L., & Sanjaya, D. (2024). An Investigation of Dynamic Assessment on EFL Learners' Speaking Performance. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(1).
  19. Infante, P., & Poehner, M. (2019). Realizing the ZPD in second language education. *Language and Sociocultural Theory*, 6(1), 63–91. <https://doi.org/10.1558/lst.38916>
  20. Kao, Y. T., & Wu, H. H. (2022). The dialectic integration of dynamic assessment: Assessing and instructing EFL beginning learners' reading difficulties. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 31(6), 749-766.
  21. Kardoust, A., & Saeedian, A. (2021). Iranian EFL teachers' conceptions and practices of communicative language teaching curriculum. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 10(2), 171-202. <https://doi.org/10.22054/ilt.2021.58226.569>
  22. Kaveh, A., & Rassaei, E. (2022). Mobile-Mediated versus Face-to-Face Dynamic Assessment, EFL learners' writing fluency and strategy awareness. *Language and Sociocultural Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1558/lst.20288>
  23. Kazemi, N., & Tavassoli, K. (2020). The Comparative Effect of Dynamic vs. Diagnostic Assessment on EFL Learners' Speaking ability. *DOAJ (DOAJ: Directory of Open Access Journals)*. <https://doi.org/10.30486/relp.2019.1878561.1155>
  24. Kurt, D. (2022). "Vygotsky's Theories and How to Incorporate Vygotsky's Theories in The Classroom". *Education Library*. Retrieved October 23, 2022.



25. Kushki, A., & Nassaji, H. (2024). L2 reading assessment from a sociocultural theory perspective: The contributions of dynamic assessment. *Education Sciences, 14*(4), 342.
26. Kusmawan, U. (2023) Shaping the Future Assessment. Conference: Teaching and Learning Symposium 2023: The Future of Assessment. University Malaya, 22 November 2023
27. Laila, F. N., Adityarini, H., & Maryadi, M. (2023). Challenges and strategies in teaching English speaking skills to young learners: Perspectives of Teachers in Indonesia. *VELES (Voices of English Language Education Society), 7*(3), 542–556. <https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v7i3.24030>
28. Le, H., Ferreira, J. M., & Kuusisto, E. (2023). Dynamic Assessment in Inclusive Elementary Education: A Systematic Literature Review of the Usability, Methods, and Challenges in the Past Decade. *European Journal of Special Education Research, 9*(3). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejse.v9i3.5009>
29. Luria, A. R. (1966). Human brain and psychological processes. In *Harper & Row eBooks*. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA12821529>
30. Makhachashvili, R., & Semenist, I. (2022). Transdisciplinary Communication as a Meta-Framework of Digital Education. In *Proceedings of the 26th World Multi-Conference on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics* (Vol. 1, pp. 151-156). International Institute of Informatics and Systemics, USA.
31. Mardiah, A. S. (2022). *Exploring EFL Students' Speaking Challenges: A Case Study in Vocational High School* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Siliwangi).
32. Mustiah, M., Dayat, D., & Sadek, N. (2024). The Impact of Mobile-Assisted Hybrid Dynamic Assessment on Arabic Language Learners' Reading Comprehension Performance. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 12*(1), 524-534.
33. Nasri, M., Shafiee, S., & Sepehri, M. (2021). An investigation of Iranian intermediate EFL learners' L2 motivation and attitude in a Computer-Assisted Language Learning environment. *Issues in Language Teaching, 10*(1), 355–389. <https://doi.org/10.22054/ilt.2021.62359.614>
34. Omar, T. K. (2023). Students' challenges in EFL speaking Classrooms. *Academic Journal of Nawroz University, 12*(4), 957–963. <https://doi.org/10.25007/ajnu.v12n4a1809>
35. Petersen, D. B., Tonn, P., Spencer, T. D., & Foster, M. E. (2020). The Classification Accuracy of a Dynamic Assessment of Inferential Word Learning for Bilingual English/Spanish-Speaking School-Age Children. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 51*(1), 144–164. [https://doi.org/10.1044/2019\\_LSHSS-18-0129](https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_LSHSS-18-0129)
36. Poehner, M. E. (2009). Group Dynamic Assessment: Mediation for the L2 Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(3), 471–491. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00245.x>
37. Poehner, M. E., van Compernelle, R. A., Esteve, O., & Lantolf, J. P. (2019). A Vygotskian developmental approach to second language education. *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology, 17*(3), 238-259.
38. Poehner, M. E., & Leontjev, D. (2023). Peer interaction, mediation, and a view of teachers as creators of learner L2 development. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 33*(1), 18-32.
39. Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2024). *Sociocultural theory and second language developmental education*. Cambridge University Press.
40. Pollitt, A. (2017). Using Professional Judgement to Equate Exam Standards. In *Methodology of educational measurement and assessment*. Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50856-6\\_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50856-6_16)



41. QU, X., & LIU, Y. (2022). Dynamic Assessment of College EFL Learners' Speaking Proficiency: A Case Study. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 45(4), 510-531.
42. Quay, J., Williams, B., Pietzner, J., Boyer, A., Browning, D., & Brodie-McKenzie, A. (2023). Vygotsky's *perezhivaniy*es with Dewey's occupations: Improving integration of teaching and assessing via creative learning units. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 55(5), 598–618. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2023.2242914>
43. Radić-Bojanić, B. (2020). RELATION OF EXTRAVERSION/INTROVERSION AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY IN THE EFL CLASSROOM. *Folia Linguistica Et Litteraria/Folia Linguistica Et Litteraria*, XI(33), 253–266. <https://doi.org/10.31902/fli.33.2020.13>
44. Rashidi, N., & Bahadori Nejad, Z. (2018). An investigation into the effect of dynamic assessment on the EFL learners' process writing development. *Sage Open*, 8(2), 2158244018784643.
45. Rezai, A., Naserpour, A., & Rahimi, S. (2024). Online peer-dynamic assessment: an approach to boosting Iranian high school students' writing skills: a mixed-methods study. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 32(1), 306-324.
46. Salimi, S. A. & Khazaei Kouhpar, M. (2024). Iranian EFL Teachers' Understanding and Beliefs of Critical Pedagogy: A Multiple Case Study. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies*, 11(1), 101-124. DOI: 10.30479/jmrels.2023.18569.2189
47. Sarabi Asl, S., Rashtchi, M., & Rezaie, G. (2024). The effects of interactionist versus interventionist dynamic assessment models on Iranian EFL learners' speaking sub-skills: A mixed-method study. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-023-00237-x>
48. Shafipoor, M., & Latif, F. (2020). A Mixed Method Study of Interventionist DA: A Case of Introvert vs. Extrovert EFL Learners' Academic Essay Writing. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 13(13), 118–139. <https://doi.org/10.30495/jal.2020.676937>
49. Sharafi, M., & Sardareh, S. A. (2016). The Effect of Dynamic Assessment on Elementary EFL Students' L2 Grammar Learning. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(3), 102–120.
50. Shrestha, P. N., & Shrestha, P. N. (2020). Dynamic Assessment of Academic Writing and Its Future in Higher Education. *Dynamic Assessment of Students' Academic Writing: Vygotskian and Systemic Functional Linguistic Perspectives*, 231-246.
51. Sohrabi, S., & Ahmadi Safa, M. (2020). Group dynamic assessment and EFL learners' oral production, motivation, and classroom anxiety. *English Teaching & Learning*, 44(4), 353-376.
52. Son, Ga-young, & Kim, Seong-woo., (2017). The potentials of dynamic assessment for the development of English-speaking performance: A microgenetic analysis. *English Education*, 16(1), 47-82.
53. Şükür, M., Yakişik, B. Y., & Ekşi, G. Y. (2023). Mediational moves and reciprocity behaviors in face-to-face and mobile-assisted dynamic assessment. *Kuramsal Eğitim Bilim Dergisi*, 16(2), 423–453. <https://doi.org/10.30831/akueg.1172583>
54. Teferi, H. (2023). Cultivating EFL learners' productive skills by employing dynamic and non-dynamic assessments: Attitude in focus. *Language Testing in Asia*, 13(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00228-2>



55. Tridinanti, G. (2018). The Correlation between Speaking Anxiety, Self-Confidence, and Speaking Achievement of Undergraduate EFL Students of Private University in Palembang. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 6(4), 35. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.6n.4p.35>
56. Özturan, T., & Gürdal, H. H. U. (2023). Dynamic Assessment as a Learning-Oriented Assessment Approach. In *Advances in educational technologies and instructional design book series* (pp. 89–103). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-5660-6.ch006>
57. Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R.W. Rieber & A.S. Carton (Eds.), *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky, Volume 1: Problems of general psychology* (pp. 39–285). New York: Plenum Press. (Original work published 1934.)
58. Zarei, A. A., & Shishegarha, E. (2024). The effect of dynamic assessment models on L2 listening and speaking anxiety. *Journal of Language Horizons*, 7(4), 149-176.
59. Zhang, Y. (2023). Promoting young EFL learners' listening potential: A model of mediation in the framework of dynamic assessment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 107(S1), 113-136.

### Biodata

**Samaneh Safarpour** is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in the field of teaching English as a foreign language at Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon Branch in Iran. With a decade of teaching experience at English language institutes in Gilan, she has instructed various levels of English language grammar courses.

Email: [samaneh.safarpour2424@gmail.com](mailto:samaneh.safarpour2424@gmail.com)

**Davood Mashhadi Heidar** is an assistant professor of TEFL in the Department of ELT at Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon Branch in Iran. With 12 years of teaching experience, he has delivered courses on discourse analysis, contrastive analysis, linguistics, and English as a foreign language in ELT. Additionally, he has conducted studies on topics related to applied linguistics and teaching English language methodologies.

Email: [davoodm\\_tarbiatmodares@yahoo.com](mailto:davoodm_tarbiatmodares@yahoo.com)

**Ramin Rahimy** holds the position of associate professor of TEFL in the Department of ELT at Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon Branch in Iran. With 28 years of teaching experience, he has taught courses on English language research, teaching methods, linguistics, and English as a foreign language in ELT. Furthermore, he has conducted studies on various topics within his field of study.

Email: [raminrahimy49@yahoo.com](mailto:raminrahimy49@yahoo.com)



© 2024 by the authors. Licensee International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research, Najafabad Iran. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY NC 4.0 license). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

