Original Article

Iranian EFL Learners' Attitudes toward the Application of Different Models of Dynamic Assessment to Listening Comprehension Instruction

Mahshid Ghenaat¹, Fariba Rahimi Esfahani¹,*, Sajad Shafee¹, Mehrdad Sepehri¹

¹English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

Abstract

Simultaneous evaluation of the impact of different types of dynamic assessment on EFL learners' listening comprehension has never been conducted as far as the related literature discloses. Most of the studies connected with the dynamic assessment and various language skills have focused on speaking and writing performance. The present qualitative study aimed to examine Iranian EFL learners' attitudes toward the application of three models of dynamic assessment; namely, Interactionist Dynamic Assessment (I-DA), Group Dynamic Assessment (G-DA), and Computerized Dynamic Assessment (C-DA to Listening Comprehension Instruction. For this purpose, the Preliminary English Test (PET) was administered to 140 Iranian EFL female learners in four English Language Institutes in Ahvaz, Iran, who were chosen through availability sampling, and 80 of them were selected as homogeneous participants of the study. Then, they were given a perception questionnaire intended to elicit their insights about applying the different types of dynamic assessment. Three parallel questionnaires were constructed, each consisting of 15 items, and asking the learners about the efficacy of interactionist dynamic assessment in the I-DA group, group dynamic assessment in the G-DA group, and computerized dynamic assessment in the C-DA group. The descriptive analysis of the respondents' answers revealed that the degree of the IDA, GDA, and CDA learners' positive attitudes towards the application of DA reached statistical significance. This finding implies that EFL teachers may need to deliberate on the positive influence of different dynamic assessment models on EFL learners' listening comprehension improvement and, therefore, provide them with more opportunities to interact.

Keywords: Computerized Dynamic Assessment (C-DA), Dynamic Assessment, Group Dynamic Assessment (G-DA), Interactionist Dynamic Assessment (I-DA), Listening Comprehension

* Corresponding Author's Email: rahimi_fariba@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

Many diagnostic tests (e.g., Alderson et al., 2000) have long been valid and reliable. However, their partial array of cryptographic and metacognitive skills and sub-expertise reveal the opposite. At the same time, linking learning to a sociocultural setting is another method that requires participants to be part of a learning activity that requires a lot of support from learners to ensure LP. According to Vygotsky (1986), learners can show signs of effective learning in the existence of more knowledgeable peers who can guide them to an area close to their actual development and engage in intervention activities using specific strategies and skills (Lantolfe & Pohner, 2007).

One of the most widely used exam methods in today's academic environment is the product-based test, which involves learning a second and foreign language. Many language teachers around the world use final assessment tests in their curricula. The basic idea behind testing students after the allotted time is to see how much progress the students have made in the subject they are teaching. On the other hand, it is not uncommon for a teacher to say that some students are doing well in class but do not understand why they are not getting high grades in exams. At this point, Dynamic Assessment, which applies Vygotsky's sociocultural theory/ SCT to evaluation, can provide new insights for evaluation in the language classroom. He believed that a normal learning situation for the learner was a socially meaningful collaborative activity. This interaction is the source of new cognitive functions and learning abilities. Later, they are internalized and transformed, and the learner's internal cognitive processes are established. The DA for L2 Research and Educational Institutions was introduced by Lantolfe & Pohner (2007) and Pohner & Lantolfe (2005).

Dynamic assessment has been classified into four types: 1) Interactionist Dynamic Assessment (I-DA) which, according to Pohner (2008), follows Vygotsky's approach to cooperative interactions. During the Interactive Dynamic Assessment, key question stimuli are not prearranged; instead, they rise from a facilitated discourse between the examiner and the examinee. The examiner retorts to the examinee's requests and continuously regulates their intercession (Mardani & Tawakoli, 2011). In this approach, help arises from the communication between the mediator and the learner and is, thus, very effective for the learner's immediate advance. 2) Group Dynamic Assessment (G-DA) which claims to have the ability to capture learners' ZPD in groups (Lantolfe & Pohner, 2011). According to Pohner (2009), G-DA has two distinct approaches: synchronous and cumulative. Even if an

individual learner is providedwith mediation, due to the common approach, an exchange initiated in the form of a question or comment through the first interaction can create an opportunity for the second to cooperate. In cumulative G-DA, the basic interactions students interact with their teacher, and Computerized Dynamic Assessment (C-DA) developed by Tzuriel & Shamir (2002). Involved in cognitive psychology, they have attempted to assess a series of thinking abilities in young childrenthat are considered essential to achievement in learning mathematics. 3) Interventional Dynamic Assessment which propounds that if learners cannot respond appropriately to a sequence of tasks, instructions are offered, ranging from implicit ('try again') to explicit (towards significant features of the task), indicating relevant principles or providing reminders. Teachers are also present during test management. They can provide complimentary backing, such as checking the learner's discernment of the task and providing various prompts and explanations, which can also be used in the ultimate diagnosis. According to Tzuriel & Shamir (2002), this process deepens the learner's abilities and creates more learning opportunities while the teacher ispresent, especially when mediated by computers.

The current study can be regarded as a significant one since the studies conducted on DA in Iran have been colossal, but none of the studies has compared the three types of DA, I-DA, G-DA, and C-DA before. Furthermore, the reviewed literature on different types and models of DA shows that C-DA, which is a rather new extension of DA, has attracted much research on reading comprehension. Due attention has not been paid to otherlanguage skills especially listening comprehension. Thus, the findings of this study will be valuable for teachers, material developers, and instructors to recognize the effectiveness of different aspects of dynamic assessment in developing learners' listening performance.

2. Literature Review

The Socio-Cultural Theory of Mind (SCT) (Vygotsky, 1986) demonstrates that language learning is ahead of the process. It is social and cultural ratherthan personal. Language learning is effective and needs to be done socially and culturally relevant by a mediator or more knowledgeable friend (Pohner & Lantolfe, 2005). DA's attorneys (e.g., Abliva, 2008; Anton, 2009; Sternberg and Grigorenko, 2002) stated that students do not necessarily need DA's help to achieve better marks; instead, it aims to diagnose ZAD and ZPD. However, some attention should be paid to predicting actual scoreson the postulation

that such scores do not provide much information about the arbitrary level of learners. To further determine the learners' competence, the mediation scores obtained by the learners indicate the magnitude of the mediation they perform in the ZPD (Lantolfe & Pohner,2011; Vygotsky, 1986). It is believed that the analysis of developing progressions (Poehner & von Kompernoll, 2020) foresees the future actions of individuals, where reference and evaluation are integrated into one comprehensive activity, and such an analysis ultimately leads to a single performance. Learners sometimes do not benefit significantly from mediation and, therefore, when theirZAD is well developed and the potential is already mature, it may not be conducive to learning more.When true low-potential learners fail to reach great heights in achieving high scores in mediator performance, this calls into question the effectiveness of using DA (Hidri, 2019).

So far, it has been shown that DA, inspired by Vygotsky's theory, may be a comprehensive assessment approach that identifies the individual's actual cognitive abilities and targets and helps them develop their maturing abilities. Most importantly, its major contributionto formative assessment is its emphasis on integrating teaching and assessment into a singleactivity, which makes it a radically different assessment approach from others. Thus, learning and development are at its heart. However, DA has been criticized by scholars working within the mainstream assessment approaches in terms of its purpose of assessment, methodology, validity, and reliability. These issues are relevant to the interactionist approach of DA rather than the interventionist since the latter closely follows the traditional form of assessment procedures such as standardization and scoring.

The purpose of DA is sometimes questioned, given its changing goal of assessment. Traditionally, the purpose of assessment is to measure an individual's existing ability at a given time. In contrast, the goal of DA is to examine both their existing and potential abilities and modify them. However, if abilities are modifiable and dynamic, it may be argued that it is impossible tomeasure them accurately (Glutting & McDermott, 1990). Furthermore, this criticism is not valid due to DA's strong alignment with Vygotsky's notion of the ZPD and dynamichuman mental abilities.

In this sense, the purpose of assessment is not to *measure* per se but to *interpret* the cognitive abilities and consider how they can be further developed.

Another issue is the methodology used during the DA process. The learner is assisted rather than the teacher controlling the variables during the assessment process. It has been

arguedthat this poses a threat to the procedure's reliability (Glutting & McDermott, 1990) since the assistance helps to change the ability. DA, however, is a success of the method because its purpose is to bring about changes in the learner through collaboration. The psychometric lens should not be used to examine DA due to its theoretical orientation (i.e., sociocultural theory) andpurpose.

As far as the relevant literature is concerned, the influence of different dynamic predictionson the aural perception of EFL learners has never been assessed simultaneously. Many studies on dynamic assessment and different language skills have focused on writing performance.For example, Anton (2009) examined the DA approach to writing skills of five students in the Spanish Clinical Trial for Advanced Levels. Aljafre & Lantolf (1994) maintained DA proceduresfor writing, in which the mediator supported everything from explicit instructions to explicit amendments. Although Anton noted that mediated learners could gain more in-depth explanations of existing and potential language capabilities through DA policies, DA policies are administered only once after a trial, and their interaction appears to be very limited.Furthermore, Anton did not offer specifics of the DA measures to be tracked through the mediation.

Some other investigations focus precisely on writing in the English setting as a foreign language. Two papers are worth observing here, though they are more related to English language learning than disciplinal education. Alavi & Taghizadeh (2014) were the first to commence their research with Iranian graduate students during the IELTS exam. The authors tested a secret-to-clear method to mediate with participants. The focus was on content writing andorganizational skills and strategies. The study followed a pre-test and post-test design and directed a statistical analysis of student performance in essay writing. As in preceding research, the authors found that participants' areas of focus positively affected different areas of primate development (i.e., learning ability). They argued that clear teacher feedback is most operative in the mediation procedure. However, their paper does not contain in-depth data on the concrete mediation procedure or the interaction between teachers and learners. Another study was conducted by Ebadi and Rahimi (2019) on three undergraduate Iranian university students in the IELTS academic written test setting. DA processes were managed synchronously through Google Docs. The authors discovered that DA sessions positively affected participants' overall academic writing progress in terms of coherence and coherence, vocabulary, syntactic range, and accuracy,which are the essential criteria exploited in the

IELTS exam. They pursued participants for exercise assignments, which displayed participants' matured writing capacities. They stated the participants' positive perceptions about DA.

The studies reviewed above state that DA improves students' language skills by improvingstudent-independent performance and responding appropriately to teacher-student development potential through teacher mediation by providing them with the support they need. These studies have been conducted on only a few students learning some strict foreign or second language characteristics from a DA perspective. Furthermore, no researcher has used the all-inclusivelanguage usage theory, which Gardner (2010) discovered almost a decade ago. The aim of the present study was, therefore, to contribute to filling this gap by exploring Iranian EFL learners' attitudes towards the application of three models of dynamic assessment; namely, Interactionist Dynamic Assessment (I-DA), Group Dynamic Assessment (G-DA), and Computerized Dynamic Assessment (C-DA to Listening Comprehension Instruction. Thus, the following research question was addressed:

RQ. What are Iranian EFL learners' attitudes towards applying I-DA, G-DA, andC-DA to listening comprehension?

3. Methodology
3.1. Design and Context of the Study

This study is qualitative and consists of three participant groups focusing on the variables of interactionist dynamic assessment, group dynamic assessment, and computerized dynamic assessment as the independent variables and listening comprehension as dependent variables. The study was done in the context of English Language Institutes in Ahvaz, Iran, with eighty intermediate students.

3.2. Participants

For the present study, the Preliminary English Test (PET) was given to one hundred and forty Iranian EFL learners, and eighty of them were selected as the study sample. The students were selected from four English Language Institutes in Ahvaz, Iran, and their level of general English proficiency was intermediate. Their age range was between 18 and 32 years old. All the participants were females, and they were native speakers of Persian. The non-random availability sampling method was used to choose the study sample.

3.3. Instruments

Two instruments were utilized in the present research. The first tool was the Preliminary EnglishTest (PET). It was used to select homogeneous participants. According to this test, learners who scored 32 to 39 were considered intermediate. This test consists of 60 multiple choice items. Students who score 32 to 39 are considered pre-intermediate. Students with scores from 42 to 48 are considered Intermediate. Students who score 48 to 54 are called advanced learners, and those who score 55 to 60 are considered very advanced learners. The second tool was the standard Awareness Questionnaire which aims to unravel the learners' understanding of the different types of dynamic assessment implementation. Based on this questionnaire, the authors constructed three parallel questionnaires. Each consisted of 15 items, which asked the participants about the application of interactive dynamic assessmentin the I-DA group, Group Dynamic Assessment in the G-DA group, and Computerized Dynamic Assessment in the C-DA group. A detailed analysis of the respondents' answers revealed that the positive attitudes of IDA, GDA, and CDA learners towards DA application had reached statisticalsignificance.

3.4. Procedures

3.4.1. Data Collection Procedure

Before conducting the main part of the study, the Preliminary English Test (PET) was administered to the whole population in four English Language Institutes in Ahvaz, Iran. Eighty of them were selected as the intermediate participants of the study. Then, to collect the needed data for analysis and ultimately find an answer to the study's research question, the standard Awareness Questionnaire was administered to all the participants. The obtained data were statistically analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, and a one-sample t-test.

3.4.2. Data Analysis Procedure

The present study was conducted to check Iranian EFL learners' attitudes toward applying interactionist dynamic assessment, group dynamic assessment,and computerized dynamic assessment to listening comprehension instruction. To this end, the frequencies of the participant's responses to the questionnaire mentioned above were calculated. An item mean score for each questionnaire item was determined, showing the extent to which the

learners (dis)agreed with that questionnaire item. Then, using a one-sample *t*-test, the learners' overall agreement/disagreement level in each group was determined, and its statistical value was tested.

4. Results

The research question of the present study was formulated to check Iranian EFL learners' attitudes toward applying interactionist dynamic assessment, group dynamic assessment,and computerized dynamic assessment to listening comprehension instruction. To this end, three versions of a standard questionnaire were given to the participants, and frequencies ofresponses were used to calculate an item mean score for each questionnaire item, which showed the extent to which the learners (dis)agreed with that questionnaire item. Then, using a one-sample*t-test*, the learners' overall agreement/disagreement level in each group was determined, and its statistical value was tested. Table 1 shows the frequencies of responses provided by the IDA group to the questionnaire.

Table 1

Attitudes of the Learners Towards IDA

No	Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean
1	The assistance Ireceive throughIDA helps me understand the listening texts.	8	9	3	0	0	4.25
2	IDA offers opportunities formore effective listening comprehension.	5	7	4	3	1	3.60
3	IDA offers flexibility in listening comprehension.	4	6	5	4	1	3.40
4	IDA allows me to interact and tacklemy listening comprehension problems.	6	8	5	1	0	3.95
5	IDA motivates meto keep interactingand improving mylistening comprehension	6	9	5	0	0	4.05
6	Listening in an IDA environment is a	7	7	6	0	0	4.05

	valuable alternativeto the classical learning methods.						
7	Listening in an IDA environment is effective and enjoyable.	4	6	5	3	2	3.35
8	By interacting, learning listening comprehension canbe managed in a better way.	5	8	5	2	0	3.80
9	It is interesting to interact and learn to listen in English.	7	8	5	0	0	4.10
10	Learning to listen inan IDA environment motivates me to improve.	5	5	6	4	0	3.55
11	Learning to listen inan IDA environment makes me more proficient.	4	5	7	3	1	3.40
12	Listening in an IDA environment eradicates ambiguity and causes less anxiety for me.	6	9	5	0	0	4.05
13	In an IDA environment, I feelless inhibited and stressed when listening in English.	4	7	6	2	1	3.55
14	Overall, I am satisfied with the application of IDA in listening lessons.	6	7	7	0	0	3.95
15	I acclaim the use ofIDA in upcoming listening courses.	4	8	6	2	0	3.70

In this questionnaire, as can be seen, the average score for all the questionnaire items wasgreater than 3.00 (i.e., when the average value of the options was strongly accepted and accepted when not accepted). This implies that IDA learners approved of all the questionnaire items relatedto the positive features and properties of the interactionist dynamic assessment on the auditory perception of EFL learners. The highest average scores in Table 2 were # 1 (M = 4.25), 9 (M = 4.10), 5 (M = 4.05), 6 (M = 4.05), and 12 (M = 4.05), obtained by learners (a) IDA. Assistance issaid to help them understand the lessons they listen to, (b) learn to speak and listen in English is interesting, and (c) IDA helps them communicate and improve their listening comprehension. (D) listening in an IDA environment is a valuable alternative to classical learningmethods, and (e) listening in an IDA environment eliminates ambiguity

and causes less concern about them. Similarly, all other aspects were approved by the learners. The one-sample *t*-test results in Tables 2 and 3 should be consulted to see if this level of agreement is statistically significant, but before that, GDA and CDA learners' attitudes towards treatment should be observed.

Table 2

Attitudes of the Learners Towards GDA

No	Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean
1	The assistance I receivethrough GDA helps me understand the listening texts.	7	11	2	0	0	4.25
2	GDA offers opportunities for more effective listening comprehension.	6	8	5	1	0	3.95
3	GDA offers flexibility in listening comprehension.	5	8	6	1	0	3.85
4	GDA allows me tointeract and tacklemy listening comprehension problems.	8	8	4	0	0	4.20
5	GDA motivates meto keep interactingand improving my listening comprehension	7	10	3	0	0	4.20
6	Listening in a GDA environment is a valuable alternativeto the classical learning methods.		8	5	0	0	4.10
7	Listening in a GDA environment is effective and enjoyable.		8	7	2	0	3.60

8	By interacting, learning listening comprehension canbe managed in a better way.	6	9	5	0	0	4.05
9	It is interesting to cooperate and learn to listen in English.	6	9	5	0	0	4.05
10	Learning to listen ina GDA environment motivates me to improve.	6	7	7	0	0	3.95
11	Learning to listen ina GDA environment makes me more proficient.	4	6	8	2	0	3.60
12	Listening in a GDA environment eradicates ambiguity and causes less anxiety for me.	7	8	5	0	0	4.10
13	In a GDA environment, I feelless inhibited and stressed when listening in English.	5	7	6	1	1	3.70
14	Overall, I am satisfied with the application of GDA in listening lessons.	7	7	6	0	0	4.05
15	I acclaim the use ofGDA in upcoming listening courses.	5	7	8	0	0	3.85

Table 2 shows that the questionnaire items received mean scores larger than 3.00, indicating that the GDA learners approved of all the questionnaire items, which were all positive comments about group dynamic assessment with reference to its effects on L2 listening comprehension. The highest mean scores in Table 4.14 were for items # 1 ($M = 4.25$), 4 ($M = 4.20$), 5 ($M = 4.20$), 6 ($M = 4.10$), and 12 ($M = 4.10$), through which the learners concurred that (a) the assistance they received through GDA helped them understand

the listening texts, (b) GDA allowed them to cooperate and tackle their listening comprehension problems, (c) GDA motivates them to keep interacting and improving their listening comprehension, (d) listening in a GDA environment is a valued alternative to the conventional learning methods, and (e) listening in a GDA atmosphere eradicates ambiguity and causes less anxiety for them. All the other 10 items received the learners' approval as well.

Table 3

Attitudes of the Learners Towards CDA

No.	Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	No. opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean
1	The assistance I receive through CDA helps me understand the listening texts.	5	9	3	3	0	3.80
2	CDA offers opportunities for moreeffective listening comprehension.	4	7	6	2	1	3.55
3	Using computers in a DA environment offersflexibility in listening comprehension.	6	5	4	3	2	3.50
4	CDA allows me to use technology to tackle my listening problems.	7	8	3	2	0	4.00
5	CDA motivates me to keep working and improving my listening comprehension.	5	7	4	3	1	3.60
6	Listening through CDAis a valuable alternativeto the traditional learning methods.	7	7	4	2	0	3.95
7	Listening in a CDA environment is effective, amusing, and enjoyable.	4	6	5	4	1	3.40
8	Receiving support in a computerized context, learning listening comprehension can be managed better.	6	8	4	2	0	3.90
9	It is interesting to gain help online and learn tolisten in English.	4	6	7	3	0	3.55
10	Learning to listen in aCDA environment motivates me to improve.	4	8	5	3	0	3.65
11	Learning to listen in aCDA environment makes me more confident and proficient.	4	7	6	2	1	3.55
12	Listening through CDA eradicates ambiguity and causes less anxiety for me.	6	8	6	0	0	4.00

13	In a CDA environment,I feel less inhibited andstressed when listening in English.	6	6	4	2	2	3.60
14	Overall, I am satisfiedwith the application ofCDA in listening lessons.	5	8	5	2	0	3.80
15	I acclaim the use of CDA in upcominglistening courses.	5	8	6	0	0	3.75

For the CDA questionnaire, all the items had larger-than-average mean scores, implying that the CDA learners approved of all the statements in the questionnaire items and had thus positive perceptions of the effects of computerized dynamic assessment on the listening comprehension EFL learners. The highest mean scores in Table 3 were those of items # 4 ($M = 4.00$), 12 ($M = 4.00$), 6 ($M = 3.95$), and 8 ($M = 3.90$), through which the learners expressed that (a) CDA allowed them to use technology to tackle their listening problems, (b) listening through CDA eradicated ambiguity and caused less anxiety for them, (c) listening in a CDA environment was a valuable alternative to the classical learning methods, and (d) receiving support in a computerized context, learning listening comprehension could be handled in a better manner. In like manner, the mean scores of all the other 10 items implied the learners' approval. To check if the extent of this approval is statistically substantial or not, the results of the one-sample *t-test* in Tables 4 and 5 should be consulted. This statistical tool likens the mean score of adistribution with a constant (which was 3.00 in this analysis since the choices in the Likert-scale questionnaire vacillated from 1 to 5, and the average value of the selections was 3.00). Table 4 displays the results of descriptive statistics accomplished for this goal.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for the Learners' Attitudes

	N	Mean	*Std.* Deviation	*Std.* Error Mean
Attitudes towards IDA	15	3.78	.29	.07
Attitudes towards GDA	15	3.96	.20	.05
Attitudes towards CDA	15	3.70	.19	.04

The overall attitude mean scores for the IDA, GDA, and CDA learners were equal to 3.78, 3.96, and 3.70, larger than 3.00. This implies that, as stated above, the IDA, GDA, and CDA learners' overall attitudes towards the use of DA for listening comprehension were positive. To find out whether these positive attitudes were of statistical significance or not, the authors had to check the *p* values under the *Sig.* (2-tailed) column in the one-sample *t-test* table(Table 5).

Table 5

One-Sample t-Test Results for the Learners' Attitudes

| | | | | Test Value = 3 | | |
| | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
	T	*df*	*Sig.* (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
Attitudes towards IDA	10.28	14	.000	.78	.62	.94
Attitudes towards GDA	17.88	14	.000	.96	.85	1.08
Attitudes towards CDA	14.14	14	.000	.70	.59	.81

Table 5 shows that the attitude mean scores of IDA ($M = 3.78$), GDA ($M = 3.96$), and CDA($M = 3.70$) were significantly different from the average value of the choices (i.e., 3.00) because the three *p* values were smaller than the quantified level of significance ($p = .000 < .05$). Accordingly, it could be decided that the extent of the IDA, GDA, and CDA learners' positive attitudes towards the application of DA for L2 listening comprehension lessons reached statisticalsignificance.

5. Discussion

As an alternative to the traditional exam practice, Dynamic Assessment (DA) involves a variety of approaches in psychology and education that combine instruction with a prediction (Elliott, 2003). It is no longer a new psychological and academic evaluation approach, and someof its current applications are over half a century old. Inspired by theories in learning and psychology, including the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and Sociocultural Theory (SCT), DA has different versions and, therefore, is classified into different types. Such typologies includeinteractionist, group, and computerized orientation for dynamic assessment. They attempted to assess the hierarchical thinking abilities of young children, which are considered essential to achievement in learning mathematics. According to Pohner (2008), following the interventionist model, the Dynamic Evaluation of Interactions (IDA) follows Vygotsky's approach to collaborative interactions. In this qualitative approach, the interaction between the moderator and the learner is facilitated, and thus the learner's immediate developmentis more penetrating (Mardani & Tawakoli, 2011). According to Interactive Dynamic Assessment,leading questions and suggestions by Abliva (2008) are not preplanned; instead, they emerge in mediation discussions between the examiner and the examinee. The examiner responds to the examinee's needs and continuously responds to regulate their mediation.

Based on Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, Group Dynamic Assessment (GDA) is definedas the ability to capture learners' ZPDs into groups (Poehner & Lantolf, 2011). According to Pohner (2009), the GDA has two distinct approaches: simultaneous and cumulative. Based on theprevious one, even if mediation is provided to the individual learner, the conversion initiated by the first interactor in the form of inquiry or comment may create an opportunity for the cooperationof the second. Later, however, learners engage in basic interactions in communicating with their teacher.

Finally, computerized dynamic Assessment (Tzuriel & Shamir, 2002), the most recent type of DA, is an approach to creating mediated interactions for learners. Here scholars have learners who cannot respond appropriately to a sequence of tasks. Some instructions range from implicit ('try again') to explicit ('important import features of the work'). The teacher checks the learner's understanding of the task during the test administration,providing various prompts and explanations. According to Tzuriel & Shamir

(2002), this processfurther enhances the learner's abilities and creates more opportunities for learning while the teacheris present, especially when mediated by computers.

The role of the above types of DA in auditory perception indications has been explored inprevious literature. Most studies on DA have focused on reading comprehension except for Listening Comprehension, although both skills are equally adaptable and are influenced by DA processes. Consequently, the present study's focus is on the role of these three types of DA, namely, IDA, GDA, and CDA, to see if the attitude of EFL learners towards their application is positive.

As shown by the data analysis results, the overall attitude of IDA, GDA, and CDA learnerstowards the use of Dynamic Assessment for listening awareness are significantly positive. The study results confirm the results of Ebadi & Rahimi (2019), who conveyed positive insightsto the participants about DA application in academic writing development. The findings are consistent with Babamoradi et al. (2018) and Heywood and Lidz (2007). Their studies have shown that learners have a helpful attitude toward DA implementation in language teachingand evaluation.

6. Conclusion

Based on the results obtained from the analysis of data, it is worth mentioning that althoughcaution should be exercised in generalizing the finding to non-Iranian language learners, the fact that this finding strengthened the positive role of dynamic assessment in listening comprehensiondevelopment would highlight the general effectiveness of dynamic assessment in language learning. Not only do the results of the present study highlight that dynamic assessment is effectivein listening comprehension, but it also became evident that theories and principles behind dynamic assessment are valid in promoting learning. Accordingly, teachers and curriculum developers mayuse creative theories and principles behind dynamic assessment for language instruction, including the receptive skill of listening comprehension. Moreover, some implications can be drawn from the current study. Generally, this research has a boundlesspossibility to back Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). The obtained results indicatethat EFL instructors may need to reflect on the constructive impact of IDA, GDA, and CDA on the listening comprehension enhancement of intermediate EFL learners and, therefore, afford theirlearners more prospects to interact and receive mediation and support.

The study results may also propose an alteration in the outdated models of listening comprehension assessments, which accentuate psychometric quantification of students' achievements and provide no chances for learner-teacher interaction and growth. Specifically, language teachers can use online CDA procedures inside and outside the classroom contexts to fulfill two major goals. First, they can use the results of such procedures for diagnostic purposes. That is, before the introduction of CDA into the field of diagnostic assessment, teachers could only make use of learners' level of independent performanceor ZAD (i.e., actual scores), yet DA equips teachers with more diagnostic tools such as mediated and learning potential scores as well as the learners' scoring profiles generated right after they finished the test. Teachers could use these diagnostic tools for the whole class or individual learners.

The results of this research also recommend that, in the first place, Iranian EFL teachers cantake advantage of the use of dynamic assessment procedures when it comes to teaching languageskills, including listening comprehension. Language teacher trainers can focus on incorporating dynamic assessment in their course content to better prepare the teachers for delivering dynamicassessment in the light of cultural orientations. In addition to language teachers and teacher trainers, material developers need to be aware of the positive aspects of dynamic assessment and learners' positive attitudes towards it and design their textbooks to accommodate the use of dynamic assessment.

References

Abliva, R. (2008). The effects of dynamic assessment on L2 listening comprehension. *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages*, 57-86.

Alavi, S. M., and 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.

Alderson, J. C., Percsich, R., and Szabo, G. (2000). Sequencing as an item type. *Language Testing, 17*(4), 423-447.

Aljafreh, A., and Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The modern language journal, 78*(4), 465-483.

Anton, M. (2009). Dynamic assessment of advanced second language learners. *Foreign Language Annals, 42*(3), 576-598.

Babamoradi, P., Nasiri, M., Mohammadi, E. (2018). Learners' attitudes toward using dynamic assessment in teaching and assessing IELTS writing task one. *International Journal of Language Testing* 8(1), 1-15.

Ebadi, S., and Rahimi, M. (2019). Mediating EFL learners' academic writing skills in online dynamic assessment using Google Docs. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 32*(5-6), 527-555.

Elliott, J. (2003). Dynamic assessment in educational settings: Realizing potential. *Educational Review, 55*(1), 15-32.

Gardner, S. (2010). SFL: A theory of language for dynamic assessment of EAL. *NALDIC Quarterly, 8*(1), 37-41.

Gibbons, P. (2006). Bridging Discourses in the ESL Classroom: Students, Teachers, and Researchers. London: Continuum.

Glutting, J., and McDermott, P. (1990). Principles and problems in learning potential. *Handbook of psychological and educational assessment of children. Intelligence and achievement, 1*, 296-347.

Hidri, S. (2019). Static vs. dynamic assessment of students' writing exams: a comparison of two assessment modes. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 13*(4), 239-256.

Haywood, H. C., and Lidz, C. S. (2006). *Dynamic assessment in practice: Clinical and educational applications.* Cambridge University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., and Poehner, M. E. (2007). Dynamic assessment of L2 development: Bringing the past into the future. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice, 1*(1), 49-72.

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.

Mardani, M., and Tavakoli, M. (2011). Beyond Reading Comprehension: The Effect of Adding a Dynamic Assessment Component on EFL Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(3).

Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting L2 development.* Springer Science and Business Media.

Poehner, M. E. (2009). Group dynamic assessment: Mediation for the L2 classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(3), 471-491.

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

Poehner, M. E., and van Compernolle, R. A. (2020). Reconsidering time and process in L2 dynamic assessment. In *Toward a Reconceptualization of Second Language Classroom Assessment (*pp. 173-195): Springer.

Sternberg, R.J., and Grigorenko, E.L. (2002). *Dynamic testing: The nature and measurement of learning potential.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tzuriel, D., and Shamir, A. (2002). The effects of mediation in computer-assisted dynamic assessment. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 18*(1), 21-32.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Sociocultural theory. *Mind in society, 6*, 52-58

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and Language (A. Kozulin, Trans.) Cambridge, MA.* Paper presented at the MIT Press.