

The Impacts of Classroom Digital Literacy on EFL Iranian Teachers' Dynamic Assessment Quality Improvement

Raeisi, Mohammad Reza*
mohammadreza.raeisi@yahoo.com

Mashhadi Heidar, Davood
davoodm_tarbiatmodares@yahoo.com

Khodareza, Mohammadreza
m.khodarezadg@gmail.com

English Faculty, Tonekabon Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of dynamic assessment as a process-oriented mechanism on the digital classroom literacy of Iranian institute EFL teachers. The participants were 168 male and female institute EFL teachers to whom the teachers' digital classroom literacy was studied in two groups. A truncated form of classroom checklist was also given to the participants to assess their language proficiency. The participants were divided into 2 groups based on the researcher's task. 1 experimental group (84 females in group A and 84 males in group B) and 1 control groups (21 females in group C and 21 males in group D). The dynamic assessment was based on the digital literacy model adopted from Nawaz and Kundi (2010) consisting of frequency of usage of computers, internet and digital technology in EFL classrooms. The control groups received the traditional assessment without modern technologies. The data were analyzed using one independent samples t tests, mean and the effect size. The results showed that the applicability of dynamic assessment considerably improved the digital literacy of the participants.

Key words: applicability of dynamic assessment; digital literacy; possibilities; process-oriented mechanism

1. Introduction

Although various ways of appraising digital classroom literacy have been recommended in the literature, the rise of web 2.0 tools and digital technologies have not been developed in the promotion of tools within dynamic assessment (Garcia, Dungag, Elbeltagi and Gimour, 2013). With the advent of digital technology, a new generation of students entering higher education in institute that is very different from previous generation (ibid). This generation has been

considered to have developed through digital software, internet technologies and increasingly web 2.0 technologies (Waycott et al, 2010).

Moreover, Nawaz and Kundi (2010) provided an accurate analysis of the contemporary paradigms of digital literacy so that there can often be a mismatch between the training provided and the requirement of academic staff who are frequently not engaged in the design of training. One important assessment is that due to a broader measurement in terms of dynamic assessment in that the teacher can do, formative and summative assessment is in fact of a high value for him/her. Gillen and Barton (2010) also believe that parallel to changes in conceptions of language are changes in prevailing conceptions of "literacy" in the field of education.

As Norton (2013) notes the complex ways in which families, schools and communities interact and differ in their literacy practices provide significant insights into the ways in which people talk each other, and have literacy both inside and outside institute classrooms.

Technically speaking, compared to the traditional assessment saying L2 teachers to inform facts in regard to pre-formulated questions, dynamic assessment does not deal with the process of teaching speaking as well as other skills since they cannot truly describe L2 learners' capability (Lam and Lee, 2010). They also showed that due to being a type of formative and un-timed assessment, dynamic assessment regarding a full length picture of L2 learners' ability. Likewise, portfolio assessment can make L2 teachers to do better assessment of L2 learners' performance so that alternative assessment can promote the learning process among L2 learners and strengthen the learners' autonomy (p. 136 as cited in Hashemian and Fadaei, 2013).

Nevertheless, by introducing dynamic assessment as a factor that improves the teacher's digital classroom literacy, L2 teaching has experienced a change in assessment practices. This fact may be accounted for the problems with the traditional assessment like American File (1) iChecker CD ROM. According to Ezziane (2007), digital technologies can be learnt through both informal and formal tools. At large, the manner in which individuals are expected to best learn and it relies on the knowledge of utilizing digital technologies with those with lower knowledge needing greater support from formal training.

Whereas training may help in the growth of digital literacy, it is required to mention whether there can frequently be a disharmony among teachers provided and needs of teachers are not considered seriously. However, we have been long familiar with the teachers' digital classroom literacy in the Iranian institutes that are mostly involved in computer technologies with few tools of digital knowledge on the part of learners' education.

Reviewing digital literacy of literature (e.g. Beckingham and Belshaw, 2012, Countryman, 1992, Fraillon, Schulz and Ainley, 2013) shows that the different methods and assessments which try to investigate the ability and practicality of such a model in their educational contexts. However, dynamic assessment (DA) has been widely researched in different fields and it appeared that language scholars have begun to study its pedagogical programs (Lantolf and Poehner, 2004; Poehner, 2005).

This study was designed to investigate teachers' digital literacy of classroom assessment in Iran and their current classroom assessment practices. Specifically, the study tried to study the methods and tools teachers want to assess their students. The researcher conducted how classroom dynamic assessment of teacher's literacy carried out in the institutes by focusing on the literacy and digital knowledge of the teachers so as to assess the teachers' practices in the classroom.

In addition, the researcher investigated teacher literacy of the role of dynamic assessment applicability based on possibilities existed in institutes. Likewise, Alavi and Taheri (2014) stated that DA requires more interaction and provision of more feedback; therefore, it makes the second language classrooms more interactive and authentic. Related studies have shown that including self-assessment in the overall plan for evaluation can have a number of general benefits. It can expand responsibility for assessing learning (Birjandi and Mosallanegad, 2011).

2. Literature Review

This section gives an overview on how Iranian teachers learn English and reviews studies that have been conducted on classroom assessment. Then it describes relationships between interactions and practice and at last it presents a brief description of digital classroom literacy in Iran.

2. 1. The effects of Dynamic Assessment on Digital Classroom Literacy

For a few decades, different researchers have investigated learners' English ideas and teacher literacy and application of dynamic assessment as well as their development (Angelo, and Cross 1993). Most of the results of these studies suggest that learning English is complex, takes time and is not often conveyed by many teachers (Even & Tirosh, 2002). Attempts to develop theories that describe how students learn English continue to evolve. Classroom assessment can involve formative assessment conducted with the aim of enhancing both teaching and learning (Gronlund, 2003; Stiggins & Chappius, 2005; Shephard, 2000). A prominent example is the Vygotsky's theory of education, one of the most comprehensive theories formulated concerning dynamic assessment.

According to Vygotsky (1987), students learn when they are in their zone of proximal development, what they also refer to as ZPD. The theory states that when students learn in the classroom. Dynamic assessment, with its roots in Vygotsky's theory of mind, takes the integration of assessment and instruction much further by enabling the leader in this dialogic dance to optimally promote learners' abilities by continually fine-tuning their mediation to the learners' changing needs. In fact, central to DA is the tenet that cognitive abilities can only be fully understood by actively promoting their development. DA overcomes the assessment–instruction dualism by unifying them according to the principle that mediated interaction is necessary to understand the range of an individual's functioning but that this interaction simultaneously guides the further development of these abilities.

Research evidence also shows that classroom assessment is an essential ingredient for effective teaching and learning (Gipps, 1990; Black & Wiliam, 1998; Shephard, 2000; Stiggins, 2002). Assessment could also be seen in broad social terms, where one can refer to the evaluation process taking place in any social situation, any industry or place of work. Likewise, Stobart appraises the ability of assessment in everyday life asserting that, "Assessment in the broad notion of gathering evidence in order to make a judgment, is part of the artificial part of life" (Stobart, 2008, p.5).

Hence the application of dynamic assessment can have different implications in institutes. However, Broadfoot (1996) states "the term 'assessment' that is used both as a general umbrella term to cover all methods of testing and assessment, and as a term to distinguish 'alternative assessment' from 'testing' (p4). Some applied linguists use the term 'testing' to apply to the construction and administration of formal or standardized tests such as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and 'assessment' to refer to more informal methods such as those listed below under the heading 'alternative assessment.' For example, Buckingham (2007) argues that digital literacy tended to take a rather restricted idea of information and explains discussions of digital literacy to place a major emphasis on information technology. There seems, indeed, to have been a shift in many language testers' perceptions so that they, perhaps subconsciously, may be starting to think of testing solely in relation to standardized large-scale tests.

Iran's system of education has been characterized as examination oriented with low internal efficiency. Therefore, the appearance of an innovative educational framework such as Dynamic Assessment (DA) required language teachers to investigate the ability and practicality of such a model in their educational contexts. However, DA has been widely researched in different fields and it appeared that language scholars have begun to study its pedagogical programs (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004; Poehner, 2005).

2.2. Teachers' Assessment Practices.

Three methods have been used to investigate teachers' assessment practices, as well as their levels of preparation to assess students: surveys of attitudes, beliefs, and practices; tests of assessment knowledge; and reviews of teachers' actual assessments.

A major feature of recent developments in the sociology of the school has been the renewed study of examinations and assessment for many years. Broadfoot (1996) studied that "access to and success in examination has been a key determinant of social mobility. But he has seen more clearly that examinations are important instruments of social control "accrediting" individuals and legitimating' knowledge" (p.9).

Tarasa (2010) notes that "Assessment for Learning and various permutations of this can be found in use in educational institutions across the world: it began as a distinct movement in the UK which is based on principles to support learners through assessment. Tarasa has also disseminated four interventions: questioning, feedback through marking, peer- and self-assessment, and formative use of summative tests" (P. 3015).

Teaching English is providing situations that can help learners to find a useful interaction and dynamic assessment during classroom era. Students should be guided to see the importance of literacy not by interaction but by investigating and relating to real-life situations and applicability of dynamic assessment so as to outperform classroom instruction. Giving students Quiz Exams of each unit as a task based on dynamic assessment can enhance learning process to help them to understand textbooks considered for them. The more they do the assignment or a well-disciplined assessment; they can grasp contents of units more efficiently.

2. 3. Digital Classroom Literacy in Iran

Institute teacher education remains a big challenge in Iran. The majority of the tutors in teacher training are secondary school teachers transferred to the colleges to train primary school teachers without any further training them (Susuwale-Banda, 2005). For instance, the current practice is that the Ministry of Education identifies a secondary school teacher to become a primary school teacher. The secondary school teachers join the primary teacher training colleges without thorough understanding of the basic mathematical concepts and pedagogical content.

This creates problem because the tutors fail to draw from their own experience. The only resources that the college tutors use are the student's handbooks. Although the institute teachers have no formal teaching, experience, they are expected to prepare the specific teacher trainees to become effective teachers. This arrangement is one of the contributing factors to poor standards of institutes in Iran.

Researchers have attempted to investigate teacher's perceptions of assessment in many different ways (Chester & Quilter, 1998). A study conducted by Chester and Quilter (1998) on in-service teachers perceptions of classroom assessment standardized testing and alternative methods concluded that teachers perceptions of classroom assessment affected their assessment classroom practices, Teachers that attached less value to classroom assessment used standardized tests most of the times in their classroom.

Chester and Quilter went further to say that teachers with negative experiences in classroom assessment and standardized testing are least likely to see the value in various forms of assessment for their classroom. They recommended, therefore, that in-service training should focus on helping teachers see the value of assessment methods rather than how to do assessment.

True as it may seem, to the best of the present researchers' literacy, there is a scarcity of quantitative studies as to the possible effect of dynamic assessment on L2 teachers' literacy and the potential effect of digital knowledge on dynamic assessment with respect to teaching American File courses in institutes. Therefore, the present study was an attempt to investigate the following questions:

1. Do dynamic assessment and traditional assessments differ in their process-oriented mechanism on teachers' digital literacy with respect to the way of teaching?
2. Does digital classroom literacy make any significant difference vis-à-vis the impact of dynamic assessment on teaching as a process-oriented mechanism in Iranian Institutes?

3. Methodology

Participants

First, the Classroom Digital Literacy Questionnaire (Plake & Impara, 1993) was administered among 150 institute EFL English teachers, male (n=70), who were studying in 16 English language institutes in Mazandaran, Iran, and who were selected based on convenience sampling, that is, the participants were selected on the basis of their presence in institutes for at least three times in a week. The participants' age ranged from 22 to 48, and some of them had experiences of teaching in schools and universities, however, most of teachers were involved in institutes for their teaching experiences. Moreover, they were asked to utilize digital technologies for assessments rather than paper-based assessment. iChecker CD assessment was a convenience sampling test to re-evaluate learners. As Table 1 shows, based on the mean score (M=108.5) and the standard deviation (SD=45.36) assessed by SPSS, 80 participants (from among the 150 EFL English teachers) whose digital literacy level on assessment was below the mean score were selected:

Table 1

Mean Score and standard Deviation of Teachers' Digital Literacy Questionnaire

	<i>N</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Scores</i>	168	1.00	43.00	3.56	3.32

Second, in order to check the participants' paired samples statistics with respect to teachers' digital classroom literacy, a truncated checklist of American English File (1-5) Online Practice adopted from Latham-Koeing, Oxenden and Seligson (2013) was given to the participants. As Table 2 shows, probing the output box presenting the results of the compare the mean, and paired samples test scores of the mean scores of the male and female participants indicated standard deviation and standard error mean based on their variable defined in two groups:

Table 2

Paired Samples statistics

<i>Pair</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Std. Error Mean</i>
<i>Variable 1</i>	3.5714	84	4.55300	.49677
<i>Variable 2</i>	3.5595	84	1.2059	.13158

Then, the 168 participants were randomly selected through observation, interview and memo into two groups: one experimental group (84 female and male in different institute classes) and one control group (48 female teachers and 36 male teachers in different classes in thirteen English institutes). Most teachers randomly selected from 13 institutes in Mazandaran, Hamadan, Karaj, and Tehran. The experimental group was selected in order to be assessed through dynamic assessment both summative and formative assessment through self-assessment, CD DROM of American File Set and the control group was provided with the conventional approach of testing (Quizzes, Midterm and Final Exams). Table 3 summarizes the participants' characteristics:

Table 3
Characteristics of the Participants

	Experimental	Control
Female	48	41
Male	36	43

Thanks to the Iranian Islamic regulations, mixed classes were not permitted in the language institutes. Thus, the researcher gathered the data from the male and female participants by himself.

Instruments

The instruments were the followings:

The first was teachers' digital classroom literacy questionnaire (Plake & Impara, 1993). This questionnaire consists of three main parts: The first part selects the checklist information of the classrooms, and the second part has the demographic information of the participants, and the third part (inventory) consists of two parts. Part I consists of 35 items related to the seven Standards for Teacher Literacy in the Dynamic Assessment of Students on a 4-point Likert scale about the teachers' literacy in dynamic assessment of Iranian regarding the learners (see Appendix A).

The choices range from (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*) Some of the items are intended to measure general concepts related to testing and assessment, consisting of the use of assessment strategies for determining student practices and finding the results of assessment to students and parents; other items are related to knowledge of standardized testing and the remaining items are related to classroom assessment. Part II consists of related to participants' background as a classroom teacher. These questionnaires ask for the impact of dynamic assessment on the teachers' digital literacy and the most effective use a teacher can make of an assessment need students to show their work through the way they got at a stage to a problem or the aim to achieve at a conclusion.

It should be noted that, through doing factor analysis, Plake and Impara, (1993) confirmed the presence of four factors of teachers' digital literacy in this questionnaire: dynamic assessment, self-assessment, the validity of the scores from a classroom assessment, Process-oriented mechanism on the digital classroom literacy of Iranian institute EFL teachers. As to the reliability and validity of the above questionnaire, the former was measured through applying paired samples statistics. The standard deviation turned out to be 3.3, showing that the questionnaire functioned well in terms of variance and reliability.

The second instrument was a questionnaire form of digital classroom literacy inventory of the impact of DA on Iranian EFL teachers to make sure that the teachers conducted the all questions completely or not with the same level of proficiency, and accordingly, to homogenize them prior to the beginning of the study. The questionnaire had 42 multiple questions and 5 personal questions regarding their backgrounds of teaching in institutes. This was a questionnaire along with its guidelines for the application of dynamic assessment stages of digital classroom literacy checklist.

Procedure

The data collection process was based upon 16-session experimented study (90 minutes for each session). Since the participants were not familiar with the type of experiment, the researcher explained the design, goal, and procedure of the dynamic assessment in the experimental groups (i.e., classes A, B, C and D) in the participants' L2 (i.e., English), answered their questions, and tried to use iTools digital resources they wanted to encounter used iChecker self-assessment software for each unit that were in class DVD. Having received the participants' first iChecker CD-ROM, the instructors (i.e., the researchers) explained them to the teachers at the pre-service classes and they wrote down the dynamic assessment oriented process based on the Dynamic assessment rubric. An assessment version of the teachers' digital classroom literacy proposed by Latham-Koenig, Oxenden and Seligson (2013) was applied in the current study. The dynamic assessment rubric consists of five subscales: Grammar, Vocabulary, Pronunciation, reading and Listening.

Then, the participants were asked to reflect on their digital literacy. As peer collaboration, they were also checked their sitcom-style video, a quick test for every file and iTools. As an attempt to remedy the potential shortcomings, the teachers could consult the researchers after the class in order to inquire about their digital classroom literacy. Then, they used their dynamic assessment based on the EFL Iranian teachers' literacy.

At the end of the term, the participants in the experimental groups were asked to choose the best tools for teaching. Through applying Latham-Koeing, Oxenden and Seligson (2013) instruction, the dynamic assessment was the average of the scores on those midterm and final scores. The results of the participants were rated on a 15 and 25- point scale. The ratings were made by four instructors. To ensure the reliability of the dynamic assessment, each participant's score was the mean of the four raters' scores (total score 50). In order to ascertain intra-rater reliability, the correlation coefficient using Spearman- Brown formula was found to be .88.

In contrast, the control groups (i.e., classes C and D) received the traditional assessment of teaching American English File (1). The teachers clearly demonstrated such different parts as developing iChecker (self-assessment for their EFL learners at home. The participants were asked to conduct self-assessment so that it includes 12 files along with 2 kinds of dynamic assessment through multi ROM CD as process-oriented mechanism on the digital classroom literacy of Iranian institute EFL teachers. Unlike the experimental groups, the participants' in English classes C and D were not required to reflect online classroom management teacher digital literacy.

At the end of the 16-session period, the researchers administered the digital classroom literacy inventory (Plake & Impara, 1993) to the experimental and control groups in order to assess the impact of the dynamic and traditional assessment on learners.

4. Results

The first research question addressed the dynamic assessment and traditional assessments differ in their process-oriented mechanism on teachers' digital literacy with respect to the way of teaching. To probe that, an independent sample *t* test was utilized to compare the experimental and control groups, as presented in Table 5:

Table 5: One Sample Test for dynamic and traditional assessment on teachers' digital literacy:

Table 4: One-sample Test

	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</i>	
					<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>
<i>Control Group</i>	53.88	83	.000	79.5	76.52	82.38
<i>Experimental Group</i>	57.24	83	.000	84.73	81.78	87.67

8

Looking at the output box giving the results for equality of variances, we can see that the significant level for sample test is .000. since it is zero the cut-off .05, equal variance is assumed .000. By referring to the column labeled *Sig (2-tailed)*, the value for equal variance is .000. Because it is less than .05, there is a significant difference in the digital literacy of teachers experiencing the dynamic assessment and traditional assessment in institute classrooms.

In order to compare the experimental and control groups concerning the highest level of literacy, the mean scores of the groups were compared:

Table 5

Mean Scores in the Experimental and Control Groups

<i>Groups</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Std. Error Mean</i>
<i>Experimental</i>	84	84.7262	13.56408	1.47996
<i>Literacy</i>				
<i>Control</i>	84	79.4524	13.51430	1.47453

As Table 6 shows, the mean score for literacy in the experimental groups experiencing the dynamic assessment is 84.7262, and the one in the control groups experiencing the traditional assessment is 79.4524. Therefore, the results verify that using dynamic assessment in the experimental groups led to a higher level of literacy. Also, to test the magnitude of the difference between the groups, the researchers studied the digital classroom literacy among teachers. We can see that the value of 88 for literacy is a large effect, and it represents 82.38 of the variance explained by literacy.

In order to probe the second research question and to understand whether digital literacy made any significant difference with respect to the impact of digital literacy on dynamic assessment of learners, a second independent samples t test was employed the results of which were shown in Table 6.

5. Discussion

This study grew out of the digital classroom literacy of English teachers to improve their classroom performances through dynamic assessment. Vygotsky (1987) maintained that those teachers used assessment in their classroom are more influential to realize learning and teaching in class. In order to understand what occurs in the institute English classroom in Iran. This study considered the following questions:

- A. How do institute teachers assess classroom practices?
- B. What kinds of dynamic assessment approaches do teachers use to evaluate their learners in conversation?
- C. And what is the impact of digital classroom literacy on improvement of Iranian learners in institutes.

Twelve teachers in four institutes were observed four times each while teaching American File and Top Notch (syllabi taught in institutes) through a questionnaire, observations, memos and pre and post interviews collected about practices of Iranian English teachers. In fact, this paper

proposed three zones for students to assist them. Also the digital literacy and applicability of dynamic assessment could provide a facilitative phase for classroom practices both formative and summative assessment to reach a classroom complement.

As research developed along with Digital Classroom at the Academy – two additional research strands emerged. Firstly, the Digital Classroom became a focal point for broader community engagement addressing community needs, digital access and development of digital literacy in Alborz Academy and Poyesh Academy. Secondly, through collaboration with high school teachers in neighbouring area of Noor, Iran were carried out the research.

Obtaining data for this study through written questionnaires, focus groups, and documents produced a very broad range of responses, ideas, and concepts. It was evident through the data analysis that the participants are enthusiastic about learning, teaching, and the students who enter their classrooms and what they bring to the table. They have expectations for certain skill sets and are vocal about the need for schools to provide instruction related to the topics at hand. The responses that were provided were astute and well thought out. Eventually, two themes emerged: a 21st century digital curriculum should include hard technology skills; and a 21st century digital curriculum should be reinforced by digital curriculum.

This questionnaire aims at determining the teachers' literacy in Iranian institutes before lesson observations. The questionnaire had fifteen closed items (Appendix A). The first four questions sought to establish teaching experience, how long the teacher had been teaching English, the grade level at which the teacher was teaching English conversation and how long the teacher had been teaching English textbook at that grade. The rest of the items will be in two major categories, namely literacy of classroom assessment and classroom assessment practices: possibilities facilities and applicability of dynamic assessment.

Sampling

Three institutes and three state schools were purposefully sampled to participate in this study and data were collected through observation and interviews. A total of six male teachers and six female teachers were drawn from the three schools and three institutes. At each school one teacher was purposefully selected one from each section of the school: infant, junior and senior section. Initially all the teachers from the urban schools and teachers from standard (grade) 1 to seven from the urban school responded to a questionnaire and their responses were one of the factors that were considered for the selection of the twelve teachers.

A meeting was called to brief all the teachers on the purpose of the study and to build their literacy. Head teachers of the selected schools attended the briefing. After the briefing the teachers were asked to make their final statements whether they would participate in the study or not. All teachers expressed their interest to participate in the study. No teacher was forced to participate in the study. After the meeting the researcher visited the three schools twice to familiarize himself with the operations of the school and also to build rapport with the selected teachers and the school heads.

This questionnaire aims at determining the teachers' interaction of classroom assessment literacy prior to lesson observations. The questionnaire had fifteen closed items (Appendix A). The first four questions strove to create teaching experience, how long the teacher had been teaching English, the grade level at which the teacher was teaching English and how long the teacher had been teaching at that level. The rest of the items were in two major categories, namely practices of classroom assessment and digital classroom assessment literacy.

Cross Case Analysis

This part gives an overall picture of the findings of this study by bringing together the major findings from twelve teachers. The section begins by presenting the teachers' literacy of classroom assessment based on the questionnaire, which they completed at the beginning of the study followed by the type of feedback they provide to students, assessment methods and tools used by the teachers, classroom assessment practices, and lastly the teachers' subject knowledge.

6. Conclusions

Having revised the basic literature on applicability of dynamic assessment and teachers' literacy, the researcher considered the capabilities and capacities of the present institutes based on digital classroom tools in Iran. The implication is that young learners can painstakingly gain better facets of learning by means of digital knowledge of teachers' practices done and needed to find which method works best for learners in the framework of the domain of assessment. It can also be very influential in shaping classroom reflection.

Dynamic assessment applicability will enhance the whole process of learning and promote continual development as well. Technology tools can provide another way for learners to make sense of the world in which they live to be up-to-date. They can be used in appropriate ways that are beneficial to all learners whether young learners or adults at any age levels.

Furthermore, just as many touching means of expression, such as pencils, board markers, and computer application such as I pod, active inspire, power point, etc. creating a new approach to learning. If they were used in a skilled way, they can improve and enhance learning based possibilities available to everyone and can increase required opportunities for every student and this can be a key to succeed in teaching practices with the exclusive capabilities technology instruments. Likewise, dynamic assessment is limited in the language classroom so that it needed further attention for some reasons.

Firstly, this prevents language teachers from having practical guidelines about how to incorporate dynamic assessment into their curricula. Secondly, a lot of countries throughout the world apply standardized language dynamic assessment. These challenges must be confronted and answered by researchers in the field. Thirdly, DA holds great potential for dynamic teaching and assessing and for prompting richer learning processes.

Lastly, the crucial point is that if we abandon the traditional way of delivering the students' exam papers in the way that the papers involve just the comments without scores, we would undoubtedly experience good results through utilizing digital classroom literacy to improve learning by DA approach. This Digital Capability approach has informed both the development of a Digital Families Programme – a series of digital media co-production activities for families – and the use of a Digital Classroom as a community space.

References

- Alavi, M., & Taheri, P. (2014). Examining the Role of Dynamic Assessment in the Development and Assessment of Listening Comprehension. *ELT*, 1, (2), 23-40.
- Beckingham, S., & Belshaw, D. (2012). *Connecting the digital dots: 21st century digital literacies*. Paper presented at the CITE Southampton Digital Litera Conference, Southampton. <http://www.slideshare.net/dajbelshaw/connectingthe-digital-dots-with-sue-beckingham-13325303>
- Birjandi, P. & Mosallanejad, P. (2011). *An Overview of Testing and Assessment*. From theory to Practice. Sepahan Publication.
- Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7-74.
- Broadfoot, P. (1996). Liberating the Learner through Assessment. In G. Claxton, T. Atkinson, M. Osborn and M. Wallace (Eds.). *Liberating the Learner*. London: Routledge.
- Bucking, D. (2007). Digital media literacies: Rethinking media education in the age of the internet. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 2, 45-54.
- Buckingham, D. (2007). Digital media literacies: Rethinking media education in the age of the Internet. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 2, 42-55.
- Chester, C., & Quilter, S. M. (1998). In-service teachers' perceptions of popular and unpopular peers: A multi-method assessment. *Developmental Psychology*, 38 (5), 635-647.
- Countryman, J. (1992). *Writing to learn mathematics: Methods that work*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Even, R., & Tirosh, D. (2002). Teacher knowledge and understanding of students Mathematical learning. In L.D. English (Ed.). *Handbook of international research In mathematics education (pp. 219- 240)*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ezziane, Z. (2007). Information technology literacy: Implications on teaching and learning. *Educational Technology & Society*, 10, 175-191.
- Frailon, J., et al (2013). *International Computer and Information Literacy Study: Assessment Framework*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands. IEA Secretariat.

- Garcia, E; Duguay, K; Elbeltagi, I & Gilmour, N. (2013). An Evaluation of the Impact of Academic Staff Digital Literacy on the use of Technology: A Case Study of UK Higher Education. Barcelona, Spain.
- Gillen, J. & Barton, D. (2010) Digital Literacies. Research briefing for the TLRP-TEL (Teaching and Learning Research Programme – Technology Enhanced Learning). London: London Knowledge Lab, Institute of Education.
- Gipps, C. (1990). *Assessment: A teacher's guide to the issues*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Gronlund, N. E. (2003). *Assessment of Student Achievement*. Seventh ed. Custom edition for the University of Alberta.
- Hashemian, M & Fadaei, B. (2013). Fostering EFL learners' autonomy in light of portfolio assessment: Exploring the potential impact of gender. *IJLTR Journal*. Urmia University. 1(2)Pp. 135-144.
- Lam, R., & Lee. I. (2010). Balancing the dual functions of Portfolio Assessment. *ELT Journal*, 64 (1), 54-64.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2004). Dynamic assessment: Bringing the past into the future. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 49–74.
- Latham-Koeing, Oxenden and Seligson (2013). *American English File*. USA. Oxford University Press.
- Nawaz & Kundi. (2013). Digital Literacy: An analysis of the Contemporary Paradigms. *Journal of Science and Technology Education Research*, 1 (2), pp. 19-29.
- Norton, B (2013). *Identity, Literacy, and English Language Teaching*. Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research. Urmia. IJLTR. Urmia University Press.
- Plake B, S & Impara, C. (1993). *Assessment Literacy Inventory Survey*. University of Nebraska. Lincoln. <https://www.surveymonkey.com>
- Poehner, M. E. (2005). *Dynamic assessment of oral proficiency among advanced L2 learners of French*. Unpublished dissertation. Pennsylvania State University.
- Shepard, L., A. (2000). The Role of Assessment in a Learning Culture. *Educational Researcher*. Vol, 29, No, &, pp, 4-14. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org>.
- Stiggins, R.J. (2002). Where is our assessment future and how can we get there from here? In R. W. Lissitz and W.D. Schafer (Eds.). *Assessment in educational reform: Both means and ends (112-125)*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Stiggins, R & Chappuis, J. C. (2005). Using Student-Involved Classroom Assessment to Close Achievement Gaps. *Theory into practice*, 44(1), 11-18. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/>

Stobart, G. (2008) *Testing times: The uses and abuses of assessment*, New York/London: Routledge.

Susuwele-Banda, W., J. (2005). *Classroom Assessment in Malawi: Teachers' Perceptions and Practices in Mathematics*. Blacksburg, Virginia. Dissertation unpublished. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Taras, M. (2010). Assessment for learning: assessing the theory and evidence Maddalena Tarasa. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2 (2010) 3015–3022. Available on line at <http://www.sciencedirect.com>

15

Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (eds.), *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky. Vol. 1. Problems of general psychology* (pp. 39-285).. New York: Plenum.

Waycott, J et al. (2010). Digital Divides? Student and Staff Perceptions of Information and Communication Technologies, *Computers and Education*, 54, pp. 1202-1211.

APPENDIX

GRAMMAR. Adapted from: Latham-Koeing, Oxenden and Seligson (2013). *American English File*. iChecker digital technology CD

1 Put the words in the correct order.

Example: is Lily now what doing ?

What is Lily doing now?

1 read every do a day newspaper you ?

2 wearing are they why warm-up suits ?

3 cups many drink how of did coffee you ?

4 musical can any instruments Tony play ?

5 to Sasha which does school go ?

6 are what studying you college in ?

2 Complete Paloma’s email. Use the verb in parentheses in the present simple or present continuous.

Hi Mandy,

My name’s Paloma and I live (live) in Manhattan. I go to the movies sometimes, but I

14

1 _____ (love) the theater. What about you? 2 _____ you
_____ (prefer) the movies or the theater?

I’m a student, but it’s winter vacation, so now I 3 _____ (not study) –
I 4 _____ (work) in a store. I 5 _____ (want) some extra money
because I’m going to visit Japan next year! I 6 _____ (not speak) Japanese very
well, so I 7 _____ (take) some lessons.

8 _____ you _____ (learn) any languages at the moment?

Write soon,

Paloma

	8
--	---

3 Underline the correct word or phrase.

Example: Martin goes / go / is go to the movies every week.

- 1 All of my friends **has** / **have** / **are have** good jobs.
- 2 We **don’t know** / **doesn’t know** / **not know** Kerry very well.
- 3 What time **finishes Dave** / **Dave finishes** / **does Dave finish** work?
- 4 Listen! Someone **playing** / **is playing** / **he’s playing** the violin.
- 5 Tom and Kate **not working** / **aren’t working** / **no are working** today.
- 6 Why **you’re using** / **you using** / **are you using** my computer?

	6
--	---

Grammar total		20
---------------	--	----

VOCABULARY

4 Match the words in the box with the definitions. There are five words you don’t need.

a warm-up suit	a coat	a bracelet	sandals	a cap
gloves	tights	a ring	a scarf	a suit
boots	a T-shirt			

Example: You wear them on your feet in summer. sandals

- 1 Jewelry you wear on your finger. _____
- 2 A jacket and a pair of pants or a skirt. _____
- 3 A top you wear in summer. _____
- 4 You wear them on your hands when it’s cold. _____

- 5 Winter footwear. _____
 6 You wear it over your clothes when you go out. _____

	6
--	---

5 Underline the correct preposition.

Example: Who do you sit **next to** / **under** / **on** at work?

- 1 There's a big tree **behind** / **in front** / **in the middle** of our house.
- 2 My son has posters **in** / **between** / **on** the walls of his bedroom.
- 3 My desk is the one **between** / **on the left** / **near** the window.
- 4 This is a photo of my family. That's me **in** / **on** / **to** the middle.
- 5 Who's the man standing **behind** / **on the right** / **under** you in this photo?
- 6 There's a table **on** / **in front** / **between** my desk and the window.

	6
--	---

6 Complete the sentences with the correct word.

Example: You were very *quiet*. Why didn't you say anything?
 talkative friendly quiet

- 1 He's _____ height and a little bit overweight.
 short medium tall
- 2 Mary never does any work! She's very _____.
 generous hard-working lazy
- 3 Tammy's very _____. She loves meeting new people.
 extroverted hard-working clever
- 4 Antonio is _____ because he doesn't get any exercise.
 thin overweight slim
- 5 My teacher's really _____. She's nice to everybody.
 funny mean friendly
- 6 Jamie doesn't have any hair. He's _____.
 fair bald blond
- 7 Olga has _____ curly hair.
 tall straight long
- 8 David makes me laugh. He's really _____.
 funny quiet serious

	8
--	---

Vocabulary total		20
------------------	--	----

PRONUNCIATION

7 Match the words with the same sound.

address belt hard-working laughs mean wears

Example: people mean

- 1 friend _____
- 2 university _____
- 3 actor _____
- 4 glasses _____
- 5 boots _____

	5
--	---

8 Underline the stressed syllable.

Example: curly

- 1 ge|ne|rous
- 2 un|kind
- 3 o|ver|weight
- 4 ac|ce|sso|ry
- 5 car|di|gan

	5
--	---

Pronunciation total		10
---------------------	--	----

Grammar, Vocabulary, and Pronunciation total		50
--	--	----

READING

1 Read the profile on a dating website and check (✓) A, B, or C.

College Connection

College Connection is a dating website for college and university students. Read Sophie's profile on the website.

My name's Sophie, and I'm 26 years old. I'm from New York, and I'm single. I'm studying film at New York University – it's really interesting. My dad is an actor and my mom is a movie director, so I grew up watching movies. I want to work in the movies when I leave college – as a movie director, too.

I have a nice group of friends at the university. My best friend Anna is studying here, too. We all get along well. We go out to the movies together every Friday night and on Saturdays we like going out to restaurants or music bars. I also love cooking for my friends. Most of my friends love shopping for clothes and jewelry, but I prefer making my own. It's cheaper and more fun.

I don't like playing sports very much, but I like watching football on TV. My favorite team is the Giants. I'm into yoga at the moment and I try to eat lots of healthy food.

I'm a pretty sociable person. My friends say I'm very talkative! I have long dark hair and green eyes, and I'm pretty tall. I'm looking for a partner who is fun, sociable, and kind. I'd like to meet someone who has a good sense of humor and who is tall, too!

Would you like to go on a date with me? If so, I'm waiting for your reply!

Example: Sophie is _____.

A married B divorced C single

1 In college, Sophie is studying _____.

A acting B film C yoga

2 Sophie's friend Anna studies _____.

A cooking B in Boston C in New York

3 They _____ every Friday night.

A watch a movie B go dancing C stay at home

4 Sophie's _____ love buying clothes and jewelry.

A sisters B friends C parents

5 Sophie enjoys _____.

A watching football on TV B playing football C all sports

6 Sophie is _____.

A pretty short B pretty tall C medium height

7 Sophie wants to meet someone who has _____.

A dark hair B blue eyes C a good sense of humor

	7
--	---

2 Read the profile again. Are the sentences true (T) or false (F)?

Example: *College Connection* is a dating website for students. T

1 Sophie thinks her university major is boring. _____

2 Sophie's dad is an actor. _____

3 Sophie wants to work as a movie director. _____

4 Sophie and her friends like going to music bars. _____

5 Sophie hates cooking for her friends. _____

6 Sophie enjoys making her own jewelry. _____

7 Sophie's friends think she is quiet. _____

8 Sophie is looking for a partner who is kind. _____

	8
--	---

Reading total		15
---------------	--	----

WRITING

Write your profile for the *College Connection* website. Write about these things. (100–150 words)

- your personal details
- your job / studies
- your interests

Writing total		10
---------------	--	----

Reading and Writing total		25
---------------------------	--	----

LISTENING

1 Listen to a description of a famous painting, *Nighthawks*. Check (✓) A, B, or C.

- 1 When was Edward Hopper born?
A 1882. B 1892. C 1942.
- 2 Where are the customers in the painting?
A Standing at the bar. B Sitting at the bar. C Sitting on the floor.
- 3 What is the street like outside?
A It's very bright. B It's very dark. C It's very busy.
- 4 What are the two men wearing?
A Red suits and hats. B Dark coats and hats. C Dark suits and hats.
- 5 What is the woman's hair like?
A Long and red. B Long and dark. C Short and red.

	5
--	---

2 Listen to five conversations. Where are the people in each conversation? Match the conversations with the places (A–G). There are two answers you don't need.

Conversation 1

- Conversation 2
- Conversation 3
- Conversation 4
- Conversation 5

- A in class
- B at home
- C at work
- D in a shop
- E in a restaurant
- F on a train
- G at the movies

	5
--	---

Listening total		10
-----------------	--	----

SPEAKING

1 Ask your partner these questions.

- 1 Where do you work / study?
- 2 What are your interests?
- 3 What kind of personality do you have?
- 4 What's your ideal partner like?
- 5 What clothes do you usually wear when you go out?

Now answer your partner's questions.

2 Read the information about Rob and answer your partner's questions.

Name: Rob Britten Age: 24 Occupation: web designer Personality: shy, serious, kind Hobbies: art, classical music
--

3 Now write questions and ask about the person in your partner's information.

- name?
- age?
- job?
- personality?
- hobbies?

Speaking total		15
----------------	--	----

Listening and Speaking total		25
------------------------------	--	----