

Please cite this paper as follows:

Mezher Karamallah, S., & Sarkosh, M. (2025). Effect of Interactionist and Interventionist Dynamic Assessments on Iraqi EFL Learners' Writing Performance. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 13 (53), 129-141.

**Research Paper**

**Effect of Interactionist and Interventionist Dynamic Assessments on Iraqi EFL Learners' Writing Performance**

**Saad Mezher Karamallah<sup>1</sup>, Mahdi Sarkosh<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English, Urmia State University, Urmia, Iran  
[saadmezherkaramallah@gmail.com](mailto:saadmezherkaramallah@gmail.com)

<sup>2\*</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of English, Urmia State University, Urmia, Iran  
[m.sarkhosh@urmia.ac.ir](mailto:m.sarkhosh@urmia.ac.ir)

**Received: Mar 12, 2024**

**Accepted: July 17, 2024**

**Abstract**

This quantitative correlational study explored the effects of different types of dynamic assessment on the writing proficiency of Iraqi female EFL learners. Fifty-four upper-intermediate female students, aged 17-25, from the Global English Institute in Baghdad, Iraq, participated in the study. The participants were selected based on their performance in the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) and were subsequently divided into three groups: interactionist experimental, interventionist experimental, and control. The study employed several instruments, including a participation consent form, the OPT, a writing pre-test and post-test, and writing practices administered during the treatment phase. The intervention covered a full semester, with each group receiving tailored instructional strategies. The interactionist group focused on the Dynamic Mediation Process, while the interventionist group employed targeted interventions based on individual needs. The results, analyzed through pre- and post-tests, demonstrated the efficacy of dynamic assessment techniques in enhancing writing skills, suggesting their potential for broader application in EFL contexts.

**Keywords:** Dynamic Assessment, Interactionist Approach, Interventionist Approach, Language Assessment, Writing Proficiency

این مطالعه کمی همبستگی اثرات انواع مختلف ارزیابی پویا را بر مهارت نوشتاری دانش‌آموزان زن انگلیسی زبان عراقی بررسی کرد. پنجاه و چهار دانش‌آموز دختر ۱۷ تا ۲۵ ساله از مؤسسه انگلیسی جهانی در بغداد، عراق، در این مطالعه شرکت کردند. شرکت‌کنندگان بر اساس عملکردشان در آزمون قرار دادن آکسفورد (OPT) انتخاب شدند و متعاقباً به سه گروه آزمایشی تعامل‌گرا، آزمایشی مداخله‌گرا و کنترل تقسیم شدند. این مطالعه از ابزارهای متعددی استفاده کرد، از جمله فرم رضایت مشارکت، OPT، پیش‌آزمون و پس‌آزمون نوشتاری، و شیوه‌های نوشتاری اجرا شده در طول مرحله درمان. مداخله یک ترم کامل را پوشش داد و هر گروه راهبردهای آموزشی مناسب را دریافت کرد. گروه تعامل‌گرا بر فرآیند میانجیگری پویا متمرکز شد، در حالی که گروه مداخله‌گرا از مداخلات هدفمند بر اساس نیازهای فردی استفاده کرد. نتایج، که از طریق آزمون‌های پیش و پس‌آزمون تجزیه و تحلیل شدند، اثربخشی تکنیک‌های ارزیابی پویا را در افزایش مهارت‌های نوشتاری نشان دادند و پتانسیل آن‌ها را برای کاربرد گسترده‌تر در زمینه‌های EFL نشان دادند.

کلیدواژه: ارزیابی پویا، رویکرد تعاملی، رویکرد مداخله‌گرایانه، ارزشیابی زبان، مهارت نوشتاری

## Introduction

Learning English or any other language requires the learners to master different skills and sub-skills including reading comprehension, speaking, listening and writing. The last one attracts more attention among the teachers and learners specially in academic and EFL (English Foreign language) contexts. In this vein, Emmons (2003) claims writing is one of the superior skills in comparison to others in an EFL contexts. As Lee (2003) asserts, writing is one of the essential and inevitable skills that an EFL learner needs to master on his way to professional and educational success. Writing varies in different stages ranging from simple single paragraph writing to writing essays, academic papers and professional articles (Lee, 2003).

Regarding being receptive or productive, writing is categorized as the productive one, mastery of which can lead to better performance and assist learners to express their ideas in more fluent and appropriate ways and learn to use the words and rules better (Lee, 2003). According to Poehner (2009), there are various factors that are needed in a writing process such as content, structures, semantics, word diction and even social context arrangements that EFL and nonnative learners need in the process of learning and using their writing skill which is essential to create an effective piece of writing.

Emmons (2003) claims that writing is among the skills which is usually learned late owing this feature to its difficulty among learners. In the same vein, Alsamadani (2010) describes writing as “a challenging and difficult process as it includes multiple skills such as identification of the thesis statement, writing supporting details, reviewing, and editing” (p. 55). In another strong claim Nunan (1999) believes that “writing is a skill that even most native speakers can never master because it requires the production of a long, coherent and fluent piece of writing” (p.271). He attributes the reason to the fact that creating a good piece of writing requires one to have good lexical and grammatical knowledge and to take into account the organization, coherence and cohesion in paragraphs; accordingly, language teachers are in a great demand for finding or devising advanced methods and techniques that can boost and simplify the writing process.

Since writing is a difficult task, a majority of learners face sometimes serious and various problems while learning or doing a writing task (National Report Card from the US Department of Education, 2008). Marshi and Henatabad (2011) attribute the weak writing performance of EFL learners to the methods applied and administered by their teachers which they call as traditional. They also assert that traditional methods lack the required efficacy in teaching writing to EFL learners since in these very methods, the teachers only “assign a topic, the students write and the teacher evaluates and (at his/her best) provides feedback” (p.79).

Ellis (2008), Lantolf and Poehner (2014) and Heidari (2019) believe that the difficulty of learning writing can be smoothed by applying new techniques, methods and approaches of teaching and assessing writing. They strongly disagree with continuing just with the traditional methods, approaches of teaching and evaluation of language skill specially writing, suggesting that educational authorities, teacher trainers, and teachers should be motivated and encouraged to look for different approaches of teaching and assessing writing which they can apply in their classes. In addition to the teaching strategies applied to teach writing to learners successfully, the assessment of writing as a measure of evaluating the progress as well as finding the erroneous areas is of great importance.

Lussier and Swanson (2005) highlight the importance of assessment claiming that it is one of the key elements of every learning environment. Regarding the effective and significant role of testing and assessment in the process and success of teaching, educational administrative and school officials have always tried to devise or look for new and more effective evaluation techniques and tools to equip the teachers with. This importance arises from the fact that



assessment can significantly assist learners by enabling them to see their progress, help them realize how they are doing in a class, and assist teachers to determine whether or not their students have understood the course materials and it further helps to motivate the students.

Among different types of assessment applied by different educational systems, the traditional assessments are largely criticized for their inability in accurately estimating the abilities of the learners and their failure in taking the developmental differences of learners into account (Lidz & Gindis 2003; Poehner, 2007). Additionally, traditional static tests have the problem of not taking non-intellectual aspects such as self-regulation or perceptions of competence into account. As a result, researchers have to explore for a broader viewpoint in order to account for psychological and cognitive aspects.

According to Poehner (2009), dynamic assessment (DA) as one of the newly proposed assessment methodologies assigns a role of participant to the examiner while the learner is taken as the one who receives the mediation. In comparison to a static assessment type, the dynamic assessment method concentrates on the process rather than the product. In static assessment, the examiner is assigned the role of an observer and the learners get no mediation (Poehner, 2009).

Dynamic assessment is theoretically rooted in the zone of proximal development (ZPD) proposed by Vygotsky. According to Vygotsky (1978 as cited in Murphy, 2011), zone of proximal development is "...the distance between the actual developmental level as determined through independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86). According to his claims, guiding the learners and teachers to work in the ZPD framework can be helpful and effective in exploring both the matured functions and the mental functions. The former is previously taken as the product while the latter is not yet fully developed.

Hence, the current study strived to study the effect of two types of dynamic assessment in comparison to nondynamic ones. It is aimed to investigate and report on the results of implementing two innovative assessment techniques (interactionist and interventionist dynamic assessment) used for evaluating EFL learners' academic writing. In order to follow the objectives of the study and take clear steps to conduct the study, the following research questions were formulated by the researcher.

**RQ<sub>1</sub>:** *Does Interactionist Dynamic Assessment have any significant effect on the writing performance of Iraqi advanced EFL learners?*

**RQ<sub>2</sub>:** *Does Interventionist Dynamic Assessment have any significant effect on the writing performance of Iraqi advanced EFL learners?*

**RQ<sub>3</sub>:** *Are there any significant differences among the effectiveness of Interactionist Dynamic Assessment, Interventionist Dynamic Assessment and Non-dynamic assessment on writing performance of Iraqi advanced EFL learners?*

### Literature Review

As Poehner (2008) highlighted, DA is opposed to the widely held belief that individuals must be tested in isolation in order to acquire pure measures of ability, and it challenges such beliefs by arguing that assessment and teaching should be completely integrated rather than separated. "The integration of instruction and assessment happens in the form of intervention embedded within the assessment procedure in order to scrutinize individuals' abilities and help them increase their self-regulation in future moves" (Lidz & Gindis, 2003, p. 99). In contrast to traditional techniques to assessment, DA combines evaluation and teaching in the interest favor of student-teacher unity, in which they collaborate, and future student development is achieved. Elaborating on DA, Douglas (2010) explained that "assessing learner individually and on the basis of his previous knowledge is not enough and the learner needs to be assessed for his future capabilities which will be unmasked with the help of teacher's mediation" (p. 79).



To put it another way, DA is an evaluation of a learner's current abilities as well as his learning potential. Dynamic evaluation, according to Haywood and Tzuriel (2002), is a type of collaborative assessment followed by purposeful and planned mediation, with the consequences of mediation on future performance being investigated. According to Barjesteh and Niknezhad (2013), the major focus of DA is on the education process rather than the learning results, and it considers the examiner's engagement in the procedure. Dynamic assessment, in their opinion, entails assisting learners in realizing their full potential by recognizing their strengths and challenges, which may be accomplished by prompting, cueing, or mediating within the exam.

The objective of DA is to examine a learner's latent potential or reserve capacity in a dynamic, process-oriented, and adaptable manner, with teaching and feedback providing aid or mediation for cognitive skill acquisition (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2002; Elliott, 2003). The logic behind this style of evaluation is that if a student can improve on his/her original performance when mediated, they have the capacity to achieve more (Smit, 2010). According to Davin (2011), another objective of DA is to make suggestions based on developmental potential that isn't indicated by regular non-dynamic exams (Davin, 2011). Participants in DA are given instructions on how to execute certain activities and are given mediated guidance on how to master them. The progress they've made in solving comparable situations is then tracked (Davin, 2011).

DA is founded on the idea that measuring an individual's current knowledge is not nearly as illuminating as assessing that individual's potential; hence, identifying potential performance takes precedence over examining usual performance in DA. In other words, because it analyzes the processes of knowledge gain at the time of the exam, DA sees the development process as a determinant of the test taker's future performance and gives potentially beneficial teaching suggestions. Language acquisition, according to DA, is a process of knowledge creation that occurs as a result of interactions between students and teachers (Birjandi, Daftarifard, & Lange, 2011). We have a clearer understanding of learner's skills owing to DA. The use of DA in mediation assists learners in reconsidering and rethinking difficulties, as well as allowing the mediator to better recognize the learners' comprehension of key language elements. Its emphasis on training and intervention within the assessment technique stems from DA's customized approach to instruction and evaluation, which identifies individual differences and takes appropriate measures for each learner based on his or her unique ZPD. However, in a non-dynamic approach, significant disparities among learners are frequently hidden.

Lantolf and Poehner (2004) suggest the words interventionist and interactionist to describe the two broad forms of mediation that DA researchers can provide, based on the many types of mediation supplied by researchers so far. Interactionist DA is concerned with helping a learner without attention to predefined endpoints, whereas interventionist DA is concerned with measuring the amount of assistance necessary for a learner to attain a predetermined objective (Poehner, 2008). These terms are briefly explained in the following parts.

### **Interactionist Dynamic Assessment**

The interactionist approach to DA, according to Lantolf and Poehner (2013), indicates that mediation emerges through interaction between examiner and examinee. This kind of DA refers to a dialogic or collaborative contact in which the examiner responds quickly to the requirements of the examinee and learners are free to ask questions and receive prompt response. Leading questions, clues, or reminders are not prepared in advance, they are provided during interactionist DA sessions, and teacher-learner exchanges are fine-tuned to the learner's ZPD. Any investigation of variance between learners or for the same student over time in an interactionist approach to DA would have to consider both the quality and amount of guidance.

An interactionist DA perceives the ZPD qualitatively in order to get better understanding of the forms of mental processes that the learner may be able to render in the next or proximal phase of development, as well as to understand the type of teaching or assistance that will be required if the learner is to realize these potentials (Poehner, 2008). In other words, Interactionist DA is highly sensitive to the learner's ZPD because it reflects Vygotsky's preference for collaborative dialoging in which help emerges from the interaction between the learner and the mediator. It focuses on the development of a single student or even a group of students, independent of the amount of work necessary or preset objectives. The communication between the mediator and the learner provides help in this technique (Lantolf and Poehner, 2004).

DA's interactionist perspective is practical. That is, supporters of this paradigm reject a quantitative approach to DA in favor of a qualitative one. Proponents of interventionist DA say that interventionist DA gives a picture of present development rather than prospective or future improvement. As a result, examinees and practitioners in interactionist DA work together in an unplanned unity throughout evaluations to ensure student achievement. The mediator's firsthand understanding of the student's conduct determines the student's needs based on the student's responsiveness to mediation, the accuracy of their replies, and the mediator's personal understanding of the student's behavior (Summers, 2008).

### **Interventionist Dynamic Assessment**

Interventionist DA employs standardized types of assessment to have measurable outcomes to compare and contrast with other evaluations or make predictions on future performance since it tends to define the amount of support necessary for a learner to attain the pre-determined ultimate objective (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004; Poehner, 2008). In other words, according to Leung (2007), measurable help and evaluation are intertwined, that guidance takes the shape of standardized assistance, which is designed to quantifiably test learners' capacity to apply predefined intervention to achieve a pre-specified objective. The learner's ZPD is measured as the difference between students' scores before and after the instructor's involvement in an interventionist method, which is often in the form of test – mediation – retest (Tabatabaei & Bakhtiarvand, 2014). Learners are provided with standardized mediation. Mediators are not permitted to respond to students' needs as they emerge throughout the procedure; instead, they must adhere to a highly scripted approach to mediation, in which all cues and clues are placed in a hierarchical order, from implicit to explicit, and are frequently given a numerical value (Poehner, 2008).

Poehner and Lantolf (2005) believe that psychometricians propose standardized methodology in DA in order to maintain validity and reliability. This enables individual measures to be compared to those of a general community. This is predicated on the assumption that the ZPD can be measured rather than being a description of a person's developmental level. Interventionist DA refers to research in which a pre-determined set of clues is devised and implemented strictly throughout assessment activities in order to establish a weighted score.

Vygotsky's early work on the use of IQ testing in schools, which includes a numerical explanation of the ZPD as a "difference score," is where interventionist DA gets its start. This approach stems from a desire to improve the assessment's impartiality, as described by standard psychometric criteria. In assessment contexts that are habituated to psychometric testing, interventionist methods may be more readily accepted than interactionist DA. Sandwich and cake are two metaphors used to illustrate how mediation is provided to learners (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2002). According to Poehner and Lantolf (2005), interventionist DA is presently implemented in two ways: an item-by-item approach (or layer-cake format), in which mediation is based on a prefabricated recipe of clues, and a pre-test, treatment, post-test (or sandwich format) experimental approach (e.g. Budoff's approach to DA).



## Methodology

### Design of the Study

The study utilized a quantitative experimental design to examine the impact of different dynamic assessment techniques on the writing proficiency of upper-intermediate EFL learners. The participants comprised 54 female students aged 17-25, selected from three intact classes at the Global English Institute in Baghdad, Iraq. The selection process began with the administration of the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) to ensure the participants' proficiency level. Based on their OPT scores, participants were randomly assigned to three groups: the interactionist experimental group (N=21), the interventionist experimental group (N=17), and the control group (N=16).

### Participants

The participants of the study included 54 upper-intermediate female students within the age range of 17-25 selected from three intact classes of Global English Institute in Baghdad, Iraq.

### Instruments

In order to conduct this quantitative correlational study, the researcher used the following instruments and materials for the purpose of examining the differential effects of different types of dynamic assessment of writing proficiency of Iraqi female EFL learners.

1. Participation Consent Form
2. Oxford Placement Test (OPT) Language Proficiency Test
3. A Writing Pre-test and Post-test
4. Writing Practices given during Treatments
5. Scoring rubrics by Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel, Hughey (1981)

### Procedures

To detail the data collection process used in this study, the following steps were undertaken:

**Participant Selection:** The study began by selecting 63 female upper-intermediate students from the Global English Institute, aged between 17 and 25. Participants were informed that their identities would be kept confidential and that no identifying information would be used in the study. To ensure voluntary participation, each participant signed a consent form.

**Oxford Placement Test:** Participants were then required to complete the Oxford Placement Test, which consisted of 60 questions and was administered by the researcher. They were given 70 minutes to complete the test. The results determined that participants who answered between 41 and 60 questions correctly were considered true advanced-level learners, based on scores within one standard deviation of the mean. These individuals were then randomly divided into three groups: the interactionist experimental group (N=21), the interventionist experimental group (N=17), and the control group (N=16).

**Pre-Test for Writing Ability:** To assess the participants' initial writing abilities and ensure a baseline level of proficiency, a writing pre-test was administered. To standardize the writing task, teachers familiarized students with the general rules and standards based on specific rubrics. In the following session, participants wrote an essay on a given topic following these guidelines, without drafting or revising. They submitted their essays via email to their teachers, who then forwarded them to the researcher. This phase was conducted in Summer 2023, with 40 minutes allocated for writing the essay.

**Treatment Phase:** During a full semester, classes were held three times a week for 75 minutes per session. All groups used the same course materials, including "Summit 2" by Allen



Ascher and Joan Saslow (2004), the workbook, and additional resources provided by the teachers.

**Interactionist Experimental Group:** This group underwent a three-step treatment process involving topic selection, idea generation, and revision. The Dynamic Mediation Process framework, as suggested by Elliott (2000) and Xiaoxiao and Yan (2010), was employed. The stages included a topic-choice stage, an idea-generation and structuring stage, and a macro-revising stage, with tasks being framed as pre-task, mediation, and post-task.

**Interventionist Experimental Group:** Participants in this group received interventions aimed at both assessing and improving their writing abilities, based on the scale by Lantolf and Poehner (2011). If errors were found in their writing, various mediation techniques were applied, such as highlighting errors, providing choices, or directly explaining mistakes. These interventions were tailored to each student's needs to enhance their writing skills.

**Post-Test:** After implementing the different treatments, a writing post-test was administered to all groups. This final assessment evaluated the improvement in writing performance following the intervention phase.

### Data Analysis Procedure

In order to check the writing proficiency of the participants in all groups to see whether there is any significant difference between the participants prior to the study, a pre-test was given to them. Before analyzing the data obtained from pre-test, to get assured of the reliability of the scoring process, 10 percent of the papers were scored by another experienced teacher. Hence, an inter-rater reliability was calculated between the scores. The results are shown in Table 1 below.

## Results

**Table 1**

*Inter-rater reliability for Pre-test Scores*

| Correlations |                     | Rater one | Rater two |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Rater one    | Pearson Correlation | 1         | .793**    |
|              | Sig. (2-tailed)     |           | .020      |
|              | N                   | 6         | 6         |
| Rater two    | Pearson Correlation | .793**    | 1         |
|              | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .020      |           |
|              | N                   | 6         | 6         |

According to Table 1 it was observed that the scoring procedure enjoyed a significant desirable reliability which indicates that the score given by the researcher can be used for data analysis processes. Once, the inter-rater reliability was confirmed, the scores were checked for distribution normality to decide on the type of analysis procedure. After the confirmation of the distribution normality of the scores, the scores in all three groups were analyzed to check participants' initial writing proficiency to be able to compare to that of post-test in order to observe the possible differences and also to investigate whether the groups have similar or different proficiencies.

**Table 2**

*Analysis of Variances of the Writing Pre-test Scores of All the Groups*

Pre-test

|                | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | 132.677        | 2  | 67.892      | .2309 | .890 |
| Within Groups  | 169.485        | 51 | 4.278       |       |      |
| Total          | 302.162        | 53 |             |       |      |

Based on the statistics revealed in the above table,  $F(3, 51) = .23$ ,  $P = 0.89$ , there was not any statistically significant difference at the  $p < .05$  level in writing pre-test scores for all groups. In other words, it is concluded that the writing proficiency of all three groups is similar, hence, any changes in the post test can be due to the given treatment. After getting assured of similarity of participants in terms of writing proficiency prior to the treatment, the post-test scores were analyzed. Similar to the procedure taken to analyze the pre-test scores, first the interrater reliability was calculated and then the normality of distribution was checked.

**Table 3***Interrater Reliability Between the Writing Post-test Scores*

| Correlations |                     | Rater one | Rater two |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Rater one    | Pearson Correlation | 1         | .832**    |
|              | Sig. (2-tailed)     |           | .012      |
|              | N                   | 6         | 6         |
| Rater two    | Pearson Correlation | .832**    | 1         |
|              | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .012      |           |
|              | N                   | 6         | 6         |

As a result of the data shown in Table 3, a positive strong correlation coefficient of .83 was observed between the two raters, indicating the scoring procedure's desirable reliability. Later, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality distribution test was used once more to make a proper judgment on the type of analysis to be performed on the data.

On the confirmation of the normality of the data, the pre- and post-test scores were compared to see whether there was any impact or possible development to verify the efficacy of the applied approaches on the learners' skill accomplishments. The tests used for investigation were paired samples t-tests.

**Table 4***Paired Samples T-Test Comparing Writing Pre-test and Post-test Scores of interactionist Group*

|           |                                             | Paired Samples Test |                       |                       |                                                 |         |       |    |                 |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|----|-----------------|
|           |                                             | Paired Differences  |                       |                       |                                                 |         | t     | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|           |                                             | Me<br>an            | Std.<br>Deviat<br>ion | Std.<br>Error<br>Mean | 95% Confidence<br>Interval of the<br>Difference |         |       |    |                 |
|           |                                             |                     |                       |                       | Lower                                           | Upper   |       |    |                 |
| Pair<br>1 | interactionist-pre –<br>interactionist-post | 5.68                | 3.683                 | 1.494                 | 5.22                                            | 11.4782 | 5.588 | 20 | .010            |

According to the statistical results of t-test run on the scores, there was a significant enhancement in learners' writing level in interactionist dynamic assessment group since  $p$

equaled .01 which was higher than the set level for this study. Therefore, it was included that the participants' writing improved from pre- to post-test.

**Table 5**

*Paired Samples T-Test Comparing Writing Pre-test and Post-test Scores of Interventionist Group*

|        |                                            | Paired Samples Test |                |                 |                                           |        | t     | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------|--------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|--------|-------|----|-----------------|
|        |                                            | Paired Differences  |                |                 |                                           |        |       |    |                 |
|        |                                            | Mean                | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |        |       |    |                 |
|        |                                            |                     |                |                 | Lower                                     | Upper  |       |    |                 |
| Pair 1 | interventionist-pre – interventionist-post | 4.00                | 2.549          | 1.464           | 6.564                                     | 10.564 | 4.535 | 16 | .031            |

A quick glance at Table 5. Revealed that the increase in the mean scores of interventionist group participants from writing pre to post-test according to the data obtained from t-test was statistically significant since  $p = .03$  which showed that interventionist dynamic assessment had significant effect on writing performance of EFL learners. Accordingly, an ANOVA test was done to spot the significance of the difference and in case of need spot the group(s) which have outperformed others.

**Table 6**

*Analysis of Variances of the Writing Post-test Mean Scores of All the Groups*

| ANOVA          |                |    |             |       |      |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Post-test      |                |    |             |       |      |
|                | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 190.458        | 2  | 130.153     | 6.964 | .000 |
| Within Groups  | 237.880        | 51 | 4.627       |       |      |
| Total          | 428.338        | 53 |             |       |      |

According to the data in Table 6,  $F(3, 51) = 6.96$ ,  $P = .00$ , there was a statistically significant difference in writing post-test scores for the three groups at the  $p = 05$  level. The statistics in Pairwise Comparison (Table 7) were analyzed to see which group(s) in this context (interactionist, interventionist, and control) outperformed the others considerably.

**Table 7**

*Multiple Comparisons of Groups Using Tuckey Post-Hoc Test in writing Post-test*

| (I) feedbacktype | (J) feedbacktype | Mean Difference (I-J) | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval |             |
|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
|                  |                  |                       |      | Lower Bound             | Upper Bound |
| Interactionist   | Control          | 3.543*                | .000 | 3.8116                  | 4.6153      |
|                  | Interventionist  | 2.243*                | .004 | 3.2326                  | 7.0364      |
| Control          | Interactionist   | -3.543*               | .000 | -4.6153                 | -3.8116     |
|                  | Interventionist  | -1.301*               | .036 | 4.5451                  | 4.2970      |
| Interventionist  | Interactionist   | -2.243*               | .004 | -7.0364                 | -3.2326     |
|                  | Control          | 1.301*                | .036 | 4.2970                  | 4.5451      |

As it is clear from the above table, regarding the fact that the difference among all the groups was statistically significant, comparing the groups mean scores and mean differences in

pairs revealed that interactionist and interventionist groups outperformed the control group in the post-test. Comparing mean scores and mean differences of the groups was also indicator of the superiority of the interactionist dynamic assessment over interventionist one in terms of writing improvement since the difference was significant.

### Discussion

Regarding the shift toward new assessment techniques such as dynamic assessments and also based on the results of current study, it can be concluded that dynamic assessment can function as a part of every teaching system and be of great importance and significance in helping the method to achieve its objectives and success. Hence, applying dynamic assessment technique along with an effective teaching strategy can lead to writing accomplishments on behalf of learners. It can be claimed that the dynamic assessment processes can contribute to better teaching and learning and facilitate the process of education providing useful feedback.

In terms of the function of assessment in education and its impact on student achievement, Struyven, Dochy, and Janssens (2005) emphasize the impact of evaluation, claiming that it has a major impact on student performance. In the same vein, Irons and Elkington (2021) believe that assessment enhances learning, provides feedback about student progress, builds self-confidence and self-esteem, and develops skills in evaluation. Furthermore, they claim that successful learning happens when instruction, assessment, and outcomes are all in synchronization. As a result, it can be stated that assessment plays an important role in learning because of its strong relationship with instruction and learning outcomes. The core of dynamic assessment, according to the developers and advocates of dynamic assessment and sociocultural theory (e.g. Kozulin & Garb, 2002; Poehner, 2007, 2008a; Poehner & Lantolf, 2013), is substantial interaction between L2 learners and the instructor. More extended interactions, according to the research (e.g., Felix-Brasdefer, 2007; Kasper & Roever, 2005; Taguchi, 2007), prepare the foundation for richer and better input and hence greater performance.

Interactionist dynamic assessment, according to Poehner and Lantolf (2005), relies on a characterization of ZPD. ZPD is defined by Vygotsky (1978) as "the difference between actual developmental level as measured by individual problem solving and prospective developmental level as determined by problem solving under adult direction or in partnership with more capable peers" (p. 86). As a result, Interactionist dynamic assessment may be claimed to assist learners in realizing their full potential, which may be limited due to a variety of factors.

The interventionist dynamic assessment approach, according to Lantolf and Poehner (2014), is interested in determining the overall amount of support that a learner needed to successfully achieve a pre-determined goal. In the context of dynamic assessment, assessments about a learner's potential performance are formed based on the type and amount of intervention needed by the learners, rather than the learner's existing dependent performance. The objective of interventionist dynamic assessment is to determine at what degree of support the learner can attain the intended point by providing step-by-step mediation, progressing from the most implicit to the most explicit. As a result, it is obvious that interventionist dynamic assessment supports learners in improving their writing abilities (Poehner, 2008).

The findings of current study regarding the effectiveness of interventionist dynamic assessment were in line with the findings of the study carried out by Koroğlu (2019) who aimed at investigating the effectiveness of the interventionist model of dynamic assessment in the assessment of student teachers' speaking skills performance. Similarly, the interventionist strategy was found to maintain and improve the oral skills performance of student teachers. In addition, the findings of the study conducted by Abdolrezapour (2017) were confirmed by the results of current study stating that interactionist dynamic assessment had a positive significant effect on second language learning.



## Conclusion

The results of this study underscore the efficacy of dynamic assessment (DA) techniques in enhancing learners' writing abilities. Both interactionist and interventionist dynamic assessments demonstrated significant positive effects on student performance, aligning with previous research in the field. The core strength of dynamic assessment lies in its interactive nature, which fosters a deeper connection between learners and instructors, thereby enriching the learning experience. This study supports the assertion that dynamic assessment not only facilitates improved educational outcomes but also provides meaningful feedback, which is critical for student development. The findings align with the broader literature, suggesting that assessment practices are integral to the educational process, as they influence student achievement and skill development by aligning instruction, assessment, and learning outcomes.

The implications of this study are far-reaching for educators, curriculum designers, and policymakers. Firstly, incorporating dynamic assessment into standard teaching practices can significantly enhance the quality of education by providing tailored feedback and scaffolding that meet individual learner needs. This approach helps in identifying the students' Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), allowing educators to offer appropriate levels of support and challenge. Consequently, this can lead to better learner engagement and improved academic performance.

Furthermore, the study suggests that both interactionist and interventionist DA methods can be successfully integrated into language education, particularly in writing instruction. Educators should consider utilizing these techniques to provide continuous and formative feedback, which is crucial for skill development. The nuanced approach of interventionist DA, in particular, can help educators understand the specific support each learner requires to reach predetermined learning goals.

For policymakers, the study advocates for the inclusion of dynamic assessment frameworks in educational standards and assessment policies. This can help shift the focus from traditional, summative assessments to more formative, learner-centered approaches. By doing so, educational systems can better support diverse learning needs and promote a more holistic understanding of student capabilities.

## References

- Abdolrezaipoor, P. (2017). Improving L2 reading comprehension through emotionalized dynamic assessment procedures. *Journal of psycholinguistic research*, 46(3), 747-770.
- Alsamdani, H. A. (2010). The relationship between Saudi EFL students' writing competence, L1 writing proficiency, and self-regulation. *European Journal of Social Science*, 16(1), 53-63.
- Barjesteh, H., & Niknezhad, F. (2013). A Paradigm Shift Toward A New Philosophy of Assessment: Dynamic Assessment from A Critical Perspective. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences*, 3(3), 526-535.
- Birjandi, P., Daftarifard, P., & Lange, R. (2011). The effects of dynamic assessment on Rasch item and person hierarchies in second language testing. *International Journal of Language Studies (IJLS)*, 5(1), 125-140.
- Davin, K. J. (2011). *Group dynamic assessment in an early foreign language learning program: Tracking movement through the zone of proximal development* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.
- Douglas, D. (2010). *Understanding language testing*. Abingdon: Hodder Education.
- Elliott, J. G. (2003). Dynamic assessment in educational contexts: Purpose and promise. In C. S. Lidz & J. G. Elliot (Eds.), *Dynamic assessment: Prevailing models and applications* (pp. 713-740). New York, NY: Elsevier.



- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition (2nd ed.)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Emmons, R. A. (2003). Personal goals, life meaning, and virtue: Wellsprings of a positive life. In C. L. M. Keyes & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived* (pp. 105–128). American Psychological Association.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2007). Pragmatic development in the Spanish as a FL classroom: A cross-sectional study of learner requests.
- Haywood, H. C., & Lidz, C. S. (2007). *Dynamic assessment in practice: Clinical and educational applications*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Heidari, F. (2019). The effect of dynamic assessment of Toulmin model through teacher- and collective-scaffolding on argument structure and argumentative writing achievement of Iranian EFL learners. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 11(2), 81–100.
- Irons, A., & Elkington, S. (2021). *Enhancing learning through formative assessment and feedback*. Routledge.
- Kasper, G., & Roeever, C. (2005). Developing pragmatic competence. *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, 3(2), 317-334.
- Köroglu, Z. Ç. (2019). Interventionist Dynamic Assessment's Effects on Speaking Skills Testing: Case of ELT Teacher Candidates. *Advances in language and literary studies*, 10(3), 23-31.
- Kozulin, A., & Garb, E. (2002). Dynamic assessment of EFL text comprehension. *School Psychology International*, 23(1), 112-127.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2004). Dynamic assessment of L2 development: Bringing the past into the future. *Journal of applied linguistics*, 1(1), 23-37.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2011). Dynamic assessment in the classroom: Vygotskian praxis for second language development. *Language Teaching Research*, 15, 11-33.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2013). The unfairness of equal treatment: Objectivity in L2 testing and Dynamic Assessment. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 19, 141–157 .
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and the pedagogical imperative in L2 education. Vygotskian praxis and the research/practice divide*. London: Routledge.
- Leung, C. (2007). Dynamic assessment: Assessment for and as teaching?. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 4(3), 257-278.
- Lidz, C.S., & Gindis, B. (2003). Dynamic assessment of the evolving cognitive functions in children. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev, & S. M. Miller(eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 99-116). Cambridge University Press.
- Lussier, C. M. & Swanson, H. L. (2005). Dynamic assessment: A selective synthesis of the Experimental literature. In G. M. van der Aalsvoort, W. C. M. Resting, & A. J. J. M. Ruijsenaars (eds.), *Learning potential assessment and cognitive training: Actual research and perspectives in theory building and methodology* (pp. 65-87). New York: Elsevier.
- Murphy, R. (2011). *Dynamic assessment, intelligence and measurement*. London: John Wiley & Sons.
- Poehner, M. E. (2007). *Dynamic assessment of oral proficiency among advanced L2 learners of French*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, University Park.
- Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic Assessment: A Vygotskian Approach to Understanding and Promoting Second Language Development*. Berlin: Springer Publishing.
- Poehner, M. E. (2009). Group dynamic assessment: Mediation for the L2 classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(3), 471-491.



- Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2005). Dynamic assessment in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 9, 233-265.
- Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2013). Bringing the ZPD into the equation: Capturing L2 development during computerized dynamic assessment (C-DA). *Language Teaching Research*, 17(3), 323-342.
- Smit, U. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in higher education: A longitudinal study of classroom discourse*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2002). *Dynamic testing: The nature and measurement of learning potential*. Cambridge university press.
- Struyven, K., Dochy, F., & Janssens, S. (2005). Students' perceptions about evaluation and assessment in higher education: a review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(4), 325-341.
- Summers, R. (2008). *Dynamic Assessment: Towards a Model of Dialogic Engagement* (Doctoral dissertation). University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida, USA.
- Tabatabaei, S. & Bakhtiarvand, M. (2014). Application of Dynamic Assessment in Second and Foreign Language Teaching. *International Journal for Teachers of English*, 4(3), 1-14.
- Taguchi, N. (2007). Corpus-informed assessment of comprehension of conversational implicatures in L2 English. *TESOL quarterly*, 43(4), 738-749.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.
- Xiaoxiao, L., & Yan, L. (2010). A case study of dynamic assessment in EFL process writing, [Electronic version]. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33, 24-40.

### Biodata

**Saad Mezher Karamallah** is a Ph.D. student in English Language Teaching at Urmia University. He is a Lecturer at Baghdad University. He is superintendent at the Ministry of Education, Baghdad and has several articles published in local and international journals.  
Email: [saadmezherkaramallah@gmail.com](mailto:saadmezherkaramallah@gmail.com)

**Mahdi Sarkhosh** is an assistant professor of TEFL at Urmia State University, Urmia, Iran. His areas of interest include research, language teaching methodology, linguistics and testing. He has been teaching courses related to language teaching and testing at the graduate and post-graduate levels for 10 years. He has published and presented many papers during these years.  
Email: [m.sarkhosh@urmia.ac.ir](mailto:m.sarkhosh@urmia.ac.ir)

