

A Comparative Study of the Effects of two Types of Dynamic Assessment (Interventionist vs. Interactionist) on Iranian EFL Learners' Grammatical Accuracy in Writing: A Classroom Based Study

Parviz Ajideh¹, Rougia Oghbatalab^{1,*}

¹Department of English, Faculty of literature and Foreign Languages, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran

Corresponding Author's Email: rougiaoghba@gmail.com

KEYWORDS

Dynamic Assessment,
Interactionist Dynamic
Assessment, Interventionist
Dynamic Assessment

ABSTRACT

Conventional assessment methods have faced widespread criticism, highlighting the need for alternatives like dynamic assessment (DA). This study examines the efficacy of two types of DA, interventionist and interactionist, on grammatical accuracy in writing. A total of thirty-eight Iranian EFL (English as a foreign language) learners whose ages range from 18 to 30 and include both males and females participated in this study at Paymeh-Noor University in Tabriz, Iran. Convenience sampling technique was used, selecting two existing intact classes to preserve a natural classroom environment. Their initial homogeneity was established based on scores obtained from the Preliminary English Test (PET). The participants were randomly assigned to two experimental groups: one receiving an interactionist assessment and the other receiving an interventionist one. The intervention spanned ten sessions of ninety minutes each, during which all groups experienced identical instructional procedures and received the same instructional materials. Upon completion of the course, all the participants completed a parallel form of the PET as the post-test to assess their progress. The analysis of the scores obtained from the pretest and post-test revealed that learners who participated in interactionist DA showed significantly greater improvements in grammatical accuracy in writing compared to their interventionist counterparts. This study highlights the value of interactionist DA in language education, highlighting its capability to deliver personalized, real-time mediation aligned with learners' needs. By promoting active participation and ongoing formative feedback, interactionist DA enhances language development more effectively than interventionist approaches. Educators should adopt this learner-centered framework to boost responsiveness and outcomes.

ARTICLE INFO

Article type: Research Article

Article history:

Received: 11 June 2025

Revised: 28 August 2025

Accepted: 18 October, 2025

Published online: 18 October
2025

Introduction

Language assessment has traditionally relied on standardized methods that often fail to capture learners' dynamics and potential abilities. In reaction against traditional approaches to assessment, the field has increasingly adopted more interactive and adaptive assessment approaches that focus on learning processes (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2002). In this context, alternative assessment methods, notably those employing authentic procedures, have gained prominence as a means to systematically evaluate learners' capacity to apply their potential knowledge in novel problem-solving situations or task-oriented activities. Scholars have increasingly viewed assessment not only as an evaluative tool but also as a mechanism for guiding instructional changes within classrooms and for informing curriculum reform efforts (Fattah, 2024; Lock, 2001, as cited in Ahmadi Safa & Beheshti, 2018).

How to Cite: Ajideh, P., & Oghbatalab, R. (2025). A Comparative Study of the Effects of two Types of Dynamic Assessment (Interventionist vs. Interactionist) on Iranian EFL Learners' Grammatical Accuracy in Writing: A Classroom Based Study. *International Journal of Practical and Pedagogical Issues in English Education*, 3(4), 82-96. DOI: 10.22034/ijpie.2025.530005.1110



© The Author(s).

Among various alternative methodologies, Dynamic Assessment (DA) has gained notable prominence for its effectiveness in accurately identifying learners' specific learning difficulties and providing targeted support to help them overcome such challenges (Irons, 2007; Zohrabi & Khalili, 2025). According to Lantolf and Poehner (2008), this form of appropriate scaffolding is pedagogically advantageous because it interactively combines two traditionally separate aspects of education, instruction and assessment, thereby serving both purposes simultaneously. The principal aim of DA is to both evaluate and enhance learners' capabilities concurrently (Shrestha & Coffin, 2012). This process of capability development not only enables learners to successfully complete a particular task but also equips them with strategies to approach future tasks through mediated interaction between the learner and the instructor (Poehner & Lantolf, 2005). Unlike traditional assessments, which are mainly summative and aim to measure the level of learning achieved at the end of the course of instruction, in DA the distinction between instruction and evaluation is blurred. In classroom settings, DA provides feedback that promotes student progress and guides teaching strategies. It also helps learners to understand pedagogical goals and learning objectives in a more effective way. According to Ajideh and Nourdad (2012), DA can offer valuable insights into individual learning strategies and processes, revealing important information about learners' current cognitive and metacognitive awareness. So, DA is inherently formative and supports learning and development (Kashef & Ashrafi, 2023).

DA is a formative type of evaluation and reflects Vygotsky's sociocultural approach to education (Leung, 2007). It is built upon the fact that cognitive abilities can change and grow, rather than being static (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2002). The theoretical foundation of DA is primarily derived from Vygotsky's emphasis on the development of an individual's potential capabilities (Poehner & Lantolf, 2005, 2013; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2002). Although Vygotsky himself did not explicitly use the term DA, the concept was introduced by Vygotsky's colleague, Luria (1961, as cited in Poehner & Lantolf, 2013), who coined the term in his writings in English that pertained to Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory of mind.

Williams and Burden (1997) posited that DA constitutes a pedagogical approach in which assessment and learning are inherently interconnected, rather than conceptualized as discrete activities (p. 42). Similarly, Lidz and Gindis (2003) characterize DA as an "approach to understanding individual differences and their implications for instruction that incorporates intervention within the assessment process" (p. 99). According to Poehner and Infante (2015), DA functions as a conceptual bridge linking evaluation and instructional practices, as well as integrating teaching and learning processes, and encompassing both the cognitive and constructivist dimensions of knowledge acquisition. Educators, particularly those in second and foreign language fields, have widely welcomed the use of DA (Zohrabi & Khalili, 2025). For teaching and assessing a range of language skills and sub-skills simultaneously, various DA models have gained popularity (Malmir, 2020). The primary distinction among these models pertains to their respective modes of delivering mediation. As Lantolf and Poehner (2008) indicate, there are two main frameworks within DA, namely, the interventionist and interactionist approaches, which will be examined in greater detail in the subsequent section. Both interactionist and interventionist DA models seek to amalgamate assessment and instruction via mediation within learners' Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD); however, they are fundamentally distinct in their methodologies: interactionist DA uses flexible, responsive, and dialogic mediation tailored in real time to individual learner needs, whereas interventionist DA employs more structured and standardized prompts across learners.

To sum up, both the interactionist and interventionist approaches of DA play a significant role in supporting learners' development. A substantial body of research has examined the effectiveness of these approaches across various language skills and subskills, including reading (Ebadi & Saeedian, 2015; Kazemi et al., 2020), writing (Rashidi & Bahadori Nejad, 2018), oral communication (Ahmadi Safa et al., 2015; Estaji & Farahanynia, 2019; Safdari & Fathi, 2020), pragmatic competence (Malmir, 2020), and lexical knowledge (Gharekhani & Seyyed Rezaei, 2015; Sarani & Izadi, 2016). However, there are few studies to examine the effect of two types of DA on grammatical accuracy in writing (Khorramifard & Derakhshi, 2019). Addressing this gap in the literature, the purpose of the present study is to explore how these two approaches to DA affect grammatical accuracy in written production at Paymeh-Noor University in Tabriz, Iran.

Literature Review

The initial paradigm of DA has its conceptual roots in Vygotsky's early analyses of IQ testing within educational contexts and is characterized by a predominantly quantitative orientation. Lantolf and Poehner (2004) refer to this framework as the 'interventionist' approach to DA. Within this model, the mediator standardizes the intervention, ensuring consistency among different learners. As Gutierrez (2000) notes, the interventionist approach tends to involve prearranged, quantifiable forms of assistance that are designed to facilitate psychometric measurement and yield quantifiable outcomes. In essence, the support provided takes the form of standardized interventions developed to assess individuals' or groups' capacity to utilize predetermined guidance, feedback, and support mechanisms, with the aim of enhancing the predictive validity of the assessment process. According to Poehner (2008), the interventionist model differs from the interactionist one. The interventionist model follows a more structured sequence of mediation that moves from more implicit to more explicit forms, ultimately leading to a specific response. In this framework, assessments are conducted using a primarily standardized procedure; when learners fail to successfully complete a task, the instructor supplies prompts or cues to facilitate task completion, adhering to a systematic and replicable methodology. According to Lantolf and Poehner (2010), during interventionist DA, the teacher facilitates the learner's error recognition by pausing, repeating the sentence without indicating the error or isolating the erroneous phrase. The teacher signals a problem by querying or stating its presence, points out the incorrect word, uses either/or questions to guide learners toward the correct form, and finally provides the correct answer with an explanation. This scaffolded mediation promotes learner self-correction within their ZPD.

The second paradigm is rooted in Vygotsky's later theoretical contributions and emphasizes instructional and developmental processes over purely statistical measurement, adopting an interpretive and dynamic perspective on assessment. Lantolf and Poehner (2004) designate this approach as the interactionist model of DA. In the interactionist framework, the mediator engages actively with the learner, engaging in ongoing assessment of the learner's current developmental level. This continuous interaction underpins the rationale for the term 'dynamic' (Fulcher, 2010). This model integrates assessment and instruction, making it impossible to conceptualize one without the other (Poehner, 2008). The interactionist approach, unlike conventional assessment models that focus on standardized methods, emphasizes the enhancement of learners' ability to assimilate new information. It aims to improve learners' abilities to develop essential skills and identify effective problem-solving strategies. As Poehner (2008) notes, "While interactionist assessment emphasizes an interactive and qualitative

approach to evaluation, interventionist assessment tends to be scripted and quantitative, aligning with psychometric paradigms” (p. 44). Furthermore, Poehner (2008) highlights that “interactionist DA aligns with Vygotsky's emphasis on cooperative dialogue, where assistance emerges through the dynamic interplay between the mediator and the learner, making it highly responsive to the learner's Zone of Proximal Development” (p. 18).

Numerous variations of DA, particularly the interactionist and interventionist paradigms, have demonstrated considerable efficacy in the development of second language (L2) proficiency across diverse EFL and English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts (Bachman & Palmer, 2010). Specifically, DA has been shown to play a pivotal role in improving L2 reading comprehension skills (e.g., Ebadi & Saeedian, 2015), writing abilities (e.g., Heidari, 2019), and oral competencies, including listening and speaking (e.g., Ebadi & Asakereh, 2017), as well as lexical knowledge (e.g., Sarani & Izadi, 2016). In a recent investigation conducted by Malmir (2020), the comparative impact of interventionist and interactionist models of DA on the pragmatic comprehension accuracy and processing speed of Iranian EFL learners was systematically examined. The findings indicated that participants subjected to both types of DA significantly outperformed the control group, who received non-DA. Furthermore, the interventionist DA cohort demonstrated superior performance relative to the interactionist DA group in terms of pragmatic accuracy, although no significant differences were observed regarding pragmatic comprehension speed. Rashidi and Bahadori Nejad (2018) conducted a study in Iran to examine the effect of DA on EFL learners' writing proficiency. Their findings showed that DA significantly improved participants' writing scores. Interviews with the learners supported these results, revealing that DA helped them enhance their overall writing skills. Similarly, Khorramifard and Derakhshi (2019) explored the effect of the interventionist DA model on improving linguistic accuracy in Iranian EFL learners' writing. Their quantitative analysis demonstrated that the experimental group, which received mediated support, experienced fewer writing difficulties and performed significantly better than the control group, which received non-DA.

Ahmadi Safa and Beheshti (2018) investigated the effects of both interactionist and interventionist DA on listening comprehension development. The findings indicated that the interactionist approach to DA was the most effective method for facilitating listening comprehension. Furthermore, while the interventionist DA group seemed to show more progress than the non-DA group, this difference was not statistically significant ($p > .05$). In a similar study, Sharifi and Abbasnasab Sardareh (2016) examined the effect of interventionist DA on grammatical accuracy among Iranian EFL learners. It was revealed that DA has a significant impact on learners' grasp of prepositions of time and place.

Building upon previous scholarly investigations, a great deal of research in this field has examined the effect of a specific type of DA (either interactionist or interventionist) on different skills and subskills, but only a few studies compare the effect of two DAs. With this in mind, the present study aims to examine the potential benefits of DA, specifically the interventionist and interactionist approaches, for the grammatical accuracy of Iranian EFL learners' writing. Accordingly, the following research question has been formulated to guide the investigation.

To examine the effect of two types of DA (interactionist and interventionist) on Iranian EFL learners' grammatical accuracy in writing, the following research question was formulated:

RQ: Is there any significant difference between the effects of the interactionist DA and interventionist DA on Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy?

Method

Research Design

This research employed a quasi-experimental pre-test and posttest design involving two experimental groups. The pretest and post-test were utilized to systematically evaluate the effects of the independent variables, namely the interactionist and interventionist models of DA on the dependent variable, which was grammatical accuracy in writing.

Participants

A total of 38 undergraduate (BA) students (15 male and 23 female) participated in the study from the Payameh Noor University of Tabriz, East Azerbaijan province, Iran. The criteria for selecting the participants were based on convenience sampling. The average age of participants ranged from 18 to 30, and all of them had previously passed their mandatory English course in the first year of university. Instruction was administered once a week, with each session lasting ninety minutes. The duration of the course spanned approximately three months. To mitigate potential instructor-related biases, both classes were conducted by the same instructor (the researcher). The participant pool included both male and female students, with gender considerations deemed nonessential to the scope of this study. Prior to the intervention, the homogeneity of participants' overall English language proficiency was evaluated using the standardized Preliminary English Test (PET), which assesses four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Given the primary focus of the research on grammatical accuracy within writing, the sections pertaining to listening and speaking were excluded from the assessment, leaving the reading and writing components as the basis for establishing initial proficiency levels. The related information has been tabulated in Table1.

Table1

Participants characteristics

Number of the participants	38
Age	18-30
Gender	15 male, 23 female
Degree	BA
L1	Turkish

Instruments

For the data collection procedure, two types of instruments were employed purposefully: Preliminary English Test (PET) and a list of teacher-made writing tasks.

Preliminary English Test (PET)

To ensure homogeneity in participants' overall language proficiency levels, the PET was selected as the assessment instrument. The paper-and-pencil format of the test was utilized for administration to the study participants, comprising two main components. The reading section consists of 25 items, including multiple-choice questions, matching tasks, and filling-the-gap

exercises. The Writing section encompasses 3 tasks, such as composing messages, brief notes, completing forms, or generating short narratives. The PET is internationally recognized as evidence of intermediate English language proficiency, suitable for academics and professionals, and regarded as a reliable and valid assessment tool for English language proficiency.

Teacher made Writing Tasks

For both the pretest and post-test, the researchers designed a set of ten writing tasks, carefully selected to align with the learners' interests. Each task was completed as a classroom writing task during the course sessions. In one class, participants received an interactionist approach, while the other one experienced an interventionist method. The parallel form of the test was administered as a posttest to assess the impact of the respective model of DA. Grammatical accuracy in the writing was analyzed using T-units, providing a standardized measure of syntactic correctness and language development. This methodology enabled a clear and reliable evaluation of how the different interventions influenced learners' grammatical accuracy over the course.

Data Collection Procedure

The homogeneity of the participants was initially verified through the administration of PET. Subsequently, two intact classes, whose proficiency levels were confirmed to be comparable, were selected as participants. The researcher randomly assigned one class to the interventionist group and the other to the interactionist group. At the outset of the instructional period, both groups received comprehensive explanations regarding the procedures for the writing assessments. Participants were then given writing tasks and instructed to compose short essays on topics selected from general domains to avoid the necessity of specialized knowledge. For instance, one of the assigned topics was "The Most Important Day of My Life." The researchers deliberately chose the topics that reflect every day, general writing tasks rather than specialized academic writing, thereby ensuring the tasks are relevant and accessible to the learners without requiring specialized knowledge.

Throughout a ten-session treatment phase, both experimental groups engaged in writing and assessment activities. During the second session, participants were asked to write an essay concerning their goals for learning English. Data collection began after this activity and persisted throughout all ten sessions. In the ninth session, both groups were prompted to write an essay on a similar thematic topic. The researcher evaluated the learners' written compositions for grammatical accuracy, which provided the primary data for this study.

It is significant that both experimental groups were taught in accordance with the curriculum specified in the General English textbook approved by Payameh Noor University, Tabriz, Iran. In the interactionist DA group, participants engage in dialogue with their peers and instructor, with continuous support and scaffolding by the teacher acting as the more knowledgeable other (MKO) within the learners' zone of proximal development (ZPD). The mediation process was collaboratively negotiated between the instructor and the learners and was adaptable based on the learners' needs. The researcher employed prompts, leading questions, explicit feedback, and suggestions consistent with the principles of interactionist DA. The interaction persisted until learners achieved the correct response.

The interventionist DA group received treatment grounded in the procedures articulated by Lantolf and Poehner (2010). Within this framework, the instructor provides calibrated interventions and direct instructional input aimed at evaluating and promoting learners' performance on specific tasks. Based on this regulatory scale, the researcher delivered prompts ranging from highly implicit cues (such as pauses) to highly explicit feedback (e.g., requesting an explanation), depending on the learners' responses, until the correct answer was attained. The intervention scale comprises eight hierarchical levels of mediation. If the less explicit prompts proved insufficient, the teacher employed more explicit forms of mediation until learners could produce the correct responses. Ultimately, if necessary, the instructor explicitly corrected errors, and when learners failed to grasp the solution, she provided comprehensive and detailed explanations to facilitate understanding.

Data Analysis

The assessment of grammatical accuracy in participants' compositions was operationalized by calculating the ratio of error-free t-units to the total number of t-units within the texts. This ratio was subsequently converted into a percentage score, which was scaled to a standardized score out of twenty. For instance, if ten error-free t-units were identified within a total of fifteen, the resulting percentage would be approximately 66%, corresponding to a final score of 13.5 points out of 20. Error identification and classification adhered to the framework proposed by Hubbard, Jones, Thornton, and Wheeler (1996, as cited in Derakhshi & Fard, 2019), which categorizes linguistic errors into grammatical, syntactic, substantive, and lexical error types.

The scores from the PET and the obtained accuracy measures from both the pre-test and post-test were systematically compared between the two groups to determine whether significant differences existed in their performance following the respective treatments. An independent samples t-test was employed as the statistical procedure to assess whether there were statistically significant variations between the mean scores of the two independent groups. Prior to applying the parametric independent samples t-test, the assumption of normality for the score distributions was verified using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The significance level (alpha threshold) was set at .05 to evaluate the null hypotheses.

Results

The collected data were statistically analyzed to find answers to the research question. Before applying the Independent-samples t-test to compare the two groups' means, it was a prerequisite to check the normality of the score distributions. For this purpose, the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was run. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2
One-Sample KS Test to Check the Normality of the Distributions

		Pre-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Post-test	PET	PET
		Interactionist	Interventionist	Interactionist	Interventionist	Interactionist	Interventionist
N		20	18	20	18	20	18
Normal		14.6250	14.3611	16.7000	15.0556	37.2500	36.4444
Parameters mean	Std. Deviation	2.13908	1.98380	1.49032	1.50381	6.24816	5.74172
Most Extreme	Absolute	.127	.112	.247	.124	.209	.218

Differences	Positive	.090	.112	.146	.089	.124	.114
	Negative	-.127	-.110	-.247	-.124	-.209	-.218
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.567	.477	1.103	.526	.936	.924
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.905	.977	.175	.945	.344	.360

As it is seen in Table 2, the p-values obtained for all sets of scores in the data were above the alpha level of significance ($\alpha=.05$), showing that the normality assumption could be confirmed and it was legitimate to use the Independent-samples t-test as a parametric test to compare the two groups' mean scores. The first comparison was made between the two groups' scores in the PET as a test of English language proficiency at the beginning of the study. Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics for the PET scores obtained from the two groups.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for the PET Scores

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PET	1	20	37.2500	6.24816	1.39713
	2	18	36.4444	5.74172	1.35334

As is seen in Table 3, the number of participants in the Interactionist group (Group 1) and the Interventionist group (Group 2), is 20 and 18, respectively. The mean scores in two groups are 37.25 and 36.44, respectively. In order to compare the two groups' mean score statistically, an Independent-samples t-test was used. Table 4 shows the results of the analysis.

Table 4

Independent Samples t-test to Compare PET Scores

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
		PET	Equal variances assumed	.158	.694	.412	36	.683
	Equal variances not assumed			.414	35.980	.681	.80556	1.94512

The results in Table 4 show that the p-value observed for the t-test (.68) was above the alpha level of significance (.05), indicating that the null hypothesis of equality between the two means was accepted. In other words, the difference between the two means was not statistically significant, and the two groups were almost equally proficient in English at the beginning of the study. As the main concern of the present research was writing accuracy, the researcher gave the writing assignment as the pretest. The participants were assigned a writing test during the pretest to respond to a specific topic. Descriptive statistics for the pretests of the two classes are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for the pre-test Scores

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pre-test	1	20	14.6250	2.13908	.47831
	2	18	14.3611	1.98380	.46759

The mean scores in the two groups were 14.62 and 14.36, respectively. To compare the two groups', mean scores statistically, an independent sample t-test was employed. To examine the significance of the difference between the two means, the Independent-samples t-test was run. Table 5 shows the results of the analysis.

Table 6

Independent Samples t-test to Compare Pre-test Scores

		Levene's test for Variances	t-test for Equality of Means						
			F	Sig.	Effect S	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Pre-test	Equal variances assumed	.039	.844	.013	.393	36	.697	.26389	.67162
	Equal variances not assumed				.395	35.961	.696	.26389	.66889

The results of the comparison in Table 6 show that the p-value observed for the t-test was above the alpha level of (.69>.05), indicating failure to reject the null hypothesis of equality between the two means. Furthermore, A Cohen's d of 0.13 denotes a small effect size, indicating a minimal difference between group means. In other words, the difference between the two means was not statistically significant, indicating the homogeneity of the two groups. To examine the effect of the two forms of DA, namely interactive DA, and interactional DA on participants' writing accuracy, the researchers administered a post-test of writing composition at the end of the treatment period. The scores obtained from this test were analyzed using an independent sample t-test. Tables 7 and 8 show the descriptive analysis and the t-test analysis of the scores, respectively.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for the post-test Scores

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post-test	1	20	16.7000	1.49032	.33325
	2	18	15.0556	1.50381	.35445

As is seen in Table 7, the mean score of the interactionist group was 16.70 and the interventionist one was 15.05. In order to compare the two groups' mean scores statistically, an independent samples t-test was employed. Table 8 shows the results of the analysis.

Table 8*Independent Samples t-test to Compare Post-test Scores*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	Effect Size	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Post-test	Equal variances assumed	.287	.596	7.78	3.382	36	.002	1.64444	.48627
	Equal variances not assumed				3.380	35.511	.002	1.64444	.48651

As is shown in Table 8, the p-value observed for the t-test was below the alpha level of .05 ($.002 < .05$), indicating that the null hypothesis of no difference between two means was strongly rejected and the difference between the two means was statistically significant. A Cohen's d value of approximately 7.78 represents an exceptionally large effect size, indicating that the difference between the means of the two groups is roughly 7.78 standard deviations. Such an effect size is regarded as exceptionally significant in academic research, indicating a profound and noteworthy difference between the groups.

Discussion

The findings of the present study align with those documented by Kushki et al. (2022), Orikasa (2010), and Rashidi and Bahadori Nejad (2018). Their research collectively demonstrated that interactionist DA within the context of second language learning is effective in facilitating learners' mastery of the English language. These outcomes are further substantiated by Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory, which asserts that human activities are embedded within a social context. According to Vygotsky, knowledge transfer sometimes proceeds in multiple directions from MKO to less knowledgeable ones. Instead, learning is conceived as a dynamic, participatory process involving active engagement from both educators and learners. Corrective interactions constitute a social activity characterized by collaborative engagement, wherein teachers and students engage in substantive exchanges. Through the process of mediation, educators assist students in recognizing their errors and reformulating their utterances appropriately.

By incorporating instructional and evaluative processes within a dynamic interactionist framework of assessment, educators seek to enable EFL learners to exceed their current competencies (Poehner & Lantolf, 2005). Learners who are unable to independently demonstrate certain skills can advance to higher levels of proficiency through collaborative efforts, including cooperation, interaction, and mediated support. Poehner and Lantolf (2005) argued that interactionist DA emphasizes qualitative interpretations of the ZPD. Accordingly, it can be posited that interactionist DA assists learners in realizing their latent potential, which may be hindered by specific obstacles. This approach seeks to mitigate such barriers by requiring mediators to provide targeted mediations that aid learners in comprehending and actualizing their prospective capabilities.

Notably, while both approaches—interventionist dynamic assessment (DA) and interactionist DA—positively affected students' grammatical accuracy in writing, the findings of

this study showed that the interactionist DA method resulted in greater improvements in learners' accuracy than the interventionist approach.

These outcomes can be understood within the framework of Vygotsky's dialogic collaboration theory. In this model of DA, support is delivered through interactive exchanges between learners and mediators, rendering the assistance highly responsive to the individual learners' ZPD. Conversely, interventionist DA is more closely associated with psychometric considerations, relying heavily on static assessment modes. Given this distinction, Orikasa (2010) argued that quantitative methods, such as psychometric examinations, are inadequate for capturing a comprehensive view of learners' potential, highlighting the limitations of interventionist approaches in reflecting the full scope of learner development. Moreover, interventionist DA employs standardized scales and assistance to produce precise outcomes, facilitating comparison across groups and prediction of future performance. This alignment with core DA principles suggests that the interactionist model is inherently more effective. The interactionist approach, which is more in tune with each person's ZPD, also does a better job of capturing the cognitive processes that underlie learning and finding more specific ways to identify effective mediations and teaching methods (Fulcher, 2010). Through meaningful negotiation and mediated interaction, this model aids educators in providing targeted feedback and addressing the underlying causes of learners' linguistic challenges.

Conclusion

The current investigation aimed to evaluate the efficacy of two distinct models of DA, namely the interactive and interventionist approaches to the grammatical accuracy of writing among Iranian EFL learners. The study was conducted at Payameh-noor University utilizing a convenient sample of thirty-eight students enrolled in a general English course. The research employed a quasi-experimental pre-test-post-test design. Following the statistical confirmation of initial equivalence between the two groups in terms of overall English proficiency, one group was assigned to the interactionist DA model, while the other was subjected to the interventionist model. The final test scores of participants were statistically compared to determine the significance of observed differences. The data analysis indicated that the interactionist group achieved a higher mean score on the post-test assessment of writing accuracy. Consequently, the data indicated a significant difference between the effects of the interactionist and interventionist models of DA on the grammatical accuracy of Iranian EFL students' writing, rejecting the null hypothesis.

These findings hold important implications for educators, students, and curriculum developers. As Poehner and Lantolf (2013) articulated, DA has profound significance for language acquisition. Its principles elucidate not only L2 proficiency but also affective factors such as learner emotions. From a psychoanalytic perspective, DA may mitigate anxiety-related learning difficulties and foster greater learner autonomy. Furthermore, DA facilitates collaborative learning, enabling evaluators and learners to jointly address learning challenges (Poehner & Lantolf, 2005). According to Harding et al. (2015), DA enables educators to categorize students based on their true ability levels by accounting for performance disparities and providing insights into learners' skills. This approach also has implications for curriculum developers, who can design exercises tailored to facilitate both learning and assessment. Such tasks can foster learner autonomy and awareness, enhancing the learning experience.

Additionally, they provide teachers with mediating roles that support instructional and evaluative practices.

Given the limited sample size of 38 participants, the generalizability of the study's findings is constrained, necessitating caution when applying these results to broader populations. The relatively small and homogeneous sample may not capture the full variability present in diverse learner groups, potentially limiting the robustness of the conclusions. Additionally, the study did not account for demographic variables such as socioeconomic status, educational background, or prior language learning experiences, which could influence the outcomes. The cross-sectional nature of the research also restricts insights into long-term effects, and the absence of a control group further limits definitive assertions about the causal impact of the DA interventions. Future studies should address these limitations by incorporating larger, more diverse samples, longitudinal designs, and control conditions to strengthen the validity and applicability of the findings. Moreover, interrater reliability was not assessed, raising concerns about the consistency and objectivity of the data collection process. Future research should address these limitations by including larger, more diverse samples, longitudinal designs, control conditions, and evaluations of interrater reliability to enhance validity and applicability.

References

- Ahmadi Safa, M. & Beheshti, S. (2018). Interactionist and interventionist group dynamic assessment and EFL learners' listening comprehension development. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 6(3), 37-57.
- Ahmadi Safa, M., Donyaie, S., & Malek Mohammadi, R. (2015). An investigation into the effect of interactionist versus interventionist models of dynamic assessment on Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill proficiency. *Teaching English Language*, 9(2), 146–166. <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2015.53728>.
- Ajideh, P. & Nourdad, N. (2012). The effect of dynamic assessment on EFL reading comprehension in different proficiency levels. *Language Testing in Asia*, 2(4) 101-122. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2229-0443-2-4-101>
- Bachman, L. & Palmer, A. (2010). *Language assessment in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.a2084808>
- Ebadi, S., & Asakereh, A. (2017). Developing EFL learners' speaking skills through dynamic assessment: A case of a beginner and an advanced learner. *Cogent Education*, 4(1), 2-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2017.1419796>
- Ebadi, S., & Saedian, A. (2015). The effects of computerized dynamic assessment on promoting at-risk advanced Iranian EFL students' reading skills. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 4(2), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.58837/chula.the.2023.1288>
- Estaji, M., & Farahanynia, M. (2019). The immediate and delayed effect of dynamic assessment approaches on EFL learners' oral narrative performance and anxiety. *Educational Assessment*, 24(2), 135–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2019.1578169>.

- Fattah, Z. (2024). The effect of portfolio assessment on Iranian EFL learners' writing ability. *International Journal of Practical and Pedagogical Issues in English Education*, 2(2), 13-34. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/4106882>
- Fulcher, G. (2010). *Practical language testing*. Hodder Education. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532210394641>
- Gharekhani, S., & Seyyed Rezaei, S. H. (2015). The effect of dynamic assessment on vocabulary learning and retention of EFL learners. *A Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(2), 174-186.
- Gutierrez, V. F. (2000). Dynamic assessment: An approach to assessing children's language learning potential. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 21(3), 214-223. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2000-13195>
- Harding, L., Alderson, J. C., & Brunfaut, T. (2015). Diagnostic assessment of reading and listening in a second or foreign language: Elaborating on diagnostic principles. *Language Testing*, 32(3), 317-336.
- 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. (2007). *Enhancing learning through formative assessment and feedback*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203934333>
- Kashef, S. H., & Ashrafi, R. (2023). Investigating the Relationship between Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners' Language Anxiety and Their Reading Ability. *International Journal of Practical and Pedagogical Issues in English Education*, 1(1), 43-55. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijetst/v3i06.15>
- Kazemi, A., Bagheri, M. S., & Rassaei, E. (2020). Dynamic assessment in English classrooms: Fostering learners' reading comprehension and motivation. *Cogent Psychology*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2020.1788912>
- Khorramifard, S. & Derakhshi, Z. (2019). The role of dynamic assessment on promotion of writing linguistic accuracy among EFL learners: An interventionist model. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 4(2), 14-28. <https://doi.org/10.29252/ijree.4.2.14>
- Kushki, A., Nassaji, H., & Rahimi, M. (2022). Interventionist and interactionist dynamic assessment of argumentative writing in an EFL program. *System*, 107, 1028-1052 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.>
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2004). *Dynamic assessment in the language classroom* (CALPER Professional Development Document CPDD-0411). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, CALPER.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (Eds.) (2008). *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages*. Equinox Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009189422>

- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2010). Dynamic assessment in the classroom: Vygotskian praxis for second language development. *Language Teaching Research*, 15 (1), 11-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810383328>
- Leung, C. (2007). Dynamic assessment: Assessment for and as teaching? *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 4 (3), 257-278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434300701481127>
- Lidz, C. S., & Gindis, B. (2003). Dynamic Assessment of the evolving cognitive functions in children. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. Gs. Ageyev, & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 96-116). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511840975.007>
- Malmir, A. (2020). The effect of interactionist vs. interventionist model of dynamic assessment on L2 learners' pragmatic comprehension accuracy and speed. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 9 (1), 279-320.
- Orikasa, M. (2010). *Interactionist dynamic assessment in L2 learning: A case study of tutoring L2 English oral communication* [Master's thesis, University of Hawaii at Mānoa]. ScholarSpace. <https://hdl.handle.net/10125/20258>
- Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic Assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting second language development*. Berlin: Springer Publishing.
- Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2005). Dynamic assessment in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 9, 233–265. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168805lr1660a>
- Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2013). Bringing the ZPD in to the equation: Capturing L2 development during computerized dynamic assessment. *Language Teaching Research*, 17(3), 323-342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813482935>
- Poehner, M. E., & Infante, P. (2015). Mediated development as inter-psychological activity for L2 education. *Language and Sociocultural Theory*, 2, 161–183. <https://doi.org/10.1558/lst.v2i2.26982>
- Rashidi, N. & Bahadori Nejad, Z. (2018). An investigation to the effect of dynamic assessment on the EFL learners' process writing development. *SAGE Open*, 10 (4), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018784643>
- Safdari, M., & Fathi, J. (2020). Investigating the role of dynamic assessment on speaking accuracy and fluency of preintermediate EFL learners. *Cogent Education*, 7(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2020.1818924>
- Sarani, A., & Izadi, M. (2016). Diagnosing L2 receptive vocabulary development using dynamic assessment: A micro genetic study. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 35(2), 161–189.
- Sharifi, M. & Abbasnasab Sardareh, S. (2016). The effect of dynamic assessment on elementary EFL students' L2 grammar learning. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3 (3), 102-120.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Gregorenko, E. L. (2002). *Dynamic Testing: The Nature and Measurement of Learning Potential*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shrestha, P., & Coffin, C. (2012). Dynamic assessment, tutor mediation and academic writing

development. *Assessing Writing*, 17(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2011.11.003>

Williams, M., & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers* (Vol. 88). Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Zohrabi, M., & Khalili, A. (2025). The utility of tailor-made teacher education in Iranian EFL instructors' attitudes towards dynamic assessment. *Language Testing in Asia*, 15(29), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00366-9>

Parviz Ajideh: is a professor of Applied Linguistics at Tabriz university, Tabriz Iran. He has published papers in several journals and has presented papers at several national and international conferences. His main interests are second language writing, genre analysis, and academic discourse analysis.

Rougia Oghbatalab (corresponding author): is an English instructor at Tabriz University, Tabriz Iran. She has several years of experience in teaching English in several language institutes and universities. Her main field of interest is applied linguistics and discourse analysis.