A Comparative Study of University and Private Language Institute EFL Teachers' Familiarity with and Classroom Practicality Perceptions of Dynamic Assessment

Musa Nushi[1], Ali Momeni[2]

[1] *Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran*
E-mail: M_nushi@sbu.ac.ir
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1917-5372
(Corresponding author)

[2] *Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran*
E-mail: alireza6616@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5533-0854

DOI: 10.26907/esd.17.3.04
EDN: BMXVDU
Submitted: 1 November 2021; Accepted: 31 January 2022

Abstract
The widespread prevalence of dynamic tools to assess English language achievement has led to burgeoning research on exploring different aspects of teachers' beliefs toward Dynamic Assessment (DA). In the educational system of Iran, experts and researchers who have undergone second language education may verify that there is very little, if any, attention given to the perceptions held by instructors and teachers regarding Dynamic Assessment (DA). In an attempt to remedy this gap, the current study aimed to investigate the familiarity with DA of Iranian EFL teachers working in two educational settings (e.g., language institutes and universities). The study also set out to explore the teachers' attitudes toward the practicality of DA in the two settings. To address the research questions, a sequential explanatory mixed methods design was employed. The instruments of this study comprised a questionnaire and an Email interview with 12 ELT assessment experts in order to have their interpretations of the research findings. The results of the t-tests showed no significant difference between the two groups of teachers in terms of their familiarity with DA and their attitudes toward the practicality of DA in the two contexts. In addition, content analysis of the Email interview data revealed that the ELT assessment experts' primary arguments for the insignificant difference between the two groups in terms of the two variables related to the fact that DA has remained at the theoretical level, that there is a lack of teacher training in DA and the strict rules of Iran's educational system which prohibit teachers from applying DA principles and procedures in their classes. The implications of the findings for teacher education, materials development as well as for program administrators, EFL teachers, and learners will be discussed.
Keywords: Dynamic assessment (DA), teachers' beliefs, familiarity, practicality.

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY

Сравнительное исследование осведомленности о динамическом оценивании и его практического восприятия в сообществах университетских преподавателей и преподавателей частных институтов, преподающих английский язык как иностранный

Муса Нуши[1], Али Момени[2]

[1] *Университет имени Шахида Бехешти, Тегеран, Иран*
E-mail: M_nushi@sbu.ac.ir
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1917-5372
(Автор для корреспонденции)

[2] *Университет имени Шахида Бехешти, Тегеран, Иран*
E-mail: alireza6616@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5533-0854

DOI: 10.26907/esd.17.3.04
EDN: BMXVDU
Дата поступления: 1 ноября 2021; Дата принятия в печать: 31 января 2022

Аннотация
Широкое распространение динамических инструментов для оценки успеваемости по английскому языку привело к росту исследований, посвященных отношению учителей к динамическому оцениванию (ДО). В образовательной системе Ирана эксперты и исследователи, имеющие языковое образование, подтверждают, что вопрос восприятия динамического оценивания преподавателями и учителями мало изучен. Цель настоящего исследования – выявить, насколько иранские преподаватели EFL из двух образовательных сфер (языковые институты и университеты) знакомы с динамическим оцениванием. Исследование также направлено на изучение того, как относятся педагоги к целесообразности динамического оценивания в вышеуказанных учреждениях. Для решения поставленных задач была использована смешанная стратегия исследования – анкета и интервью, проведенные по электронной почте с 12 экспертами ELT. Результаты t-тестов не показали существенной разницы между двумя группами преподавателей в их осведомленности о динамическом оценивании и отношении к его целесообразности. Контент-анализ данных, собранных во время интервью по электронной почте, показал, чем объясняют эксперты ELT незначительную разницу между двумя группами преподавателей в их оценке обеих переменных. Согласно выводам экспертов, данная ситуация связана с тем, что проблема динамического оценивания пока находится в основном на уровне теоретического осмысления: учителей к его осуществлению практически не готовят, а устоявшиеся правила иранской системы образования не позволяют педагогам применять принципы и процедуры ДО во время уроков. В статье показана значимость полученных результатов для педагогических сообществ, администраторов, преподавателей EFL и учащихся.
Ключевые слова: динамическое оценивание (ДО), убеждения учителей, осведомленность, практическое применение.

Introduction

Over the last few decades, Dynamic Assessment (DA) has attained considerable prominence in language assessment and educational systems. A large body of research testifies to that fact (Estaji & Ameri, 2020; Leung, 2007; Poehner, 2008). Different researchers have already characterized it differently, but the distinctive feature that remains consistent is the examiners' active intervention in the assessment process of the examinees (Haywood & Lidz, 2007). DA has been endorsed as a successor for traditional

Creative Commons by the Authors is licenced under CC-BY

psychometric approaches to cognitive functioning assessment (Ableeva, 2010; Antón, 2009; Lantolf & Poehner, 2004; Poehner, 2007). The dynamic approach is an addendum to the assessment repertoire (Lidz, 1991) rather than an alternative for current approaches; it contradicts the long-held notions about how learning and learners should be evaluated most appropriately. It behooves to acknowledge that DA and traditional assessment are distinguishable as a function of their theoretical orientation, assessment procedures, and result interpretation (Carney & Cioffi, 1992). Hence, DA takes heed of both the evaluation process and product. DA is no longer a novel method to psychological and educational assessment; in fact, nowadays, its contemporary implementations can be felt in every conceivable facet of English language instruction and assessment (Ebadi & Bashiri, 2020; Estaji & Farahanynia, 2019; Safdari & Fathi, 2020). Despite its relatively extensive history, it is not frequently exercised on a global scale (Es-hagi Sardrood, 2011; Elliott, 1993, 2003; Jafary et al., 2012; Karimi & Shafiee, 2014; Kazemian Sana'ati et al., 2019; Kazemian Sana'ati & Khonamri, 2016; Khonamri & Sana'ati, 2014; Mauludin et al., 2021; Mohammadi, Babaii, & Hashemi, 2020; Nazari, 2012).

What teachers do in the classroom is anchored in thoughts or mental acts that have been molded through years of being as a teacher and/or a student (Mullock, 2006). Additionally, Britzman (1991) argues that teachers' knowledge is situated in their lives, in their values and beliefs, in the social context that supports such practice, and in the social relationships that facilitate the realization of the nature of teaching and learning. Therefore, comprehending how teachers learn and what they do in the classroom is central to understanding teachers' cognition (Borg, 2003). Further, Borg (2003) asserts that in order to properly comprehend what teachers do, focusing exclusively on their behavior is insufficient, and we must grasp their beliefs, knowledge, attitudes, and feelings. Furthermore, teachers' assessment beliefs are important because these assessment beliefs may be incompatible with appropriate assessment practices, beliefs may impede efforts to restructure and improve classroom assessment endeavors (Chang, 2006). DA is a critical concern that deserves investigation since it is an efficient procedure for comprehending learner's diverse needs and their potential to assist them in overcoming language and cognitive difficulties (Ahmed & Pollitt, 2010; Brookhart, Moss, & Long, 2010; Kozulin & Grab, 2002). The concept is particularly applicable in L2 classrooms as a means of streamlining formative assessment methods (Kafshdouz, 2010).

Given the claims made about DA's capacity for improving learners' proficiency in various language skills and components and the paucity of research in this area in Iran, this study was conducted to explore the familiarity with DA by Iranian EFL teachers in two contexts of language institutes and universities. It also explores the teachers' attitudes toward the practicality of DA in the two settings.

Literature Review

Dynamic Assessment

Historically speaking, assessment has always been taken for granted as a means of determining students' current level of specialized knowledge or ability (Teo, 2012). Gauging educational attainment is a vital responsibility of teachers in the realm of language teaching. Teachers, therefore, need to be aware of the privileges and drawbacks of different assessment procedures to be able to illuminate assessment results using proper assessment terminology and communication strategies (Zhang & Burry- Stock, 2003). Unlike the traditional forms of classroom assessment, which involve administering a quiz or test at the end of a unit and assigning a score, newly developed forms of classroom assessment implement challenging tasks to provoke higher-order thinking, and it scrutinizes not only the outcomes but also the entire learning process (Shepard, 2000).

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY

The fundamental aspect of DA that distinguishes it from other forms of assessment is the mediation component (Teo, 2012). The assessment period in DA should result in some form of learning. In other words, learners should receive some feedback from the mediator during the assessment. The role of the examiner as a mediator is also important. The examiner is responsible for mediating the learning process of individuals and thereby affecting their cognition. As a result, DA is designed to facilitate interaction between learners and mediator(s), allowing the mediator to assess the learners' stance in the learning process while also ensuring the mediation's quality. The underlying principles of DA have been applied to general education in recent years. In addition, the scope of DA has been expanded to include adults, particularly with regard to instruction in second language (L2) teaching (Lantolf & Poehner, 2010).

Teachers' Beliefs and Assessment

Richardson (1996) contends that teachers' beliefs are formed by three distinct sources: their personal experiences in general and teaching in particular, their experiences as students, and their knowledge of school courses. According to Woods (1996), classroom events are governed and regulated by teachers' belief systems and background knowledge composition, which includes knowledge of the culture, world, pertinent contexts, linguistic script, plans, and expectations. Yin (2010) similarly argues that teachers' cognitive strategies, such as their beliefs about language learning and their interactive view of students' performance, influence how they arrange, sequence, and apply assessment techniques. The findings of this study brought light to the fact that implicit constructs and perceptions exist in the EAP environment and possess an empirical foundation in the classroom. Furthermore, it was revealed that teacher thinking research is founded on the premise that the teacher is a thoughtful professional rather than a script-following technician (Borg, 2003; Clark & Peterson, 1986). Lu (2003) investigated the beliefs and practices of two university instructors in Taiwan regarding assessment. Interviews, classroom observations, and other pertinent documents were used to collect data. The findings indicated a high degree of consistency between teachers' beliefs and their assessment practices. Due to a variety of constraints, including a lack of time, institutional regulations, and negative suggestions from colleagues, these beliefs could not be appropriately implemented in the classroom. Moreover, it was found out that teachers' role in the assessment system is minimized at the sight of the various situational and contextual factors that restrict teachers from executing innovative and effective assessment practices in the classroom. The findings are significant as they show that instructors' assessment beliefs may be incompatible with appropriate assessment practices, and these beliefs may impede efforts to restructure and improve classroom assessment endeavors (Chang, 2006).

Chang (2006) probed teachers' beliefs and attitudes regarding oral language assessment in Tai's academic EFL classes. The results showed that teachers feel that by varying their usage of oral language assessment, they may obtain a more holistic view of learners' oral language skills. Many of the teachers view assessment as a natural extension of teaching, significantly impacting student engagement and motivation. The teachers chose assessment procedures based on what would result in the highest level of student involvement and motivation. Oh (2006) undertook a study on how English teachers assess their students in the classroom. She surveyed 140 English teachers, inquiring about assessment techniques, timings, the use of marking criteria and scales, the use of assessment specifications, assessment areas, and the use of assessment results and the manner in which they were reported. She also gathered the assessment specifications used to validate the survey investigations, believing that the specifications provided a

Creative Commons by the Authors is licenced under CC-BY

more direct indication of teachers' assessment practices. The findings demonstrated that teachers primarily assessed students through observation, interviews, and pencil-paper tests. Moreover, the majority of teachers developed assessment specifications and administered assessments in accordance with the specifications, and that teachers typically assessed four English skills, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing. However, teachers rarely provided marking standards and scales, and some of those that were provided were ambiguous. Typically, teachers did not use assessment results to improve their teaching. They utilized them solely to verify the students' progress and to complete the report form. Further, teachers believed that remarks concerning assessment results were not very accurate, attributed to the fact that summarizing each student's success into one or two sentences in the given form limits what can be expressed. She concludes that priority should be given to the following to improve the assessment situation: 1) reducing the number of students in the class; 2) establishing time for assessment; 3) developing various assessment tools; 4) supplying such assessment tools; 5) developing assessment-related teacher education programs, and 6) modifying assessment report forms and how students' assessment results are stated.

In the same vein, Rogers, Cheng, and Hu (2007) studied ESL/EFL instructors' pedagogical beliefs on assessment and evaluation. A 32-item questionnaire was used to ascertain the assessment beliefs of 95 ESL/EFL instructors in Canada, 44 in Hong Kong, and 124 in Beijing. In all three contexts, the findings indicated that teachers shared more commonalities than differences. On the other hand, the instructor displayed diverse, and at times contradicting, beliefs in those three contexts. Students benefited from the assumption that assessment and evaluation were necessary components of instruction. Furthermore, a substantial positive link was found between the teachers' actual aims and uses for assessment and evaluation. Instructors' beliefs about their assessment and evaluation methods, the amount of time required, their comprehension of readiness for assessment and evaluation were only marginally related to their actual assessment practices. Brown, Hui, Flora and Kennedy (2011), discovered that teachers' beliefs about assessment are influenced by their social and cultural backgrounds. The data were gathered via a self-report survey that covered three primary areas, including accountability, improvement, and irrelevance. The aim of this research was to ascertain teachers' perceptions and understandings of assessment in Southern China and Hong Kong. The findings indicated that teachers place a high premium on aspects such as accountability and improvement. These findings are consistent with the new philosophy of utilizing assessment to enhance both the quality of teaching and student learning.

Munoz, Palacio, and Escobar (2012) conducted another study in Colombia on teachers' assessment beliefs. In this paper, they explained a study of teachers' attitudes about evaluation in general and of the assessment systems employed at a language center at a private university in Colombia in particular. Surveys, observations, and interviews were the primary data collection instruments used to determine sixty-two teachers' pedagogical beliefs. The study revealed a discrepancy between teachers' beliefs and practices, suggesting that teachers require opportunities for reflection, self-assessment, and further assistance in doing formative assessments. Moreover, Elshawa, Abdullah and Rashid (2017) carried out a research to explore the assessment beliefs of English language instructors at the tertiary level in the Malaysian context. The researchers adopted cross-sectional research designs in which 83 instructors were selected through purposive sampling. The results demonstrated that instructors viewed assessment as a means of improving teaching and learning, identifying students' weaknesses and strengths, providing students with information regarding their progress, and tailoring feedback to students as they learn. Additionally, English language instructors mentioned that they use

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY

various assessment methods for each language skill taught in their language center/unit. The findings also shed light on the fact that English instructors should be more empowered in their role as student assessors, and their knowledge about assessment procedures should be expanded via long professional development courses. Similarly, Nazari (2017) conducted a qualitative interpretive study in the United Kingdom to ascertain English language lecturers' perceptions of the difficulties and potentials associated with DA as a possible alternative. The researcher conducted ten semi-structured interviews with lecturers and senior lecturers at six UK universities. Despite the teachers' uncertain feelings and concerns about the difficulties associated with DA, the study's findings revealed that lecturers were certainly interested in the potential of DA to provide more individualized learning for students. Additionally, the research participants identified several barriers to implementing DA in classes, including university policies, a lack of training and knowledge about DA, a demand to see instances of DA, the requirement for additional time and engagement from students and lecturers, and concern about fairness.

Önalan and Karagül (2018) also investigated foreign language teachers' beliefs and practices regarding assessment and their needs in this area. The participants in this study were 70 Turkish EFL teachers from a public university's Prep Class who completed a questionnaire consisting of a 20-item 5-Likert scale. According to this study, the assessment objectives in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes are as follows: (a) formative assessment, (b) summative assessment, (c) student self-assessment, and (d) assessment to improve teachers' instruction. The findings indicated that teachers' beliefs about assessment are insistent about the importance of using assessment for formative aims, and self-evaluation processes are also assigned the next greatest level of significance. Furthermore, the results demonstrated that the assessment preferences of participants are unaffected by their undergraduate departments or years of experience.

In the Iranian EFL context, Estaji (2012) also examined teachers' beliefs and practices in relation to four stages of classroom-based assessment, including planning, implementing, monitoring, recording and dissemination process. The teachers also completed a questionnaire rating their own performance in each stage. The study's findings indicated that teachers held and implemented their own staunch beliefs with regard to classroom-based assessment and had a good deal of knowledge about testing principles and assessment. The teachers' pedagogical beliefs, their understanding of learning objectives, their preconceived notions about learners, and their estimation of students' performance in the target language use domain all influenced both their attitude toward assessment methods and their actual implementation of assessment practices. Nonetheless, it was observed that teachers were always improving their assessment abilities and expertise to overcome future barriers or tasks. Es-hagi Sardrood (2011) explored 51 Iranian EFL language institutes, universities, and school teachers' perceptions of DA through a structured interview and a questionnaire and came up with rather different results. The results demonstrated that most of the teachers held a negative attitude about DA and considered that implementing it fully in Iranian EFL classes would be too hard due to lack of DA training and guidelines, time-consuming nature of DA and ICT resources, a large number of students in EFL classes, the regular utilization of static tests, and heavy dependence on the teachers' teaching and assessment abilities.

Similar research was carried out by Karimi and Shafiee (2014), who explored Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of DA, focusing on the role of their educational degree and length of the teaching experience. The study enrolled forty-two Iranian EFL teachers. Twenty-two teachers had BA degrees, and 20 teachers had MA degrees in ELT-related topics, with varying lengths of service. Semi-structured interviews were used to elicit information on teachers' perceptions of DA. The four key themes that emerged from the audio-taped

 Creative Commons by the Authors is licenced under CC-BY

interviews' analysis revealed considerable differences in participants' perceptions of DA patterns and obsessions. The major themes included teachers' understanding of DA as a classroom practice, their own initiation in the application of DA, the role of learners in such assessments, and their understanding about contextual constraints affecting the application of DA. One of the criticisms that could be raised against this study is that the data was gathered from two groups of BA and MA holders and that the authors excluded the PhD holders, a group which could contribute greatly to this study. The BA and MA holders generally do not have much information about DA as their respective degree programs does not include a module dedicated to DA. Consequently, the data which these BA and MA students provide for the research may not be highly valid and reliable. Finally, Mohammadi et al. (2020) looked into perceptions of 25 Iranian TEFL teachers, selected through purposive sampling, concerning the application and importance of DA. The content analysis of the semi-structured interviews revealed that Iranian teachers viewed the application of DA in their classrooms positively. Furthermore, it was found out that teachers could not put DA into practice due to factors such as educational system limitations, expense matters, time concerns, and lack of literacy on the part of teachers.

The empirical literature on DA demonstrates the beneficial impact of this assessment procedure on teachers and students. Several studies on teachers' beliefs demonstrated that they play a substantial role in teachers' decision-making about the assessment approach they use in their classrooms. These investigations, however, reveal a relatively low level of concern for the formation of teachers' beliefs as a foundation for using DA in the classroom, an issue that will be addressed in the present study.

Present Study

This study is guided by the following research questions.

1. How familiar are Iranian EFL teachers working in two different contexts (i.e., language institutes vs. universities) with dynamic assessment?
2. What are Iranian institute and university EFL teachers' attitudes toward the practicality of dynamic assessment in the classroom?
3. What are ELT assessment experts' interpretations of the findings of this study?

Methodology

Design

The design of the current study is a sequential explanatory mixed methods in the sense that "first quantitative data are collected and analyzed; and then, to further explain the findings from the first phase, qualitative data are collected and analyzed; finally, integrated interpretations are drawn based on the quantitative and qualitative data" (Hashemi & Babaii, 2013, p. 833). The significance of using sequential explanatory mixed-methods design, also called a two-phase model, in this study lies in the point that quantitative results can provide a broad picture of the research questions; qualitative data gathering is then necessary to extend, refine and elucidate the comprehensive understanding of findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). In addition, teacher cognition is a set of concealed attributes that are shaped by emotions, culture, ethics, values, and prior learning and teaching experiences. Hence, teachers' cognition is best perceived when it is triangulated by data from various acts in different conditions (Hung, 2012).

Participants

For the quantitative phase of the study, the researchers electronically distributed an online questionnaire produced in Google Form to 600 EFL teachers who were either MA and PhD students or graduates via LinkedIn, ResearchGate, Email, or Telegram. These

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY

teachers were recruited through their profiles on LinkedIn, Instagram, and Telegram groups from various foreign language institutes and universities in Iran. On account that participation in this research was voluntary, this study used convenience sampling as it is the most common sampling procedure in L2 research (Dworkin, 2012).

Concerning the qualitative phase of this study, 12 ELT assessment experts were selected through purposive and snowball sampling to participate in the Email interview. These teachers were largely university professors who had taught English for at least three years and, more importantly, were experts in the field of testing and assessment (as assessed by their publications). Some criteria were used to select participants for both the qualitative and quantitative phases of the study, one of the most important of which was that the teachers had to hold MA, or PhD degrees in TEFL, English Literature, Linguistics, or English Language Translation Studies, or were students pursuing those degrees. This criterion was adopted because those with BA degrees may be unfamiliar with DA, and hence the data gathered from them cannot be considered reliable or valid. The teachers (69.7% female and 30.3% male) were all of Persian background and ranged in age from 20 to 50. Moreover, 20.2 percent of the teachers were from the university context and 79.8 percent were from the language institutes context.

Instruments

The instruments used in this study were a questionnaire and a follow-up Email interview with ELT assessment experts to ascertain their beliefs and attitudes about the findings of the quantitative phase of the study. The questionnaire of this study was an adapted version of the questionnaire by Es-hagi Sardrood (2011). The researchers of this study established reliability and content validity of the questionnaire by piloting it with a group of 30 English language teachers. Those teachers were similar to the target group of this study. The content validity of the questionnaire was established by soliciting ten ELT assessment experts' comments on the instrument. The formula which was used to calculate the content validity ratio is presented hereunder.

$$CVR = \frac{n_e - \frac{N}{2}}{\frac{N}{2}}$$

Based on this formula, the content validity ratio of 0.79 was obtained, which was an acceptable value (Taherdoost, 2016). The questionnaire comprised three sections: demographic information (questions 1-7), familiarity of EFL teachers with DA (8-9), and Iranian language institute EFL teachers' perceptions of DA practicality in classrooms (10-25) (Appendix A). The reliability of the questionnaire stood at 0.80. Moreover, the researchers conducted an exploratory factor analysis to ensure that they made the right decision about choosing this questionnaire as the instrument for the quantitative phase of the study. In exploratory factor analysis, a minimum acceptable value for the KMO test is 0.6. The KMO test result in this study was 0.701, indicating that the data are appropriate and reliable. Further, the significance level for Bartlett's Test was 0.000, signifying that there is a substantial association between the questionnaire's various items.

The purpose of the second instrument, the Email interview, was to find out ELT assessment experts' interpretations of the findings of the quantitative phase of the study. The justification for using an Email interview rather than a face-to-face interview is that it allows participants to reflect on their responses and experiences and also enables them to participate at their time of choosing (James, 2016). The Email interview consisted of two questions: the questions probed the experts' attitudes toward the findings obtained in the study's quantitative phase regarding the teachers' familiarity with DA and their attitudes

 Creative Commons by the Authors is licenced under CC-BY

toward the practicality of DA in EFL classes. To confirm the validity and accuracy of the Email interview questions, the questions and quantitative results from the study's quantitative phase were submitted to three ELT assessment experts for their comments on the questions. Consequentially, two of the items were revised in terms of language, and more background information on the quantitative phase of the study was added to the Email interview questions based on the comments of ELT assessment experts.

Data Collection Procedure

The researchers disseminated the questionnaire electronically to 600 EFL teachers at several EFL institutes and universities in Tehran and Kermanshah via their Linkedin, Research Gate, Email, or Telegram groups. Despite the researchers' efforts, only 119 EFL teachers completed the questionnaire. Additionally, the researchers invited a few university professors who were ELT assessment experts (as assessed by their publications) to respond to the Email interview questions in the form of a word document. The participants were contacted via Email and given sufficient time to respond to the questions. The primary content questions in this Email interview focused on the university teachers' beliefs and attitudes regarding the findings of our quantitative phase of the study.

Results

Research Question One

To address the first research question (i.e., How familiar are Iranian institute and university EFL teachers with dynamic assessment?), responses of the teachers in the two contexts to questionnaire items 8 and 9 were analyzed. Table 1 summarizes the results of familiarity of language institutes teachers with DA. According to Table 1, 12.6% of teachers were highly familiar, 57.9% were familiar and 29.5% were unfamiliar with the theoretical aspects of DA. Concerning their familiarity with procedural aspects of DA, 9.5% were highly familiar, 51.6% were familiar and 38.9% were unfamiliar with those aspects.

Table 1. Familiarity of Iranian Language Institute EFL Teachers with DA

The question	*F%*	*F%*	*F%*
8. How familiar are you with the theoretical aspects of DA?	Highly familiar	Familiar	Unfamiliar
	12.6	57.9	29.5
9. How familiar are you with the procedural aspects of DA?	9.5	51.6	38.9

Table 2 displays the findings of university teachers' familiarity with DA. As shown in Table 2, 13% of teachers were highly familiar, 65.2% were familiar, and 21.7% were unfamiliar with the theoretical aspects of DA. Additionally, 8.2% of teachers were highly familiar, 69.6% were familiar, and 21.7% were unfamiliar with the procedural aspects of DA.

Table 2. Familiarity of Iranian University EFL Teachers with DA

The question	*F%*	*F%*	*F%*
8. How familiar are you with the theoretical aspects of DA?	Highly familiar	Familiar	Unfamiliar
	13	65.2	21.7
9. How familiar are you with the procedural aspects of DA?	8.2	69.6	21.7

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY

The independent samples t-test was used to determine whether there is a significant difference in the familiarity of the two groups of teachers with regard to DA. The results showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of teachers' familiarity with DA, t (116) = -.89, P = 0.372 (Table 4).

Table 3. Group Statistics for Items 8 and 9 of the Questionnaire

Context of teaching	*N*	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*	*Std. Error Mean*
University	23	2.10	.54	.11
Language institutes	95	2.23	.60	.06

Table 4. Independent Samples T-test for Items 8 and 9 of the Questionnaire

	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*	*95% Confidence Interval of the Difference*	
								Lower	*Upper*
Equal variances assumed	2.33	.12	-.89	116	.372	-.12	.13	-.39	.14
Equal variances not assumed			-.95	36.23	.347	-.12	.12	-.38	.13

Research Question Two

The teachers' responses to questionnaire items 10–25 were computed to probe their perceptions of the practicality of DA in the classrooms. Based on the mean score for each column in Table 5, 5.08% of language institute teachers found application of DA in the EFL classrooms to be very difficult, 35.6% considered it difficult, 39.01% considered it easy, 3.96% considered it very easy and 16.05% had no idea. A closer analysis of the column labeled 'very difficult' reveals that items 18 (14.7) and 19 (11.6) obtained the highest percentages. These two items are concerned with 'managing the time to interact and work with every individual student' and 'managing the time to integrate teaching with assessment'. Item 15 in the 'difficult' column of Table 5 also gained a rather high percentage of the responses (51.6%).

Table 5. Iranian Language Institute EFL Teachers' Perceptions of DA Practicality in Classrooms

No	*The degree of DA practicality in Your classrooms*	*Very Difficult %*	*Difficult%*	*No idea %*	*Easy %*	*Very easy %*
10	The application of pretest-teach-posttest model	1.1	25.3	30.5	40	3.2
11	Identifying every student's ability level of English before teaching	2.1	25.3	4.2	61.1	7.4
12	Identifying every student's needs, goals, and learning problems before teaching	5.3	43.2	6.3	40	5.3

Creative Commons by the Authors is licenced under CC-BY

No	*The degree of DA practicality in Your classrooms*	*Very Difficult %*	*Difficult%*	*No idea %*	*Easy %*	*Very easy %*
13	Preparing graduated (easy-to difficult) activities and tasks before teaching	2.1	24.2	14.7	52.6	6.3
14	Providing implicit-to-explicit standardized feedback	2.1	40	16.8	35.8	0
15	Recording the amount and kind of feedback (assistance) needed for every individual student	8.4	51.6	10.5	27.4	2.1
16	Getting continuous feedback about students' progress	3.2	31.6	11.6	51.6	2.1
17	Adapting teaching to the students' responsiveness	3.2	38.9	16.8	38.9	2.1
18	Managing the time to interact and work with every individual student	14.7	46.3	3.2	30.5	5.3
19	Managing the time to integrate teaching with assessment	11.6	35.8	15.8	34.7	2.1
20	Managing the available resources such as pair-work, group work, presentation, and portfolio to have students help each other	3.2	28.4	3.2	57.9	7.4
21	Utilizing the computer-assisted instruction and other technological tools in scaffolding students.	9.5	29.5	20	35.8	5.3
22	Determining students' learning potential	2.1	40	8.4	44.2	5.3
23	Administering several tests to measure students' ability to extend their knowledge and skills to new situations	5.3	49.5	11.6	31.6	2.1
24	Passing or failing students on the basis of the DA results	3.2	31.6	37.9	24.2	3.2
25	Replacing the current practice of static tests with DA	4.2	28.4	45.3	17.9	4.2
	Mean	5.08	35.6	16.05	39.01	3.96

According to the mean score for each column in Table 6, 5.09% of university EFL teachers considered DA practicality in their classrooms as very difficult, 38.84% considered it as difficult, 35.58% considered it as easy, 4.05% considered it as very easy, and 16.22% of teachers had no idea. Table 6 indicates that items 18 (17.4%) and 19 (8.7%) garnered the greatest percentages in the 'very difficult' column. These two items are related to 'managing the time to interact and work with every individual student' and 'managing the time to integrate teaching with assessment'. It is worth noting that the issue of lack of time for university teachers is significantly more acute than it is for language institute teachers. This finding can be accounted for by the fact that university classes are quite crowded, whereas language institute classes are substantially smaller, making DA implementation much easier.

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY

Table 6. Iranian University EFL Teachers' Perceptions of DA Practicality in EFL Classrooms

No	*The degree of DA practicality in Your classrooms*	*Very Difficult %*	*Difficult%*	*No idea %*	*Easy %*	*Very easy %*
10	The application of pretest-teach-posttest model	8.7	21.7	30.4	34.8	4.3
11	Identifying every student's ability level of English before teaching	0	56.3	8.7	30.4	4.3
12	Identifying every student's needs, goals, and learning problems before teaching	4.3	47.8	4.3	34.8	8.7
13	Preparing graduated (easy-to difficult) activities and tasks before teaching	0	34.8	13	47.8	4.3
14	Providing implicit-to-explicit standardized feedback	0	34.8	34.8	26.1	4.3
15	Recording the amount and kind of feedback (assistance) needed for every individual student	4.3	43.5	17.4	34.8	0
16	Getting continuous feedback about students' progress	8.7	34.8	0	47.8	8.7
17	Adapting teaching to the students' responsiveness	8.7	43.5	13	26.1	8.7
18	Managing the time to interact and work with every individual student	17.4	39.1	4.3	39.1	0
19	Managing the time to integrate teaching with assessment	8.7	60.9	0	30.4	0
20	Managing the available resources such as pair-work, group work, presentation, and portfolio to have students help each other	8.7	34.8	4.3	47.8	4.3
21	Utilizing the computer-assisted instruction and other technological tools in scaffolding students.	0	21.7	21.7	52.2	4.3
22	Determining students' learning potential	4.3	21.7	13	52.2	8.7
23	Administering several tests to measure students' ability to extend their knowledge and skills to new situations	4.3	43.5	8.7	39.1	4.3
24	Passing or failing students on the basis of the DA results	0	39.1	39.1	21.7	0
25	Replacing the current practice of static tests with DA	4.3	43.5	47.8	4.3	0
	Mean	5.09	38.84	16.22	35.58	4.05

The independent samples t-test was employed to determine whether there is a significant difference between the attitudes of Iranian institute and university EFL teachers toward the practicality of DA in the classroom. The results revealed no substantial difference between the attitudes of the teachers toward practicality of DA in the classroom, t (116) = -.59, P = 0.552 (Table 8).

Creative Commons by the Authors is licenced under CC-BY

Table 7. Group Statistics for Items 11 to 26 of the Questionnaire

Context of teaching	*N*	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*	*Std. Error Mean*
University	23	2.94	.50	.10
Language institutes	95	3.01	.52	.05

Table 8. Independent Samples T-test for Items 11 to 26 of the Questionnaire

	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*	*95% Confidence Interval of the Difference*	
								Lower	*Upper*
Equal variances assumed	.03	.85	-.59	116	.552	-.07	.12	-.31	.16
Equal variances not assumed			-.61	34.42	.545	-.07	.11	-.31	.16

Research Question Three

To find out ELT assessment experts' interpretations of the findings of this study, the researchers conducted an Email interview with 12 English language teachers who were experts whose expertise was in the field of testing and assessment. This interview contained two questions that sought the experts' opinion on the reasons why Iranian EFL teachers working in the two settings were similarly familiar with DA, and why they largely tend to view the application of DA impractical in their settings. The interview data were analyzed for content using Glaser and Strauss's (1967) method of open, axial, and selective coding. Afterward, the frequencies of each expert's account were calculated (Table 9). The reliability of the data categorization was determined by having a PhD student in TEFL with experience in content analysis examine 50% of the data. Agreement amongst the raters varied between 0.80 to 0.95, indicating a high level of reliability. The following paragraphs will discuss the themes identified during the content analysis of the data.

Table 9. The Assessment Experts' Opinions about the Research Findings

Reasons	*Frequency (%)*
1. Teachers are just theoretically knowledgeable about DA; they lack practical understanding.	23.52
2. Teachers receive inadequate training to implement DA in the classroom.	20.58
3. Iran's educational system's strict rules prohibit teachers from using DA.	17.64
4. The application of DA principles is time-consuming and costly.	14.70
5. Iran's educational system follows a traditional system of assessment.	8.82
6. Teachers and students do not believe in the DA principles and do not see their value.	8.82
7. Teachers lack sufficient motivation to consider their professional development and that includes learning the application of DA.	5.88

Table 9 demonstrates that the experts' primary argument for the lack of difference between the two groups of teachers regarding DA is the fact that DA has remained at the level of theory, and it has not been put in the spotlight as far as practical aspects of

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY

teaching are concerned (Table 9, item 1, 23.52%). The experts believed that teachers may hear about DA and read about it, but when it comes to the practical application of DA in language classes, it is clear that the traditional approach, which is a one-shot final term exam, is followed. This argument is best expressed below by an assistant professor in TEFL.

> I learned about the DA approach in language assessment about six years ago. I just became theoretically interested in its principles. Even I checked video clips online to deepen my knowledge concerning DA and how its principles could be translated in the classroom context. However, I was not permitted to practically use this approach in my workplace (i.e., language institute). There is a missing ring between what the teachers learn in the universities and what they are expected to use in their workplaces. Teachers are required to follow the rules commonly prescribed by the heads of language schools.

Another significant reason for this lack of difference is that teachers do not receive adequate training and skills to implement DA in classrooms (Table 9, item 2, 20.58%). This is understandable given the fact that DA plays little, if any, role in the teacher training courses (TTC) offered by language institutes or language testing courses of universities.

> Another reason that I think DA is neglected is that as a theoretical concept, it has not found its way into practical workshops or training programs. As long as I can remember, in none of the TTC courses in language institutes that I am familiar with does DA play a role.

Additionally, it was discovered that the strict rules of Iran's educational system prohibit teachers from using DA in their classes (Table 9, item 3, 17.64%) and that institute managers and university English departments determine no specific procedures to apply DA in classes. This argument can be linked to Iran's sociocultural setting, as evidenced by the following comment from an associate professor in TEFL.

> We are all the product of an educational system that placed a premium on positivism, and those nurtured in this system are incapable of moving toward DA. In my opinion, our educational system should be adjusted so that DA can be accepted and integrated into the teaching process in our classrooms.

A further important factor concerning this lack of distinction is that teachers in both contexts view DA implementation in the classroom as a time-consuming and costly activity (Table 9, item 4, 14.70%). This result is consistent with the fact that classes, particularly at universities, are extremely crowded, and teachers cannot use DA in their classes and offer students personalized feedback.

> Many university-level or language institute teachers do not have enough time to exercise and follow DA principles because it takes time. Teachers need to be involved in meaningful interaction with their students; they need to be involved in time-consuming feedback-providing activities, and they also need to be engaged in a lot of thinking processes on how to provide feedback to their students.

Subsequently, the results of the content analysis shed light on another factor, namely the fact that Iran's educational system follows a traditional system of assessment (Table

Creative Commons by the Authors is licenced under CC-BY

9, item 5, 8.82%) and DA procedures in Iran are not given sufficient importance and prominence.

> The assessment procedure, especially DA, in universities and language institutes in Iran is not important in the sense that assessment in these contexts is a kind of shallow assessment that forces teachers to assign an accepted score to students in order to advance them to the next level. To this aim, training in assessment, particularly in the DA assessment technique, is not cost-effective or energy-efficient for universities and language institutes. (An associate professor in TEFL)

Another equally significant reason for the stated lack of difference is that teachers and students do not believe in DA principles and do not find them particularly useful (Table 9, item 6, 8.82%). In other words, students and teachers believe that DA cannot contribute to language learning and are unwilling to expose themselves to DA principles in language classrooms.

> Students do not believe in DA procedure because during the DA procedure the teacher tries to interfere with students' learning and the teacher somehow tends to interrupt them when they are trying to produce language. Students think that there is something wrong with their English, and that the teacher is trying to send the message that students do not know the language and need his/her help. Students think that they cannot learn the language efficiently without teacher's assistance or cooperation, or the teacher wants to undermine their self-confidence, so they would not like it. (An associate professor in TEFL)

Least but not least was teachers' lack of sufficient motivation to consider their professional development and implement DA (Table 9, item 7, 5.88%). In the Iranian context, teachers work extremely hard and do not receive nearly enough compensation or recognition for their time spent teaching. As a result, they lack the motivation to pursue professional development.

> Regarding DA, we see that teachers are not sufficiently motivated, which could be attributed to financial constraints, lack of time, and lack of appreciation on the part of language institutes and university administrators for teachers. These factors contribute to teachers losing motivation for professional development and, as a component of professional development, for DA.

Discussion

The results of the present study demonstrated that more than half of the teachers in the two educational contexts (i.e., language institutes and universities) are familiar with both theoretical and procedural aspects of DA. It has to be noted that the teachers who worked in the universities showed more familiarity with DA, which can indicate the possibility that the majority of teachers in universities are either PhD holders or PhD students and may have taken testing courses that included DA. The lower familiarity with DA among institute teachers may also be accounted for by poor performance of TTC's curriculum, which often does not include even a course in assessment (Campbell, Murphy & Holt, 2002; Schafer, 1993). Another possible explanation is that institute teacher preparation programs do not provide teachers with adequate opportunities to learn assessment fundamentals from educators with competence in educational assessment (Quilter, 1999). On the other hand, based on the researchers' personal experience, many language

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY

institute teachers are not graduates of English language teaching programs, and language institute managers prefer these individuals since they work longer hours than graduates of English language teaching programs and can be paid less. The majority of institute teachers who have not completed an English language teaching program should be trained in the field of assessment (Ahangari & Alizadeh, 2015), and that institution stakeholders should prioritize teachers who have finished an English language teaching program for the reasons stated. Meanwhile, institutes establish pre-planned traditional examinations with the assistance of non-specialists (Babaii & Asadnia, 2019), and teachers, who are critical stakeholders in the language assessment process (Scarino, 2013), are discouraged from becoming acquainted with alternative assessment procedures such as DA.

Furthermore, teachers in both contexts shared a similar perspective on the practicality of DA in EFL classrooms. More specifically, teachers emphasized two factors regarding the difficulty of practicing DA in their classes: the time required to apply DA and the provision of personalized feedback. In most EFL contexts in Iran, each lesson is limited to one and a half hours, and teachers cannot provide feedback to every student in that time frame. It can be easily deduced that insufficient time makes implementing DA in classrooms extremely difficult for teachers (Es-hagi Sadrood, 2011; Hessels-Schlatter & Hessels, 2009; Karimi & Shafii, 2014; Mohammadi et al., 2020; Nazari, 2017).

The content analysis of the interview data obtained from the testing and assessment experts demonstrated that one of the most important reasons for the lack of difference between the two groups of teachers with regard to familiarity with DA is that DA has remained a theoretical concept, and teachers are unfamiliar with its application in EFL classrooms. In fact, many teachers are still unfamiliar with the practical aspects of DA (Elliott, 2003; Jafary et al., 2012; Karimi & Shafiee, 2014; Lidz 1991; Mohammadi et al., 2020; Nazari, 2012). This finding is in lockstep with what Hidri's (2014) reported: "although the new assessment [DA] provided better insights into learners' cognitive and meta-cognitive processes than did the traditional assessment, raters were doubtful about the value of and processes involved in DA mainly because they were unfamiliar with it" (p. 1). Due to the lack of training, teachers build their assessment techniques in class with the assistance of colleagues, mentors, and published materials (Tsagari & Vogt, 2017), or they simply construct assessment utilizing typical testing protocols, which may include discrete multiple-choice items on various components of the language (Fox, 2013). Therefore, it seems highly critical to provide a transitory stage with complementary programs to assist teachers in transitioning from theory to practice (Babaii & Asadnia, 2019; Lam, 2015; Malone, 2013). To bridge the gap between theory and practice, university-based teachers, program directors, and practicum supervisors might ruminate over the standpoint of including pre-service teachers' assessment skills and knowledge as a component of their pedagogical content knowledge (Gu, 2014; Inbar-Lourie, 2013) and reconfiguring the assessment rubrics for teaching practicum to encourage long-term development of novel language assessment procedure such as DA.

A further reason for the lack of difference between the teachers with regard to the practicality of DA was that universities and language institutions have strict regulations prohibiting teachers from using DA. This can be related to Iran's context, which is not DA-oriented and is characterized by one-shot assessments. As stated by Babaii et al. (2020):

> Iranian L2 teachers often experience barriers in executing their preferred assessment practices. This dilemma seems to be mostly a function of the way assessment is understood in this context. That is, assessment is dominantly defined in achievement terms and little systematic attention is paid to formative, and much less dynamic, assessment of the teachers. (p. 13)

Creative Commons by the Authors is licenced under CC-BY

Iran's educational system is based on a top-down approach, which implies that the educational authorities 'on behalf of the people' determine how students' knowledge should be tested and taught in class, leaving teachers with little say in these respects (Sadeghi & Jabbarnejad, 2012). In this regard, Iran's dominant pluralistic society (Ahangari & Alizadeh, 2015) takes no heed of what practicality parameter of post-method underlined (Kumaravadivelu, 2003), which signifies that the teacher is spoon-fed with whatever information and theory theoretician generates. Furthermore, the Iranian assessment system is oriented on scores rather than on students' learning and progress (Ketabi & Ketabi, 2014; Mohammadi et al., 2020). This score-based system was developed because of the context in which teachers evaluate their students, and this culture can significantly influence teachers' attitudes toward assessment procedures (Bosma & Resing, 2010; Jane, 2012). It is also worth noting that the score-based nature of the educational system of Iran will negatively influence students' creativity and absence of exposure to higher cognitive skills (Arani, Kakia & Karimi, 2012; Kakia & Almasi, 2008; Porahmadi, 2008), as well as placing a significant pressure on students' personal lives, reducing their academic curiosity (Al Amin & Greenwood, 2018). This score-based approach in the long run may result in a repetitive educational system in which students prioritize good scores over anything else and at any cost, and students' fear of low performance may compel them to offset the risk of failing testing by cheating on examinations (Kirkpatrick & Zang, 2011). This approach constitutes what the academic literature tends to refer to as *grade inflation*, in which students' grades are inflated regardless of their academic achievement (Dashti, 2019; Kassahun, 2008). As a result, the teachers' role in this system is subsidiary; they are obviously required to adhere to a pre-determined set of procedures and materials to be used in class, thereby disregards the teachers' sense of plausibility (Prabhu, 1990). In consideration of the Iran's' score-based system, teachers perceptions of assessment move toward an exam-oriented procedure (see Atai & Mazlum 2013; Firoozi et al., 2019; Razavipour & Rezagah 2018; Zolfaghari & Ahmadi 2016), in which teachers downplay and overlook the role of DA and follow the regulations and rules imposed upon them since "programme teams are finding it challenging to move away from examination based practices, constrained by institutional culture, lengthy regulatory frameworks and lack of training" (Hamilton, 2014). Countless earlier research findings have documented the effect of institutional policies on constraining teachers' assessment practice in class (e.g., Arkoudis & O'Loughlin, 2004; Mansory, 2016; Rea-Dickins, 2008; Tierney, 2006; Troudi, Coombe & Al-Hamliy, 2009; Xu & Liu, 2009).

Another concern regarding the lack of difference for the practicality of DA was the costly and time-consuming nature of adopting DA in EFL classes. This finding corroborates the results of the studies conducted by prior researchers (e.g., Es-hagi Sadrood, 2011; Mohammadi et al., 2020; Hessels-Schlatter & Hessels, 2009). It was revealed that insufficient time was far more problematic in the university context, as the number of students in university classes exceeds the standards (Ahangari & Alizadeh, 2015). The majority of classes in Iranian contexts are one and a half hours long, and this length of time restricts teachers from implementing DA in their classrooms. Moreover, the findings of this study regarding the issue of time are partly in tune with those of Karimi and Shafiee (2014) and Nazari (2017), who found that one of the most significant barriers to implementing DA was teachers' lack of time. According to Broadbent, Panadero, and Boud (2018), one of the tangible rationalizations for employing summative assessment in various contexts is attributable to large classes, where teachers believe it is more equitable to evaluate a large number of students using rubrics and "clear and shared standards and scoring systems" (p.319). However, it has been suggested that DA be used in classes with a small number of students since mediation will be much easier, and the teacher

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY

could provide students with individualized feedback (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004; Missiuna & Samuels, 1989; Mohammadi et al., 2020). Likewise, it would be highly beneficial if educational policymakers in charge of managing universities and language institutes reduced the number of students in each class and increased the class duration.

A further factor that played a role in the lack of difference between the teachers in terms of their views toward DA practicality was the issue of motivation. In the context of Iran, teachers lack sufficient motivation, for different reasons, to consider their professional development, including learning to apply DA. Some of the Iranian EFL teachers are so preoccupied with financial matters (e.g., inadequate pay) that they cannot think about their professional development. In addition, other contextual factors can serve as the demotivating factors for teachers, comprising rules and regulations that do not allow teachers to use DA in classes, school facilities, students' disinterest, and educational issues such as large-class sizes (Rahmati, Sadeghi & Ghaderi, 2019). Therefore, it is recommended that future professional development courses help teachers increase their educational motivation, and stakeholders are also urged to consider teachers' financial concerns and adjust their conditions accordingly.

It is critical to recognize that if educational environments seek to use DA principles in EFL classes, technical infrastructures and facilities are non-negotiable. Many of these technical infrastructures and facilities are integrated into EFL classes, for example, group scaffolding and peer assessment (Donato, 1994). However, some of them are context-dependent and potentially available and can be used in EFL classrooms if they are financially viable. These potentially valuable resources can be accessed through computer-mediated and information communication technology (ICT) techniques such as computer-adaptive testing (CAT) or computer-based testing (CBT), and Web-based assessment (Es- haghi Sadrood, 2011). Wang (2010) endorses that proposition, saying that these tools have already been utilized to assist teachers in administering assessments, and providing timely feedback and additional learning opportunities to students.

Conclusion

The current study contributed to the growing body of literature on DA by exploring teachers' familiarity with and attitudes on DA practicality. This research has the potential to empower Iranian English language teachers by expressing their concern about the assessment system of Iran. Admittedly, publication of this research can assist in hearing teachers' voices and advocating change in Iran's assessment system, as well as in how these teachers assess their students in class. As Borg and Al-Busaidi (2012, p. 283) maintained, “an understanding of teachers' beliefs needs to be an integral part of initiatives that aim to promote change in what teachers do in the classroom”. Furthermore, this study echoes the teachers' voices, and as “in the wake of new forms of curricular policy in many parts of the world, teachers are increasingly required to be agents of change” (Priestley, Edwards, Priestley & Miller, 2012, p. 191), that would hopefully “encourage change at the discipline/institutional level” (Norton, Harrington, Norton & Shannon, 2006).

This study suffers from some methodological limitations that are hoped to be addressed in future research. One of the limitations involved in the present study was the complexity of conceptualizing and comprehending the attitudes and beliefs of teachers since these are personalized and individual and cannot be physically measured. Moreover, due to the sampling procedure and sample size of the study, the generalizability of results requires caution, and the findings cannot be extrapolated to the total population of EFL teachers in Iranian universities and language institutes. Nevertheless, the findings are generalizable to the universities and institutes sampled and give an idea of what the output would be if additional participants and various sampling procedures were to be applied.

Creative Commons by the Authors is licenced under CC-BY

List of Abbreviations

DA (dynamic assessment), L2 (second language), ELT (English language teaching), ZPD (zone of proximal development)

References

Ableeva, R. (2010). *Dynamic assessment of listening comprehension in second language learning* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Ahangari, S., & Alizadeh, K. (2015). The reasoning towards using dynamic assessment in EFL (English as a foreign language) educational system in Iran. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, *5*(2), 534-540.

Ahmed, A., & Pollitt, A. (2010). The support model for interactive assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy* & *Practice, 17*(2), 133–167.

Al Amin, M., & Greenwood, J. (2018). The examination system in Bangladesh and its impact: On curriculum, students, teachers and society. *Language Testing in Asia*, *8*(1), 1-18.

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

Arani, A. M., Kakia, M. L., & Karimi, M. V. (2012). Assessment in education in Iran. *SAeDUC Journal, 9*(2), 1-10.

Arkoudis, S., & O'Loughlin, K. (2004). Tensions between validity and outcomes: Teacher assessment of written work of recently arrived immigrant ESL students. *Language Testing*, *21*(3), 284-304.

Atai, M. R., & Mazlum, F. (2013). English language teaching curriculum in Iran: Planning and practice. *The Curriculum Journal*, *24*(3), 389–411.

Babaii, E., & Asadnia, F. (2019). A long walk to language assessment literacy: EFL teachers' reflection on language assessment research and practice. *Reflective Practice*, *20*(6), 745-760.

Babaii, E., Molana, K., & Nazari, M. (2020). Contributions of assessment-related critical incidents to language teacher identity development. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2020.1824234

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching, 36*(2), 81-109.

Borg, S., & Al-Busaidi, S. (2012). Teachers' beliefs and practices regarding learner autonomy. *ELT Journal*, *66*(3), 283-292.

Bosma, T., & Resing, W. C. (2010). Teacher's appraisal of dynamic assessment outcomes: Recommendations for weak math-performers. *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology, 9*(2), 91-115.

Britzman, D. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany, State University of New York Press: Sunny Press.

Brown, G. T., Hui, S. K., Flora, W. M., & Kennedy, K. J. (2011). Teachers' conceptions of assessment in Chinese contexts: A tripartite model of accountability, improvement, and irrelevance. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *50*(5–6), 307–320. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2011.10.003

Brookhart, S. M., Moss, C. M., & Long, B. A. (2010). Teacher enquiry into formative assessment practices in remedial reading classrooms. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy* & *Practice, 17*(1), 41–58.

Broadbent, J., Panadero, E., & Boud, D. (2018). Implementing summative assessment with a formative flavour: A case study in a large class. *Assessment* & *Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(2), 307-322.

Carney, J. J., & Cioffi, G. (1992). The dynamic assessment of reading abilities. *International Journal of Disability Development and Education, 39*(2), 107-114.

Campbell, C., Murphy, J. A., & Holt, J. K. (2002, October). *Psychometric analysis of an assessment literacy instrument: Applicability to pre-service teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Columbus, OH.

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY

Chang, X. (2006). *Teachers' beliefs towards oral language assessment in Taiwan collegiate EFL classrooms.* Paper presented at the International Conference on English Instruction and Assessment, Fooyin University

Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 255-296). London: Collier Macmillan.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Dashti, S. M. (2019). *EFL teachers' beliefs and practices about classroom assessment: A multiple case study in the context of Kuwait* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). York University, Toronto, Ontario.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Apple (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language learning research* (pp. 33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Dworkin, S. L. (2012). Sample size policy for qualitative studies using in-depth interviews. *Arch Sex Behav, 41*, 1319–1320. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-0016-6

Ebadi, S., & Bashiri, S. (2020). The effectiveness of dynamic assessment on listening comprehension development: A case study. *I-Manager's Journal on School Educational Technology*, *15*(4), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.26634/jsch.15.4.16923

Elliott, J. (1993). Assisted assessment: If it is dynamic why is it so rarely employed? *Educational and Child Psychology, 10*(4), 48–58.

Elliott, J. (2003). Dynamic assessment in educational settings: Realizing potential. *Educational Review*, *55*(1), 15–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910303253

Elshawa, N. R., Abdullah, A. N., & Rashid, S. M. (2017). Malaysian instructors' assessment beliefs in tertiary ESL classrooms. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, *5*(2), 29-46.

Estaji, M. (2012). *Assessment practices: An examination of teachers' perception of classroom-based language assessment.* Paper presented at the 1st Conference on Language Learning & Teaching: An Interdisciplinary Approach (LLT-IA). Retrieved from http://confbank.um.ac.ir/modules/conf_display/conferences/llt/14.pdf

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), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2019.1578169

Estaji, M., & Ameri, A. F. (2020). Dynamic assessment and its impact on pre-intermediate and high-intermediate EFL learners' grammar achievement. *Cogent Education*, *7*(1), 1-18.

Es-hagi Sardrood, S. J. (2011). Dynamic assessment in Iranian EFL classrooms: A post-method enquiry. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 47-63.

Firoozi, T., Razavipour, K., & Ahmadi, A. (2019). The language assessment literacy needs of Iranian EFL teachers with a focus on reformed assessment policies. *Language Testing in Asia*, *9*(1), 1-14.

Fox, J. (2013). Language assessment. In C.A. Chapelle (Ed.). *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1-6). Oxford: Blackwell/Wiley.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New York: Aldine Transaction.

Gu, P. Y. (2014). The unbearable lightness of the curriculum: What drives the assessment practices of a teacher of English as a foreign language in a Chinese secondary school? *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *21*(3), 286–305.

Hashemi, M. R., & Babaii, E. (2013). Mixed methods research: Toward new research designs in applied linguistics. *The Modern Language Journal*, *97*(4), 828–852. https://doi. org/101111/j.1540-4781.2013.12049.x

Hamilton, S. (2014). Are traditional assessment methods appropriate in contemporary higher education? BPP University.

Haywood, H. C., & Lidz, S. C. (2007). *Dynamic assessment in practice: Clinical and educational applications.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hessels-Schlatter, C., & Hessels, M. G. (2009). Clarifying some issues in dynamic assessment: Comments on Karpov and Tzuriel. *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology*, *8*(3), 246-251.

Hidri, S. (2014). Developing and evaluating a dynamic assessment of listening comprehension in an EFL context. *Language Testing in Asia*, *4*(4), 1-19.

 Creative Commons by the Authors is licenced under CC-BY

Hung, N. V. (2012). A mixed approaches method used to investigate teacher cognition of English language teaching. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(11), 161- 180.

Inbar-Lourie, O. (2013). Guest editorial to the special issue on language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, *30*(3), 301–307.

Jafary, M. R., Nordin, N., & Mohajeri, R. (2012). The effect of dynamic versus static assessment on syntactic development of Iranian college preparatory EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(7), 149-157.

Jane, S. M. (2012). Primary school teachers' conceptions of classroom assessment: A qualitative study. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education (IJCDSE)*, *3*(2), 699- 706.

James, N. (2016). Using email interviews in qualitative educational research: Creating space to think and time to talk. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *29*(2), 150-163.

Karimi, M. N., & Shafiee, Z. (2014). Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of dynamic assessment: Exploring the role of education and length of service. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(8), 143-162. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n8.10

Kafshdouz, H. M. (2010). *The impact of dynamic assessment on reading comprehension achievement of Iranian adult learners* (Unpublished master's thesis). Shahid-Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

Kakia, L., & Almasi, A. (2008). *A comparative study of effectiveness's evaluation of qualitative and quantitative assessment methods on learning, anxiety and attitude of primary pupils of Tehran city.* Paper presented at the Formative Assessment National Conference. Khoramabad, Lorestan's Education Organization, Iran.

Kassahun, D. (2008). Standardization techniques for grade-inflation problems at higher educational institutions of Ethiopia: The case of Addis Ababa. *Assessment* & *Evaluation in Higher Education*, *33*(1), 33-44.

Kazemian Sana'ati, M., Khonamri, F, Azizi, M., Molana, K. (2019). Dynamic assessment in developing EFL Learners' depth of vocabulary knowledge through critical reading. *Journal Pendidikan Malaysia, 44*(2), 20-29.

Kazemian Sana'ati, M. & Khonamri, F (2016). The effect of dynamic assessment on Iranian EFL students' critical reading performance (Kesan Penilaian Dinamik terhadap Penguasaan Pembacaan Kritikal Pelajar EFL Iran). *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia (Malaysian Journal of Education)*, *41*(2), 115-123.

Khonamri, F., & Sana'ati, M. K. (2014). The impacts of dynamic assessment and call on critical reading: An interventionist approach. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 982-989.

Kirkpatrick, R., & Zang, Y. (2011). The negative influences of exam-oriented education on Chinese high school students: Backwash from classroom to child. *Language Testing in Asia*, *1*(3), 1-10.

Ketabi, S., & Ketabi, S. (2014). Classroom and formative assessment in second/foreign language teaching and learning. *Theory* & *Practice in Language Studies*, *4*(2), 435-440.

Kozulin, A., & Garb, E. (2002). Dynamic assessment of EFL text comprehension of at risk students. *School Psychology International*, *23*(1), 112-127.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). Critical language pedagogy: A post-method perspective on English language teaching. *World Englishes*, *22*(4), 539-550. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j. 1467971X.-2003.00317.x

Lam, R. (2015). Language assessment training in Hong Kong: Implications for language assessment literacy. *Language Testing, 32*(2), 169-197.

Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2004). Dynamic assessment of L2 development: Bringing the past into the future. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 49-72.

Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2010). Vygotsky's teaching- assessment dialectic and L2 education: The case for dynamic assessment. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, *17*(4), 312- 330.

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. (1991). *Practitioner's guide to dynamic assessment*. New York: Guilford.

Lu, A. (2003). *Teachers' beliefs and classroom assessments: A case study of two university instructors of English* (Unpublished master's dissertation). National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan, ROC.

Malone, M. E. (2013). The essentials of assessment literacy: Contrasts between testers and users. *Language Testing*, *30*(3), 329-344.

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY

Mansory, M. (2016). *EFL teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards English language assessment in a Saudi university's English language institute* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Exeter, Devon, Penryn, Cornwall, England.

Mauludin, L. A., Ardianti, T. M., Prasetyo, G., Sefrina, L. R., & Astuti, A. P. (2021). Enhancing students' genre writing skills in an English for specific purposes class: A dynamic assessment approach. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *45*(3), 1-12. https://www.mextesol.net/journal/index.php?page=journal&id_article=23768

Missiuna, C., & Samuels, M. T. (1989). Dynamic assessment of preschool children with special needs: Comparison of mediation and instruction. *Remedial and Special Education*, *10*(2), 53-60.

Mohammadi, S., Babaii, E., & Hashemi, M. (2020). Examining Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions regarding the importance and application of dynamic assessment. *Foreign Language Research Journal*, *9*(4), 1305-1338. https://doi:10.22059/jflr.2019.264775.544

Mullock, B. (2006). The pedagogical knowledge base of four TESOL teachers. *The Modern Language Journal*, *90*(1), 48- 66.

Munoz, A. P., Palacia, M., & Escobar, L. (2012). Teachers' beliefs about assessment in an EFL context in Colombia. *Profile*, *14*(1), 143- 158.

Nazari, B. (2012). Teach-to-test instruction of dynamic assessment: A critical overview. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, *5*(4), 56-68.

Nazari, A. (2017). Dynamic assessment in higher education English language classes: A lecturer perspective. *The Journal of Language Learning and Teaching*, *7*(1), 100-118.

Norton, L., Harrington, K., Norton, B., & Shannon, L. (2006). *Challenging traditional forms of assessment: University teachers' views on examinations*. Paper presented at the 3rd ISSOTL Conference, Washington.

Oh, H. S. (2006). *An analysis on the performative evaluations of primary school English* (Unpublished master's thesis). Daegu National University of Education, Daegu, Korea.

Önalan, O., & Karagül, A. E. (2018). A study on Turkish EFL teachers' beliefs about assessment and its different uses in teaching English. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *14*(3), 190-201.

Poehner, M. E. (2007). Beyond the test: L2 dynamic assessment and the transcendence of mediated learning. *Modern Language Journal*, *91*(3), 323-340.

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

Porahmadi, M. (2008). *Assessment instruments characteristics and information gathering at formative assessment*. Paper presented at the Formative Assessment National Conference, Lorestan's Education Organization, Iran.

Priestley, M., Edwards, R., Priestley, A., & Miller, K. (2012). Teacher agency in curriculum making: Agents of change and spaces for manoeuvre. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *42*(2), 191-214.

Prabhu, N. S. (1990). There is no best method—Why? *TESOL Quarterly*, *24*(2), 161-176.

Quilter, S. M. (1999). Assessment literacy for teachers: Making a case for the study of test validity. *The Teacher Educator, 34*(4). 235-243.

Rahmati, T., Sadeghi, K., & Ghaderi, F. (2019). English language teachers' vision and motivation: Possible selves and activity theory perspectives. *RELC Journal*, *50*(3), 457-474.

Razavipour, K., & Rezagah, K. (2018). Language assessment in the new English curriculum in Iran: Managerial, institutional, and professional barriers. *Language Testing in Asia*, *8*(1), 1–18.

Rea-Dickins, P. (2008). Classroom-based language assessment. In E. Shohamy & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*: *Language testing and assessment* (pp. 255-270). New York: Springer and Business Media LLC.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 102–119). New York: Macmillan.

Rogers, W. T., Cheng, L., & Hu, H. (2007). ESL/EFL instructors' beliefs about assessment and evaluation. *Canadian and International Education*, *36*(1), 39- 61.

Sadeghi, K., & Jabbarnejad, L. (2012). An evaluation of EFL program objectives at tertiary level in Iran. *Asean Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (AJTLHE)*, *4*(2), 1-16.

Safdari, M., & Fathi, J. (2020). Investigating the role of dynamic assessment on speaking accuracy and fluency of pre-intermediate EFL learners. *Cogent Education*, *7*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1818924

 Creative Commons by the Authors is licenced under CC-BY

Scarino, A. (2013). Language assessment literacy as self-awareness: Understanding the role of interpretation in assessment and in teacher learning. *Language Testing*, *30*(3), 309-327.
Schafer, W. D. (1993). Assessment literacy for teachers. *Theory into Practice, 32*(2), 118-126.
Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of classroom assessment in teaching and learning. Retrieved from https://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/role-classroom-assessment-teaching-and-learning
Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and reliability of the research instrument; How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research. How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management (IJARM)*, *5*(3), 28-36.
Teo, A. K. (2012). Effects of dynamic assessment on college EFL learners' reading skills. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *9*(1), 57–94.
Tierney, R. D. (2006). Changing practices: Influences on classroom assessment. *Assessment in Education*, *13*(3), 239-264.
Troudi, S., Coombe, C., & Al-Hamliy, M. (2009). EFL teachers' views of English language
assessment in higher education in the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(3), 546-555.
Tsagari, D., & Vogt, K. (2017). Assessment literacy of foreign language teachers around Europe: Research, challenges and future prospects. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, *6*(1), 41-63.
Wang, T. H. (2010). Web-based dynamic assessment: Taking assessment as teaching and learning strategy for improving students' e-learning effectiveness. *Computers* & *Education, 54*(4), 1157–1166.
Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Xu, Y., & Liu, Y. (2009). Teacher assessment knowledge and practice: A narrative inquiry of a Chinese college EFL teacher's experience. *TESOL Quarterly*, *43*(3), 492-513.
Yin, M. (2010). Understanding classroom language assessment through teacher thinking research. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *7*(2), 175-194.
Zhang, Z., & Burry- Stock, J. A. (2003). Classroom assessment practices and teachers' self-perceived assessment skills. *Applied Measurement in Education*, *16*(4), 323- 342.
Zolfaghari, F., & Ahmadi, A. (2016). Assessment literacy components across subject matters. Cogent *Education*, *3*(1), 1–16.

Appendix A: Questionnaire of Teacher's Perceptions of Dynamic Assessment

Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire tries to find out your beliefs and practices about dynamic assessment (DA). Your answers to the questions are very valuable and important. Please answer each question based on your own personal situations. Your answers will remain anonymous, and any personal data will be kept confidential. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Part A. Background Information (Please mark your answer in the appropriate box.)
1. Gender: 1. Male 2. Female
2. Age: 1.21- 30 2. 31- 40 3.41- 50
3. Educational background (Please indicate the highest education level completed):
1. Master degree 2. Doctorate 3. PhD student
4. Major: 1. TEFL 2. English Literature 3. English Translation 4. Linguistic
5. English teaching experience:
1. 2-5 years 2. 6-10 years 3. More than 11 years
6. The level you are teaching:
1. Pre-advance 2. Advanced 3. All the above levels
7. Context of teaching:
1. University 2. Language institutes

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY

Part B. Familiarity of Iranian EFL Teachers with Dynamic Assessment

	Highly Familiar	*Familiar*	*Unfamiliar*
8. How familiar are you with the theoretical aspects of DA?			
9. How familiar are you with the procedural aspects of DA?			

Part C. Iranian EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Dynamic Assessment Practicality in EFL Classrooms

No	*The degree of DA practicality in Your classrooms*	*Very Difficult*	*Difficult*	*No idea*	*Easy*	*Very easy*
10	The application of pretest-teach-posttest model					
11	Identifying every student's ability level of English before teaching					
12	Identifying every student's needs, goals, and learning problems before teaching					
13	Preparing graduated (easy-to difficult) activities and tasks before teaching					
14	Providing implicit-to-explicit standardized feedback					
15	Recording the amount and kind of feedback (assistance) needed for every individual student					
16	Getting continuous feedback about students' progress					
17	Adapting teaching to the students' responsiveness					
18	Managing the time to interact and work with every individual student					
19	Managing the time to integrate teaching with assessment					
20	Managing the available resources such as pair-work, group work, presentation, and portfolio to have students help each other					
21	Utilizing the computer-assisted instruction and other technological tools in scaffolding students.					
22	Determining students' learning potential					
23	Administering several tests to measure students' ability to extend their knowledge and skills to new situations					
24	Passing or failing students on the basis of the DA results					
25	Replacing the current practice of static tests with DA					

Creative Commons by the Authors is licenced under CC-BY

Appendix B: Interview Questions

Dear Respondent,

We conducted a study to investigate the familiarity with Dynamic Assessment (DA) by Iranian EFL teachers (MA, and PhD students and graduates) working in two settings (e.g., language institutes and universities). We were also interested in finding out their attitudes toward practicality of DA in the two settings. The results of the t-tests revealed no statistically significant difference between the two groups of teachers in terms of their familiarity with DA. Moreover, there was no significant difference between the teachers' attitudes toward the practicality of DA in their contexts. We would like to know your expert opinion about these findings, that is,

1) Why do you think Iranian EFL teachers working in the two settings are similarly familiar with DA?

2) And why do you think that they largely tend to view the application of DA impractical in their settings?

Thank you so much for your cooperation.

Тип лицензирования авторов – лицензия творческого сообщества CC-BY