

Actualizing Language Learners' Potentials through Mediation: Cumulative vs Concurrent Group Dynamic Assessment and Students' Self-management of Learning Tasks

Seyyed Hossein Sanaeifar

English Department, Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr Branch, Qaemshahr, Iran

Maryam Seifi Divcolaii

English Department, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

Abstract—This study aims to investigate the effect of implementing cumulative GDA and concurrent GDA on students' self-management of learning tasks among Iranian intermediate EFL learners. For conducting this study 40 homogenized intermediate EFL learners were selected from private English language institutes in Sari. For collecting data in this study, participants were randomly divided into two groups named concurrent GDA group and cumulative GDA group. For measuring learners' self-management on learning tasks before the instructional phase, the researchers used the learners' self-management on learning tasks questionnaire (SLTQ). At the instructional phase, both groups were exposed to GDA procedures on doing their learning tasks. The cumulative GDA group members were exposed to cumulative GDA teaching. On the other hands, in concurrent GDA group the learners were exposed to concurrent GDA teaching style. After the instructional phase, the SLTQ was administered by the researchers in order to evaluate learners' self-management on learning tasks. The data analysis revealed that both cumulative and concurrent GDA had has statistically significant effect on promoting students' self-management on learning tasks. But the cumulative GDA group outperformed the concurrent GDA group.

Index Terms—mediation, cumulative GDA, concurrent GDA, self-management, and learning tasks

I. INTRODUCTION

For years, the dominant perspective on language testing and assessment is the static one in which the testing and assessment are implemented separate from language instruction. In static view on testing and assessment, individuals' performances are tested or assessed without provision any help from teacher or their peers. The absence of mediation is obvious in this view on language testing and assessment. But nowadays, the awareness about the importance of mediation in the process of language assessment and teaching flourished. In recent years, the concept of Dynamic Assessment (DA) appeared in TEFL field concerning to integrate testing and instruction through provision of mediation. According to Lantolf and Poehner (2004) non-dynamic assessments assess fully ripen abilities and performances of students whereas DA concentrated on immature and ongoing abilities and performances of students which are potentially ripen and shaped by provision of mediation in future.

In dynamic assessment, the necessity of one to one interaction between mediator and learners make it inefficient for crowded language classrooms especially in schools where the number of students are at least 20 members. So this shortcoming of dynamic assessment leads to introduce the notion of Group Dynamic Assessment (GDA) recently. In GDA, the procedure and process of DA is totally applied but in GDA in addition to individual ZPD, the group ZPD is concerned too. In other words, GDA focused on developing all the students' current level of performance to their potential level of performance through mediation provided by teacher. Regarding the role of teacher in classroom, the scenario is changed. Now language teachers are considered as facilitator of learning rather than transmitter of knowledge. Also at the side of language learners, they are no longer considered as passive receivers of knowledge but they are regarded as active participants of learning process. So the language teachers try to involve students in learning process and give the responsibility of learning to students as much as possible.

In traditional language classrooms, teachers are regarded as a single person who are authorized to regulate and manage everything about teaching and learning process. In such a context, there is no allowance for students to show their feelings, opinions, and unique manners of learning. They supposed to follow the steps and restrict guidelines that provided by their teachers. Thus their creativity is blocked and their right to be seen as an independent individual is ignored respectively. But in recent years by spreading the learner-centered and learner-oriented approaches in language teaching, the table has turned. Students are considered as active agencies in their language learning process and their

feelings, needs and preferences, learning styles, and uniqueness are respected more than before. So it is the time to allow them to play the game in their own manners and carry their learning responsibility on their shoulders.

For developing students' academic achievements, they need to be able to adjust and manage their learning process based on their capabilities. Simply knowing more than others cannot guarantee student success in language learning. They must be capable to assess and use their acquired knowledge, adjust, monitor, and change their learning behaviors when they dealing with learning challenges. Students who are capable to self-manage their learning tasks, show more desire to spend their learning time effectively and choose more difficult tasks with longer persistence on doing them. On the other hands, students who are unable to self-manage their learning tasks, tend to use more failure-avoiding strategies on their tasks and spend considerable time on doing their learning tasks respectively. Also their persistence on difficult tasks is considerably lower than students with high self-management ability.

Regarding Iranian EFL context, the dominant approach towards testing and assessment is the static one especially in public school. The final outcome and performance of students are emphasized without provision of any mediation by teachers. Also in terms of group-based learning and teaching, there are still miles to go. One of the most important obstacle on the way of group-based learning is the absence of cooperative learning culture among Iranian EFL students. Even in some cases language teachers are not ready technically or emotionally to implement cooperative and group-based teaching in their classroom. In addition, there are not serious and effective actions and endeavors for making language student as an autonomous learner whether in language institutes or public schools. The ability of self-management on learning tasks is considered as building blocks of the autonomous learning. Unfortunately there is no opportunity for students to develop their self-management ability in Iranian EFL context yet. Because such an issue is not on the center of attention by language program developer or even language teachers.

Considering above mentioned problems, this study aims to investigate the effect of implementing cumulative GDA and concurrent GDA on students' self-management of learning tasks among Iranian intermediate EFL learners. Based on the purpose of this study the following research questions are formulated:

RQ1: Does cumulative GDA have statistically significant effect on students' self-management of learning tasks?

RQ2: Does concurrent GDA have statistically significant effect on students' self-management of learning tasks?

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

DA is rooted in Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory which emphasizes the role of society and culture in language learning and acquisition. Based on this view, students' cognitive development depends on their interactions with their social and cultural environments and contexts. Through interacting with social and cultural context, students construct their own meaning and knowledge about language. Vygotsky (1978) believed that in DA the gradual and dialogic mediation based on learners' current level of development in accordance with their ZPD level, help the learners to move the space between their independent ability and performance and their potential ability and performance under the guidance and support of more capable others mediation. Lidz (1987) defined DA as an interaction between an intervener (teacher) and a learners who are actively participate in mutual exchange of information in order to diagnose the degree of modification and mediation needed for inducement and maintenance of intended cognitive, behavioral, and functional changes in learners' mind and performance.

In implementing DA, the role of teacher should be changed from an inactive examiner towards an active mediator who is interact with learners dialogically during assessment or testing process (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004). The dialogic and interactional nature of DA, enables teachers and students to work on their developed and still developing abilities. Through DA procedure, not only students' mature, developed, and achieved abilities are assessed but also on-going, immature, and ripening abilities are considered (Poehner & van Compernelle, 2011). Proponents of static assessment refuse provision of any intervention by the teachers during test administration because they believed that teachers' mediational supports and actions have potential threat to the reliability of tests and assessment (Poehner & Lantolf, 2005).

Because DA concentrated on mutual and individualistic interactions between teacher and students in solving their learning problems or doing their learning tasks, it arises the issue of practicality of DA in large language classes. So some practitioners and scholars believe that DA is more appropriate for small scale classrooms rather than for large scale classrooms. For instance Anton (2009) asserted that despite DA potentiality for providing rich and insightful information about individual learners under assessment, but the individualistic nature of required interaction of DA makes it time-consuming and inappropriate for actual classroom setting with numbers of students. Also Guk and Kellog (2007) believed that many language teachers especially in public school refuse the concept of DA because they supposed to teach whole class and in their views DA is time demanded and specified for individual level rather than group level.

In response to such a logistical and theoretical considerations, Poehner (2009) introduced the concept of GDA which is considered language teacher as a team driver, facilitator, and mediator in order to capture the whole students' ZPD. GDA is designed for involving students in learning tasks that required to perform in group-based dialogic interaction in order to reach the whole groups' intended learning goals. In both DA and GDA, the provision of mediation is based on learners' ZPD to help them to construct their knowledge around their actual potentiality. The distinctive point is here that in GDA, all participants' ZPDs are concerned by the assessment procedure and process (Poehner, 2009).

Two major and distinctive concepts in the procedure of GDA are the primary and secondary interactants. According to Poehner (2009) teacher and learner are considered as primary interactants when the teacher provides mediation for certain and individual learner directly in order to overcome the learning problem and difficulty. On the other hand, when this exchange and negotiation of information takes place in the classroom the rest of the class members are benefited from the potentiality of mediation and interactions between primary interactants. So the rest of classroom are considered as secondary interactants in this case. On other words, when teacher mediates given learner in response to his/her problematic learning area in order to develop his/her ZPD to next possible level they play the role of primary interactants. Since this negotiation of meaning occurs in classroom as a social environment, other learners are exposed to the dialogic exchange of information and they are considered as secondary interactants respectively.

In the process of GDA, learners are engaged in tasks that they individually cannot completely accomplished it but are achievable whenever they work in collaborative and cooperative manner and negotiate in dialogic interactions using whole class capabilities i.e. group-specific mediation. Poehner (2009) points out in GDA process teachers are required to mediate the whole class as a group in order to promote the whole class ZPD. This emphasize on group-oriented mediation does not mean that individual learners in classroom are not supposed to receive necessary mediation and interactions. In fact, the orientation and direction of every mediation are adjusted based on the group of learners' ZPDs.

Concurrent and cumulative GDA are differentiated by Poehner (2009) who believed that in concurrent GDA, first the teacher provides the mediation for particular learner (primary interactants) in classroom, if the intended learner fails to response correctly and completely to given mediation, the other learner takes the primary interactants role. This circular actions continues until one learner gives the correct response. So in concurrent GDA, all of the participants have chance to play as primary interactants with their teacher or mediator. In cumulative GDA, the teacher provides a series of one-on-one DA mediation on whole class until the group mastery happened on the target learning goal. So in cumulative GDA, all of the participants considered as the primary interactants regardless of their response to mediation.

Studies show that self-management is the important strategy for learners which enables them to understand and adjust their learning patterns, attitudes and feelings in order to achieve their learning objectives successfully (Wenden, 1995; Rubin, 2001). Self-management is the ability and capacity to work effectively toward meaningful goals, and to be flexible in dealing with unpredictable situation in learning process. Students with higher self-management ability show higher perceived self-value, resilience on difficulties, academic performance, and capacity to adapt to change on their learning tasks (Agolla & Ongori, 2009). Self-management ability enables learners to take their learning responsibilities and manage and regulate their own learning process. Self-management concept is two folded including self-adjustment where context management occurs at social, resources, and actions level and self-monitoring where learners monitor, evaluate and regulate their own learning process and strategies (Garrison, 1997).

Self-management capability at the side of students enable them to practice self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and self-reinforcement strategies in their learning tasks and considered as an effective step towards independent and autonomous learning. When students equipped with self-management the feeling of control over their own behavior and performance is constructed in their minds. Successful learners can manage their metacognitive knowledge in learning, and they are aware about their learning circumstances and skills necessary to achieve their learning goals. According to White (1995) self-management takes place when learners demonstrate their competence for the best way of setting up their intended learning conditions and goals at the process of interacting with the target Language.

Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1988) characterized individual with effective self-management skill as a person equipped with abilities such as: goal setting ability, problem solving ability, positive thinking ability, resource management ability, self-reflection ability, and resistance on achieving goal ability. Also Rubin (2001) believed learners who possess self-management skill, are able to regulate and access their prior and current knowledge, learning process based on the nature of tasks in order to adjust their learning conditions dynamically based on different situations. Self-management skill enables students to complete their assigned tasks autonomously and act as an active participant in classroom who are able to monitor and reinforce their own learning behavior towards gaining the learning goals. The critical elements of self-management skill are including ability to set learning goals, self-monitoring, self-evaluation of learning progress, time-management, self-adaptation, and self-reinforcement.

Shabani (2018) investigated the effect of GDA on L2 learners' writing ability. The results showed that receiving GDA, prompts, hints, and scaffolding promoted L2 learners' writing ability. Also the study revealed that GDA was successful in diagnosing learners' writing problems and moving the learners' ZPDs individually and at the whole class level.

Tabatabaee, Alidoust and Sarkeshikian (2018) conducted a study to compare the effects of interventionist DA, cumulative GDA, and static assessments on the grammatical accuracy of the EFL learners' narrative writing. The results of the study showed that cumulative GDA outperformed the other two groups on developing the EFL learners' accuracy in writing narrative paragraphs.

Miri, Alibakhshi, Kushki and Salehpour Bavarsad (2017) tested the efficiency of concurrent and cumulative GDA in teaching and learning English articles. This study showed that both types of GDA whether concurrent and cumulative had positive effect on developing learners' knowledge and awareness about English articles. But, it revealed that the concurrent GDA group outperformed the cumulative GDA group in promoting the learning of English articles.

Hashemi Shahraki, Ketabi, and Barati (2015) studied the effects of GDA on learners' pragmatic knowledge of conversational implicatures through listening activity. The findings of this study showed that GDA had positive and significant effect on improvement of learners' listening skill especially their pragmatic competence of conversational implicatures.

In a qualitative study Mehri and Amerian (2015) investigated the effect of GDA on the development of the control over the past tense. The results of the study showed that the three learners had significant development in their control over the past tense in their writing skill. Also it revealed that the learners no longer stayed passive in their classroom as a receiver of the teacher's mediation but they interacted actively in classroom through provision of mediation to their peers.

Alavi, Kaivanpanah, and Shabani (2012) investigated the potentiality of GDA in identifying the mediational supports by a mediator in terms of collective scaffolding when work on 12 learners' listening skill. The results indicated provision of scaffold mediation based on GDA procedures could help the learners to establish their understanding and knowledge about target skill. Also the results of the study revealed that the mediation had constructive effect on all the learners' contributions whether as primary or secondary interactants.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

A convenience sampling procedure was conducted for the subject selection. For conducting this study 40 homogenized intermediate EFL learners were selected from private English language institutes in Sari. They were male and female learners aged from 15 to 20 years old. They spend at least three years in their language institutes learning English language. All the participants were assured the confidentiality of data. In addition they were consent to participate in this study.

B. Instrumentation

1. Oxford Placement Test (OPT): This test was applied to homogenize language learners in the present study (Syndicate, 2001). It comprised 60 items in two parts. These parts designed for vocabulary and grammar (40 items) and reading comprehension (20 items).

2. Learners' Self-management on Learning Tasks Questionnaire (SLTQ): The SLTQ was designed by the researchers in order to measure learners' self-management on learning tasks. The questionnaire comprised of 30 items in a Likert scale format. The SLTQ had four parts included orientation (9 items), time planning (7 items), accomplishment (7 items), and strategic management (7 items). The researchers piloted this questionnaire on 150 participants and calculated its reliability by using Cronbach alpha formula in which it was about 0.88 respectively. Also for validating this questionnaire the factor analysis was done using SPSS software. Some modification and amendment were done as a result of factor analysis and these 30 items considered as valid items for measuring learners' self-management on learning tasks.

3. Procedure

For collecting data in this study, first the researchers administered OPT on available learners and 40 out of 68 EFL learners were selected as homogenized and intermediate language learners. Then they were randomly divided into two groups named concurrent GDA group and cumulative GDA group. For measuring learners' self-management on learning tasks before the instructional phase, the researchers used the SLTQ. At the instructional phase, both groups were exposed to GDA procedures on doing their learning tasks. The GDA procedures were done by the researchers on each group separately. The researcher used techniques such as graduated prompt, direct prompt, leading questions, clarification, and hints as mediation with emphasize on groups' ZPD developments. But the cumulative GDA group members were exposed to cumulative GDA teaching style in which all of the participants have equal chance to play as primary interactants with their mediator. In other words they were considered as primary interactants by their mediator. On the other hands, in concurrent GDA group the learners were exposed to concurrent GDA teaching style in which the participants have chance to play as both primary and secondary interactants with their mediator based on their responses to mediator contributions in classroom. The instructional phase last 8 sessions, each one and half hours two days a week. After the instructional phase, the SLTQ was administered by the researchers in order to evaluate learners' self-management on learning tasks. The obtained data were recorded and analyze through SPSS software.

IV. RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

A. Analysis of First Research Question

The first research question of this study was as follow:

RQ1: Does cumulative GDA have statistically significant effect on students' self-management of learning tasks?

In order to answer first research question, the descriptive statistics for cumulative GDA group is presented in table 1.

TABLE I.
THE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR CUMULATIVE GDA GROUP

	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Cumulative GDA Pre	20	59	89	75.85	7.322
Cumulative GDA Post	20	70	102	85.45	7.681
Valid N (listwise)	20				

The table 1 shows that the cumulative GDA group pre and post-tests' means are **75.85** and **85.45** respectively. Since choosing the appropriate test for inferential statistics is depend on pre and post-tests' scores normality, the normality calculation is presented in table 2.

TABLE II
THE NORMALITY STATISTICS FOR CUMULATIVE GDA GROUP

	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Cumulative GDA Pre	0.974	20	0.837
Cumulative GDA Post	0.963	20	0.604

According to the table 2, the sig values for cumulative GDA group pre and post-tests' scores are **0.837** and **0.604** respectively. Since both of the sig values are more than 0.05 ($0.837 > 0.05$ and $0.604 > 0.05$) it means that two sets of scores are normally distributed. So the researchers are allowed to use parametric test for comparing two means i.e. the paired sample t-test. The inferential statistics for cumulative GDA group is presented in table 3.

TABLE III
THE INFERENTIAL STATISTICS FOR CUMULATIVE GDA GROUP

Pair 1	Cumulative GDA Pre Cumulative GDA Post	Paired Differences		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Lower	Upper			
		-11.129	-8.071	-13.141	19	0.000

Based on the table 3, the sig value is **0.000**. Since the obtained sig value is less than 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$) it can be concluded that this sig value is statistically significant and the observed difference between two means is meaningful. So for the first research question, it can be said that cumulative GDA had statistically significant effect on promoting students' self-management on learning tasks.

B. Analysis of Second Research Question

The second research question of this study was as follow:

RQ2: Does concurrent GDA have statistically significant effect on students' self-management of learning tasks?

In order to answer second research question, the descriptive statistics for concurrent GDA group is presented in table 4.

TABLE IV.
THE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR CONCURRENT GDA GROUP

	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Concurrent GDA Pre	20	55	92	73.75	9.313
Concurrent GDA Post	20	62	96	80.15	9.016
Valid N (listwise)	20				

The table 4 shows that the concurrent GDA group pre and post-tests' means are **73.75** and **80.15** respectively. Since choosing the appropriate test for inferential statistics is depend on pre and post-tests' scores normality, the normality calculation is presented in table 5.

TABLE V.
THE NORMALITY STATISTICS FOR CONCURRENT GDA GROUP

	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Concurrent GDA Pre	0.990	20	0.998
Concurrent GDA Post	0.962	20	0.589

According to the table 5, the sig values for concurrent GDA group pre and post-tests' scores are **0.998** and **0.589** respectively. Since both of the sig values are more than 0.05 ($0.998 > 0.05$ and $0.589 > 0.05$) it means that two sets of scores are normally distributed. So the researchers are allowed to use parametric test for comparing two means i.e. the paired sample t-test. The inferential statistics for concurrent GDA group is presented in table 6.

TABLE VI
THE INFERENTIAL STATISTICS FOR CONCURRENT GDA GROUP

Pair 1	Concurrent GDA Pre Concurrent GDA Post	Paired Differences		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Lower	Upper			
		-8.212	-4.588	-7.393	19	0.000

Based on the table 6, the sig value is **0.000**. Since the obtained sig value is less than 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$) it can be concluded that this sig value is statistically significant and the observed difference between two means is meaningful. So for the second research question, it can be said that concurrent GDA had statistically significant effect on promoting students' self-management on learning tasks. Also the means differences in the table 1 (cumulative GDA group) and the table 4 (concurrent GDA group) show that the cumulative GDA group outperformed the concurrent GDA group.

V. DISCUSSION

The data analysis revealed that both cumulative and concurrent GDA had has statistically significant effect on promoting students' self-management of learning tasks. But the cumulative GDA group outperformed the concurrent GDA group. As Lantolf and Throne (2006) believed by DA procedure and using mediation, teachers become able to discover the learners' learning obstacles and difficulties in order to assist them to overcome the problems. DA integrates two separate parts of educational process i.e. instruction and assessment. This integration of instruction and assessment enables students to control their own learning better by giving them active role in the process of assessment. When students considered as an active agency in assessment, their level of self-confidence and motivation in doing assigned tasks increased.

As Poehner (2009) believed, in GDA, the provision of mediation is based on learners' ZPD to help them to construct their knowledge around their actual potentiality. The distinctive point is here that in GDA, all participants' ZPDs are concerned by the assessment procedure and process. In GDA process whether in cumulative GDA or concurrent GDA, teachers seek to engage whole students in the assessment and instruction process. This engagement give them opportunity to express their opinions and ideas about their learning tasks. In terms of classroom atmosphere, GDA can provide student-friendly environment for students where their voices are heard by their mediator and their classmates. It encourages them to spread their learning responsibly boundaries and move towards autonomous learning practice.

Moreover, the role of the teacher cannot be ignored in this process. Teachers are required constantly refine their mediation and contributions based learners' learning actual and potential problems in order to extend students' ZPDs level. Also in GDA, teachers are considered as feedback provider and agent of attunement on students' learning tasks. Through provision of feedbacks on students' works, the students become capable to control and regulate their learning process better. Based on Rubin (2001) point of view, learners who possess self-management skill, are able to regulate and access their prior and current knowledge, learning process based on the nature of tasks in order to adjust their learning conditions dynamically based on different situations. So the GDA process and procedures can be considered as constructive and facilitative factor in students' ability to manage and adjust their learning tasks.

VI. CONCLUSION

Language assessment play an important and critical role in students' current and future language learning journey because the process of decision making is the indispensable part of assessment and it can affect students' language or even academic life. On the other hand, this is logical to think that assessment should be in service of instruction and learning (assessment for learning) not instruction works for assessment (assessment of learning). The integration of instruction and assessment for the purpose of better learning can be regarded as an effective idea. DA can provide such a ground for integration. According to Poehner (2008), every DA session performs both an instructional and an evaluative function in integrative manner in which it's difficult to distinct instruction from assessment.

Poehner (2009) argues that a major challenge to implementing DA in the classroom is that these contexts do not permit the mutual interactions between teacher and individual students which are considered as core feature of DA process. So regarding this challenge on the way of using DA in classroom level, the concept of GDA introduced by emphasizing on whole group ZPDs development. The group-oriented mediation of GDA in classroom can be beneficent for students' learning development in many ways. As the findings of this study revealed, cumulative and concurrent GDA had has statistically significant effect on promoting students' self-management on learning tasks. On the other hand, the self-management ability is regarded as initial step towards autonomous learning. So it is important to help students to be able to manage their learning process and tasks. It can help students to be self-confident and believe that they have the abilities to succeed independently in their language learning.

This study findings can be helpful for English language teachers especially EFL teachers in their teaching practice. Also these findings can be considered valuable guide for English language program designers and curriculum developers in Iran for providing better and more effective English language programs especially in assessment and testing orientation. In addition, these finding can help teacher educators to increase their teacher-students awareness

about the true nature of assessment and testing. The last but not least, these findings can help the EFL learners whether in private language institutes or public schools to plan and schedule their learning behaviors and performances towards better learning situations and opportunities.

APPENDIX. LEARNERS' SELF-MANAGEMENT OF LEARNING TASKS QUESTIONNAIRE

1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree

N	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
Orientation						
1	I can establish my learning goals and objectives successfully.					
2	I set and follow short-term, mid-term, and long-term goals for my language learning.					
3	Being an autonomous language learner, is my ultimate goals in language learning.					
4	I make a to-do list for my learning tasks.					
5	I believe that learners' abilities, qualities, and efforts affect their effectiveness and success in doing their learning tasks.					
6	I confident enough to manage and complete my learning tasks alone.					
7	I take a positive view of my situation even when I am in trouble.					
8	I aware that receiving guidance from teacher can help me to complete my learning tasks.					
9	I understand my strengths and weaknesses in doing assigned tasks.					
Time Planning						
10	Finishing tasks on-time is my priority in language learning.					
11	I prepare schedules to help myself finish tasks successfully.					
12	I do not like disorderly learning environment.					
13	I prefer to plan everything related to assigned tasks before actual attempt for completing them.					
14	I am able to follow the plan line that I set for doing my assigned tasks.					
15	I try to be attentive and active in classroom practice as much as possible.					
16	I often think about how to better manage my time and efforts in doing assigned tasks.					
Accomplishment						
17	I can adapt my language skills based on assigned task's requirements.					
18	I can generalize of the learning undertaken throughout the intervention process on previous learning tasks to other situations.					
19	I am good at handling problems that come up in doing my learning tasks.					
20	I can regulate and handle strategies for executing and completing assigned tasks.					
21	I am able to predict and anticipate the potential problems and difficulties in doing my learning tasks.					
22	Before doing my assigned learning tasks, I analyze and synthesize the required process for doing tasks effectively.					
23	I can use specific cognitive techniques for various learning tasks autonomously.					
Strategic Management						
24	I try to develop necessary skills, ability, and understandings for successful completion of assigned task.					
25	In doing my learning tasks, I can bridge between my previous knowledge and newly acquired knowledge in practical manner.					
26	I try to put innovation in techniques and strategies for completing my learning tasks.					
27	I always try to accommodate solutions for learning tasks based on different learning contexts, needs, and objectives.					
28	I pay particular focal attention on guidelines provided by teacher for doing my assigned tasks.					
29	I often try to think critically about various aspects of my assigned learning tasks.					
30	I try to use my own specialized techniques and strategies to improve my performance in doing different learning tasks and accumulate my expertise.					

REFERENCES

- [1] Agolla, J. E., & Ongori, H. (2009). An assessment of academic stress among undergraduate students: The case of University of Botswana. Botswana: University of Botswana.
- [2] Alavi, S. M., Kaivanpanah, Sh., & Shabani, K. (2012). Group dynamic assessment: An inventory of mediational strategies for teaching listening. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 3(4), 27-58.
- [3] Anton, M. (2009). Dynamic assessment of advanced language learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(3), 576-598.
- [4] Garrison, D. R. (1997). Self-directed learning: Toward a comprehensive model. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 48(1), 16-18.
- [5] Guk, I., & Kellogg, D. (2007). The ZPD and whole class teaching: Teacher-led and student-led interactional mediation of tasks. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(3), 281-299.
- [6] Hashemi Shahraki, S., Ketabi, S., & Barati, H. (2015). Group dynamic assessment of EFL listening comprehension: Conversational implicatures in focus. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 4(3), 73-89.
- [7] 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.
- [8] Lidz, C. (1987). Dynamic assessment. New York: Guilford Press.
- [9] Mehri, E., & Amerian, M. (2015). Group dynamic assessment (g-da): the case for the development of control over the past tense. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 4(5), 11-20.

- [10] Miri, M., Alibakhshi, G., Kushki, A., & Salehpour Bavarsad, P. (2017). Going beyond one-to-one mediation in zone of proximal development (ZPD): concurrent and cumulative group dynamic assessment. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 1-24.
- [11] Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting L2 development*. New York: Springer.
- [12] Poehner, M. E. (2009). Group dynamic assessment: Mediation for the L2 classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(3), 471-491.
- [13] Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2005). Dynamic assessment in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(1), 1-33.
- [14] Poehner, M. E., & van Compernelle, R. A. (2011). Frames of interaction in dynamic assessment: Developmental diagnoses of second language learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 18(2), 183-198.
- [15] Rubin, J. (2001). Language-learner self-awareness. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communications*, 11(1), 25-37.
- [16] Shabani, K. (2018). Group dynamic assessment of L2 learners' writing abilities. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), 129-149.
- [17] Tabatabaee, M., Alidoust, M., & Sarkeshikian, A. (2018). The effect of interventionist and cumulative group dynamic assessments on EFL learners' writing accuracy. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 2(1), 1-13.
- [18] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- [19] Wenden, A. L. (1995). Learner training in context: A knowledge-based approach. *System*, 23(2), 183-194.
- [20] White, C. J. (1995) Autonomy and strategy use in distance foreign language learning. *System*, 23(2), 207-221.
- [21] Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1988). Construct validation of a strategy model of student self-regulated learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(3), 284-290.

Seyyed Hossein Sanaeifar has MA of TEFL. He is Ph.D. candidate of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr, Iran. He has been teaching English language for about 7 years. He published some articles and presented some articles in national conferences in Iran. His areas of interest are reading comprehension, vocabulary and idiom learning, and language assessment and testing.

Maryam Seifi has MA of TEFL. She is Ph.D. candidate of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Iran. Her interest area is mostly on translation and published some articles and presented some articles in national conferences in Iran. Her areas of interest are Language assessment, discourse analysis, pragmatics.