ISELT 1
Interdisciplinary Studies in English Language Teaching

Pages 1 to 26

Concurrent Versus Cumulative Group Dynamic Assessment: Effects on Iranian EFL Learners' Interlanguage Pragmatic Competence from a Microgenetic Perspective

Zeinab Azadbakht [1], Hooshang Yazdani [1]*, Elham Farahani [1]
[1] Arak University, Arak, Iran

10.22080/iselt.2026.30419.1146

Received
November 1, 2025
Accepted
February 6, 2026
Available online
February 19, 2026

Keywords:
Competence, Concurrent G-DA, Cumulative G-DA, Dynamic Assessment, Group, Interlanguage, Pragmatic, Speech Acts, Sociocultural Theory.

Abstract

Although dynamic assessment (DA) has shown promise in fostering interlanguage pragmatic (ILP) competence, empirical comparisons of concurrent and cumulative group dynamic assessment (G-DA) remain limited, particularly regarding speech act production across proficiency levels using microgenetic analysis. This explanatory sequential mixed-methods study addresses these gaps by investigating the efficacy of concurrent and cumulative G-DA in enhancing the ILP competence of Iranian English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners at pre-intermediate, intermediate, and upper-intermediate levels, focusing on requests, refusals, and compliment responses. To this end, 90 Iranian EFL learners were randomly assigned to nine groups (10 learners each): three concurrent G-DA groups (n = 30), three cumulative G-DA groups (n = 30), and three control (non-GDA) groups (n = 30), with each condition including learners from all three proficiency levels. MANOVA, one-way ANOVA, and Scheffé post-hoc tests revealed significant improvements in both G-DA groups compared to the non-GDA groups ($p < 0.05$). Concurrent G-DA yielded superior outcomes, particularly among pre-intermediate learners (η^2 = 0.48-0.58), followed by intermediate learners; gains were smaller at upper-intermediate levels, suggesting a ceiling effect. Microgenetic analyses of audio-recorded collaborative dialogues further illustrated how dialogic mediation in concurrent G-DA promoted greater pragmatic awareness and self-regulation, whereas cumulative G-DA provided more structured support suited to lower-proficiency learners. The findings highlight the importance of tailoring mediation to proficiency levels to optimize pragmatic development and offer practical implications for EFL instruction.

1. INTRODUCTION

Pragmatic competence, the ability to produce and interpret contextually appropriate utterances, is essential for effective second language (L2) communication but remains a challenge for EFL

* **Corresponding Author:** Hooshang Yazdani, Associate Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Literature and Languages, Arak University, Arak, Iran, **Email**: h-yazdani@araku.ac.ir

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). Published by the Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages at the University of Mazandaran. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) license.

learners (Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Taguchi, 2006). Even advanced L2 learners frequently experience pragmatic failure in performing socially and culturally appropriate speech acts, despite high grammatical accuracy (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Taguchi, 2019) (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001, 2013; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Taguchi, 2019). Furthermore, speech acts such as requests, refusals, and compliment responses are particularly prone to cross-cultural misunderstandings due to their dependence on sociocultural norms (Bardovi-Harlig, 2013). While grammatical proficiency often advances steadily, pragmatic development tends to lag without targeted instruction (Wilson & Kolaiti, 2017). Accordingly, previous studies have highlighted the complexity of finding effective teaching methods for ILP (Lin, 2014; Qian et al., 2024; Thomas, 1983; Ton-Nu, 2025; Zhang, 2022).

In response to the complexities of pragmatics, DA has emerged as a promising approach in teaching ILP (Azizi & Namaziandost, 2023; Rahmani et al., 2025; Rezai, 2023; Zangoei et al., 2019). DA, rooted in Vygotsky (1978) Sociocultural Theory (SCT) and the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), unifies teaching and assessment by providing tailored mediation to support learners' potential. Despite DA's promise, its application in large EFL classrooms poses logistical challenges, particularly for one-on-one mediation (Poehner, 2009). Therefore, there is a pressing need for instructional methods that can increase learners' gains in ILP even in whole-class settings. To overcome the scalability problem of one-to-one DA, Poehner (2009) proposed G-DA, in which mediation is co-constructed within a collective ZPD. Within G-DA, two primary mediation formats are distinguished: concurrent, in which teachers address errors in real time based on the group's collective ZPD, and cumulative, in which scaffolding progresses from implicit to explicit prompts over time for individual learners.

Despite the growing body of research on DA in pragmatics instruction (Azizi & Namaziandost, 2023; Qin & Van Compernolle, 2021; Rahmani et al., 2025; Rezai, 2023; Van Compernolle, 2014; Zangoei et al., 2019), important limitations still exist in the current literature. First and foremost, although both approaches of G-DA have been theoretically described by Poehner (2009), to the best of our knowledge, few studies to date have directly compared concurrent and cumulative G-DA in the domain of L2 pragmatics, with Rezai (2023) as a notable exception. Furthermore, Davin (2011) noted that the majority of DA studies in foreign language education have been conducted in university contexts. Moreover, there is limited microgenetic analysis that systematically contrasts concurrent and cumulative mediation across proficiency levels.

Therefore, this study addresses the aforementioned gaps by investigating the efficacy of concurrent and cumulative G-DA approaches to enhance Iranian EFL learners' ILP competence in producing requests, refusals, and compliment responses, offering insights into how tailored mediation strategies can support ILP development across proficiency levels.

The following are the research questions this study aimed to answer:

1. Does involving learners in concurrent G-DA improve Iranian EFL learners' ILP competence in producing requests, refusals, and compliment responses across proficiency levels?

2. Does involving learners in cumulative G-DA improve Iranian EFL learners' ILP competence in producing requests, refusals, and compliment responses across proficiency levels?

3. Which G-DA approach (concurrent G-DA, cumulative G-DA, or non-GDA) yields the greatest gains in ILP competence across different proficiency levels?

4. How do concurrent and cumulative G-DA mediate the development of Iranian EFL learners' ILP competence?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Dynamic Assessment and L2 Pragmatics

DA, grounded in Vygotsky (1978) SCT, integrates teaching and assessment through mediation tailored to learners' ZPD. In EFL pragmatics, DA has gained attention for its potential to diagnose and address pragmatic deficiencies through adaptive interventions (Azizi & Namaziandost, 2023; Qin & Van Compernolle, 2021; Rahmani et al., 2025; Rezai, 2023; Zangoei et al., 2019).

Building on these studies, within the Iranian EFL context, a growing body of recent research (Azizi & Namaziandost, 2023; Tajeddin & Tayebipour, 2012) using teacher-mediated DA has consistently highlighted the benefits of DA versus traditional assessment in fostering pragmatic awareness. However, most of the DA research on L2 pragmatics has relied on individual, dyadic, or computerized formats, leaving the scalability to large, heterogeneous whole-class settings relatively underexplored.

Concurrent versus Cumulative Group Dynamic Assessment in L2 Pragmatics

The foundational framework for G-DA was established by Poehner (2009) in his seminal work, which extended principles of DA from individualized to group-based by balancing individual and collective ZPDs. Poehner (2009) also introduced the distinction between concurrent G-DA, where errors are addressed in real-time based on group responsiveness, and cumulative G-DA, where scaffolding progresses from implicit to explicit prompts for individual learners while the rest of the group observes.

Another empirical support came from Davin (2011) and Davin and Donato (2013), who demonstrated that a concurrent approach promoted greater learner engagement and collective scaffolding, whereas cumulative formats offered more systematic and structured individual support (Kao, 2022). Influential in operationalizing mediation was Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) regulatory scale, implicit/explicit continuum, which emphasized contingent, graduated feedback based on learner reciprocity.

In the EFL Iranian context, Rezai (2023) comparison of the two approaches, concurrent and cumulative, revealed that both approaches significantly improved ILP comprehension, with concurrent G-DA yielding slightly superior outcomes due to enhanced real-time collaboration and mediation. However, the investigation primarily targeted pre-intermediate learners, focused on comprehension rather than production of speech acts, and did not systematically examine differential effects across multiple proficiency levels or incorporate microgenetic analysis to trace long-term developmental change in speech acts.

Recent studies that have compared the two approaches to G-DA suggested that concurrent G-DA promotes greater peer interaction and immediate sociopragmatic awareness (Kao, 2022; Shakki et al., 2023), whereas cumulative G-DA provides more structured, proficiency-sensitive scaffolding. Other studies have focused on pragmatic comprehension rather than production, or targeted different linguistic features (Davin & Donato, 2013; Rezai, 2023; Van Compernolle, 2014).

Microgenetic Approaches to Pragmatic Development

Microgenetic analysis, rooted in Vygotsky's (1978) genetic method, examines moment-to-moment changes in learners' behavior to uncover developmental processes within the ZPD. In EFL pragmatics, some studies applied microgenetic analysis to offer insights into how mediation fosters ILP competence through social interaction (Azizi & Namaziandost, 2023; Rezai, 2023;

Shakki et al., 2023). The findings revealed that collaborative dialogue mediation enhances pragmatic awareness and self-regulation. They also highlighted DA's benefits in fostering ILP competence, while emphasizing learner agency, feedback timing, and contextual responsiveness. However, these studies did not fully address how learner attributes, such as cognitive styles or prior pragmatic exposure, shape assessment outcomes.

The reviewed literature establishes DA's transformative potential in EFL pragmatics instruction, particularly through G-DA's capacity to integrate assessment and teaching within group contexts. However, a number of limitations still exist. First, while concurrent and cumulative G-DA have been studied separately, few studies to date have systematically compared their efficacy across proficiency levels using a microgenetic lens to track how learners achieve internalization. Second, existing studies often overlook learner-specific factors, such as proficiency, motivation, or cultural background, which may modulate mediation effectiveness. Finally, the application of microgenetic analysis to G-DA remains limited, particularly in exploring how dialogic interactions shape ILP competence over time in speech act production. Consequently, this study addresses these gaps by comparing concurrent and cumulative G-DA's effects on Iranian EFL learners' production of requests, refusals, and compliment responses, using microgenetic analysis to illuminate the developmental processes within and across proficiency levels.

3. METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

Research Design

The present study employed an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design within a quasi-experimental framework. Quantitatively, a 3 × 3 factorial design was employed (Proficiency Levels: pre-intermediate, intermediate, upper-intermediate), experimental groups: concurrent G-DA, cumulative G-DA, and non-GDA) on Iranian EFL learners' ILP competence in producing requests, refusals, and compliment responses. All groups completed a pretest and a posttest (administered seven days after the intervention) using modified written discourse completion tasks (WDCTs). In this explanatory sequential design, quantitative data collection and analysis preceded and informed the qualitative phase. The quantitative phase revealed statistical patterns and relationships concerning the development of learners' ILP competence. Integration occurred at both the method level, through purposeful sampling based on quantitative results, and the interpretation level.

Qualitatively, a microgenetic approach (De Costa, 2007; Lantolf et al., 2015; Vygotsky, 1978) was integrated to trace moment-to-moment developmental changes within learners' ZPD during the 10-session intervention. Although the WDCTs were identical across all groups, the three groups (concurrent G-DA, cumulative G-DA, and non-GDA) received different mediations based on their assigned condition: the G-DA groups received mediation in distinct ways (concurrent versus cumulative), while the non-GDA groups did not receive such mediated intervention. Besides, all treatment sessions in the concurrent and cumulative G-DA groups were audio-recorded and transcribed to illustrate how learners in both G-DA approaches gradually moved from other-regulation to self-regulation in producing pragmatically appropriate speech acts.

Participants and context

The study involved 90 EFL learners from a private language institute in Khorramabad, Lorestan, Iran. They were invited based on convenience sampling from nine intact classes, each seating

exactly 10 students (three pre-intermediate, three intermediate, and three upper-intermediate classes). Within each proficiency level, 30 learners from each category of intact classes were pooled and then randomly assigned to one of three conditions: concurrent G-DA, cumulative G-DA, and non-GDA (n = 10 per condition at each proficiency level), i.e., separate instructional groups in total (3 proficiency levels, 3 conditions). Importantly, each of the nine newly formed groups contained only learners from the same proficiency level, thereby maintaining the ecological validity of intact classroom settings while ensuring random assignment to the experimental conditions within each level.

The participant cohort was diverse after excluding the extreme cases, encompassing both male and female learners aged 15 to 42 years (M = 25.3, SD = 3.9), with a gender distribution of approximately 55% female and 45% male. All participants received English instruction for a minimum of three years at private language institutes in Khorramabad, ensuring a foundational proficiency in the target language. Ethical considerations were meticulously addressed: online informed consent was obtained from all participants, with parental consent secured for those under 18 years of age, in strict adherence to the institutional ethical guidelines. The study protocol received formal approval from the institute's review board, underscoring its compliance with rigorous ethical standards.

Instruments

Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT)

The OQPT, a standardized test developed by Oxford University Press, was administered to determine participants' general English proficiency and to ensure homogeneity across the pre-intermediate, intermediate, and upper-intermediate groups. The test consisted of two parts: Part One contained 60 multiple-choice items divided into three sections: Grammar (items 1–40), Vocabulary (items 41–50), and Reading Comprehension (items 51–60), while Part Two, which targeted advanced levels, included an additional 60 items focusing on cloze passages, advanced grammar, and vocabulary. The specified time allotted for the completion of this test was 40 minutes. Only Part One of the OQPT was used, as it effectively assesses learners up to the intermediate level, focuses on foundational grammar and vocabulary. This was deemed sufficient for classifying pre-intermediate and intermediate learners accurately. For upper-intermediate learners, Part 1 was still appropriate, as it provided a reliable baseline for distinguishing proficiency levels without requiring the additional complexity of Part Two, which focuses on advanced skills less relevant to the study's pragmatic focus. Participants were given 60 minutes to complete Part One of the OQPT, which was administered in paper-and-pencil format under supervised conditions to ensure standardized timing and prevent collaboration. Each correct response was awarded one mark, yielding a maximum score of 60. Scores were interpreted according to the official OQPT scoring guidelines and score bands as follows: 0–29 (pre-intermediate/elementary), 30–47 (intermediate), and 48–60 (upper-intermediate/advanced). This score interpretation guide, provided in the OQPT teacher's handbook, enabled reliable classification of participants into the three proficiency levels used in the study, with no participants scoring at beginner or advanced extremes that would require exclusion beyond the initial OQPT homogeneity checks.

Written Discourse Completion Tasks (WDCTs)

The WDCTs were employed for both pretest and posttest to assess learners' ILP competence in producing three speech acts: requests, refusals, and compliment responses. Each test consisted of

30 items (10 per speech act), adapted from Jalilifar (2009) and Sahragard and Javanmardi (2011) for the pretest, and from Jalilifar (2009), Amarien (1997), and Tanck (2002) for the posttest, with additional items developed by the researcher to ensure cultural and contextual relevance to Iranian EFL learners. Participants were given 60 minutes to complete each WDCT individually. Items were designed to reflect realistic scenarios to elicit contextually appropriate responses. To establish content validity, the WDCTs were reviewed by five university professors with PhD degrees in Teaching English as a Foreign Language in terms of content validity, cultural appropriateness, and alignment with pragmatic constructs. Additionally, they rated WDCT items on a 4-point relevance scale (1 = not relevant to 4 = highly relevant). Item-level content validity indices (I-CVI) ranged from .80 to 1.00, and the scale-level average (S-CVI/Ave) was .93, indicating excellent content validity (Polit et al., 2007). Furthermore, a pilot test was conducted with a small group of 15 similar EFL learners to confirm item clarity and appropriateness. Sample WDCT items are provided in Appendix A for reference. Finally, inter-rater reliability was established by having two experienced raters independently score 30% of the responses. Cohen's kappa reached .82 ($p < .001$), and any disagreements were resolved through discussion (Polit et al., 2007).

Scoring and Reliability of the WDCT

Responses to the WDCT pretest and posttest were scored by an experienced rater (Ph.D. in TEFL, over 25 years of teaching experience) using a 6-point pragmatic appropriateness scale (0 = no performance, 5 = excellent; adapted from Taguchi (2006). The rater was familiar with a 6-point Likert scale (Appendix B) adopted from Taguchi (2006) which ranged from 0 to 5: 0 (no performance at all); 1 (very poor performance), the expressions are very difficult to understand; 2 (poor performance) owing to difficulty in determining correctness due to interference from grammatical and sociolinguistic errors; 3 (fair performance), meaning that the expressions were only somewhat accurate and appropriate; 4 (good), the expressions were mostly accurate and appropriate); and 5 (excellent performance), meaning that the expressions were fully accurate and appropriate for the situation. All WDCT pretest and posttest responses were scored independently by two experienced raters based on the 6-point Likert scale questionnaire (Appendix B) adopted from Taguchi (2006).

Data Collection

The data collection procedure was unfolded over multiple phases, including proficiency testing, pretesting, intervention sessions, and posttesting, with microgenetic analysis to capture developmental processes.

Proficiency Testing

At the study's outset, the OQPT was administered in paper-and-pencil format to establish participants' proficiency levels. Based on OQPT results, 90 learners were classified into three proficiency groups: pre-intermediate, intermediate, and upper-intermediate (30 learners per level). Within each level, learners were randomly assigned to one of three groups: concurrent G-DA, cumulative G-DA, or no-GDA, resulting in nine groups of 10 learners each.

Pretest Administration

A modified WDCTs comprising 30 items (10 each for requests, refusals, and compliment responses) was administered to all nine groups to assess baseline ILP competence. Participants

completed the WDCTs individually within 60 minutes, responding to scenarios as they would in real-life conversations involving various interlocutors (e.g., friends, bosses, etc.). The pretest was conducted in a controlled classroom setting to ensure consistency.

Intervention Sessions

During the 10-session treatment (90 minutes each), the concurrent and cumulative G-DA groups worked collaboratively on 30 WDCT items (approximately three new items per session). In the first two sessions, learners wrote their responses on the whiteboard to promote participation.

Concurrent G-DA Groups: In the concurrent G-DA groups, the teacher provided real-time mediation based on the group's collective ZPD. When pairs of learners made errors while completing WDCTs, the teacher employed an interactionist approach, offering immediate feedback ranging from implicit hints to explicit corrections. For example, if a learner produced an inappropriate request, the teacher might prompt a peer to suggest a more contextually and linguistically appropriate alternative, fostering collaborative dialogue. In the first two sessions, pairs wrote responses on the whiteboard to encourage participation and shape contributions.

Cumulative G-DA Groups: In the cumulative G-DA groups, during the intervention, the teacher attempted to draw the learners' attention to a particular speech act by choosing and writing it on the whiteboard. The teacher then requested one of the learners to read it out and tell the class its appropriate use based on the context. When a student's production was not linguistically and pragmatically acceptable, in line with the procedures of cumulative G-DA, the teacher provided the first addressed student with implicit to explicit prompts to allow her to find the problematic part and rectify it. The teacher in these groups aimed to push the entire class forward in its ZPD through detailed negotiations with individual students in their respective ZPDs.

Non-GDA Groups: The non-GDA groups were included to establish the added value of G-DA. In direct contrast to the concurrent and cumulative G-DA groups, participants in the non-GDA groups received traditional, non-dialogic error correction. The mediation was immediate and explicit; that is, when errors occurred, the teacher directly provided the correct form to the whole group without collaborative discussion. The teacher focused solely on presenting target linguistic accuracy, with no consideration for pragmatic appropriateness or the learner's developing understanding. This interaction pattern operated entirely outside the framework of a learners' ZPDs, and there was no mediation to diagnose or scaffold the learner's readiness, and the peer role was none, eliminating any opportunity for collaborative knowledge building. This contrasted with the interactive, dialogic patterns of the interactions in G-DA groups.

Microgenetic Data Collection

To address the qualitative research question, all classroom dialogues between the teacher and learners in the experimental groups were audio-recorded with participants' consent. These recordings captured collaborative interactions during the intervention sessions, enabling microgenetic analysis to trace moment-to-moment changes in learners' pragmatic development. The recordings were transcribed verbatim and analyzed to identify how mediation shaped ILP competence, focusing on shifts from other-regulation to self-regulation (Appendix C).

Posttest Administration

Seven days after the intervention, all groups completed a WDCT posttest (30 items, 10 per speech act) to evaluate changes in ILP competence. The posttest mirrored the pretest in format and duration (60 minutes), ensuring comparability. The procedure ensured a systematic comparison of

concurrent and cumulative G-DA effects, with ethical considerations addressed through informed consent and institutional approval. The use of audio recordings and detailed transcription supported a comprehensive microgenetic analysis, complementing the quantitative data collected via WDCTs.

Data Analysis Procedure

Quantitative data were analyzed first, followed by qualitative microgenetic analysis, with integration occurring at the interpretation stage.

Quantitative Data Analysis

All WDCT pretest and posttest responses were scored independently by two experienced raters based on the 6-point Likert scale (Appendix B) adopted from (Taguchi, 2006). Inter-rater reliability was calculated with Cohen's kappa and reached K= .82 ($p < .001$). 30 percent of the data were double-scored, and disagreements were resolved through discussion.

Prior to the main analyses, assumptions for parametric tests were checked and met: Shapiro–Wilk tests confirmed normality of score distributions (all *p*s > .05), and Levene's test indicated homogeneity of variances (*p*s > .05).

Because the primary interest was in gains over time and possible interactions between treatment type and proficiency level, a 3 Treatment: concurrent G-DA, cumulative G-DA, non-GDA × 3 (Proficiency Level: pre-intermediate, intermediate, upper-intermediate) × 2 (Time: pretest vs. posttest) repeated-measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted, with time as the within-subjects factor and treatment and proficiency level as between-subjects factors. The total WDCTs scores at pretest and posttest served as the two related dependent variables. Repeated-measures MANOVA was selected because it allows simultaneous examination of changes over time across multiple related outcome measures while accounting for the correlation between pretest and posttest scores and controlling the Type I error rate.

This multivariate approach was preferred over a univariate mixed-design ANOVA (which treats time as a single within-subjects factor on one dependent variable) or ANCOVA (using pretest scores as a covariate) because it explicitly models pretest and posttest as two correlated dependent variables, offering greater robustness when sphericity assumptions may be uncertain and when the correlation between repeated measures is moderate to high. Additionally, repeated-measures MANOVA provides higher statistical power for detecting interaction effects involving time without requiring homogeneity of regression slopes across groups, making it particularly suitable for the present 3 × 3 × 2 design.

Pillai's Trace was used as the multivariate statistic because of its robustness when sample sizes are equal (Olson, 1976). Effect sizes are reported as partial eta-squared (η^2p) using Cohen's guidelines. Significant multivariate effects were followed by univariate tests and post-hoc pairwise comparisons using the Scheffé procedure to control for Type I error. This omnibus MANOVA primarily addressed Research Question 3 (which assessment approach yields the greatest gains across proficiency levels) through the three-way interaction (Treatment × Proficiency Level × Time) and relevant lower-order effects. Research Questions 1 and 2 (effectiveness of concurrent and cumulative G-DA, respectively, across proficiency levels) were examined via planned follow-up repeated-measures ANOVAs conducted separately for the concurrent and cumulative groups (with Proficiency Level as between-subjects factor and Time as within-subjects factor), supplemented by the descriptive statistics and one-way ANOVAs reported for pretest and posttest

differences within each treatment condition. All quantitative analyses were performed using SPSS version 27.

Qualitative (Microgenetic) Data Analysis

Rooted in Vygotsky (1978) genetic analysis, microgenetic or historical analysis primarily concerns how the overt or in-flight examples of learning unfold over a relatively short span of time (Lantolf, 2000). The microgenetic approach uncovers the process through which the learners' ZPDs are shaped and developed in the context of social interactions. In essence, microgenesis, as a local contextualized learning process, traces learners' evolution from other-regulation to self-regulation (Mitchell & Myles, 1998).

To address the qualitative research question, all 10 treatment sessions of the six experimental groups (concurrent and cumulative G-DA at three proficiency levels) were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim, producing approximately 54 hours of classroom interaction. Following Vygotsky (1978) genetic method and the microgenetic approach (De Costa, 2007; Lantolf, 2000; Van Compernolle, 2015), the microgenetic analysis was employed to capture fine-grained developmental processes as they occurred in real time. To illustrate the microgenetic coding process, consider the following stages. Similar coding was applied across all 18 selected episodes, enabling the identification of broader themes such as real-time peer co-construction and gradual internalization.

1. Identification and segmentation of all mediation episodes (e.g., teacher–learner and learner–learner interactions).
2. Open coding to find instances of other-regulation, co-regulation, and emerging self-regulation (e.g., marking long pauses, hesitation, reliance on external support, use of L1 for negotiation, and positive reinforcement by the teacher).
3. Focused coding using Poehner (2009) mediation continuum (from the most implicit to the most explicit prompts) and Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) regulatory scale-implicit/explicit continuum. (e.g., tracking how mediation decreases over time, and moves from implicit to explicit)
4. Selection of 18 representative mediation episodes (e.g., three early sessions, three mid-sessions, and three final sessions for both concurrent and cumulative G-DA to trace ILP progress across proficiency levels.
5. Longitudinal microgenetic tracing of learners' movement from other-regulation to self-regulation in the production of requests, refusals, and compliment responses. (e.g., G-DA groups showed a more teacher-led approach from explicit corrections in early sessions to increasing sociopragmatic awareness in mid-sessions and internalized control in the final session).
6. Reliability check: Two independent raters (Ph.D. holders in applied linguistics) re-coded 30% of the episodes; inter-coder agreement was 89%. All disagreements were resolved through discussion.

Integration of quantitative and qualitative results took place at the discussion stage, where microgenetic evidence was used to explain the statistical findings.

4. RESULTS

Research Question 1

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest Scores of Concurrent G-DA Groups

Test	Proficiency	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% confidence interval
Pretest	Pre	30	126,87	3,57	0,63	
	Int	30	132,37	3,42	0,62	131,09
	Up	30	139,03	5,44	0,99	137,00
	Total	90	132,76	6,53	0,68	131,39
Posttest	Pre	30	194,17	10,12	1,84	190,39
	Int	30	179,63	6,83	1,24	177,08
	Up	30	177,90	5,36	0,98	175,90
	Total	90	183,90	10,57	1,11	181,69

Descriptive statistics for the pretest and posttest scores of the concurrent G-DA groups are presented in Table 1, respectively, to illustrate differences across proficiency levels. It is important to note that the observed initial differences in pretest scores across groups are attributable to the deliberate stratification of participants by proficiency level (pre-intermediate, intermediate, and upper-intermediate), as confirmed by the Oxford Quick Placement Test, rather than to any pre-existing inequities between treatment conditions within the same proficiency level.

Table 2: ANOVA For Between-Group Differences in Concurrent G-DA

Test	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Pretest	2227.22	2	1113.61	61.655	.000	.58
Within	1571.40	87	18.06			
Total	3798.62	89				
Posttest	4788.26	2	2394.13	40.368	.000	.48
Within	5159.83	87	59.30			
Total	9948.10	89				

ANOVA results (Table 2) revealed significant differences across proficiency levels for concurrent G-DA groups. For the pretest, $F(2, 87) = 61.65$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .58$, indicating a large effect. The ANOVA results for the pretest revealed statistically significant differences in proficiency levels among the concurrent G-DA groups, with higher proficiency learners demonstrating notably stronger baseline performance. The ascending mean scores from Pre-intermediate (M = 126.87) to Intermediate (M = 132.37) and Upper-intermediate (M = 139.03) indicate a clear progression in initial ability, and the large effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.58$) confirms that proficiency level accounts for a substantial portion of the variance in pretest scores.

For the posttest, $F(2, 87) = 40.36$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .48$, also reflecting a large effect, though slightly smaller than the pretest due to intervention effects reducing initial disparities. Hence, the posttest ANOVA results revealed a statistically significant difference in performance across proficiency levels among the concurrent G-DA groups, with $F(2, 87) = 40.36$, $p < .001$, and a large effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.48$. This indicates that 48.1% of the variance in posttest scores is

attributable to proficiency level, suggesting that learners in higher proficiency groups not only started stronger but also maintained or expanded their advantage after the G-DA intervention. The substantial effect size underscores the impact of proficiency grouping on learning outcomes and supports the effectiveness of differentiated instruction within the G-DA framework.

Table 3: Post-Hoc Scheffé Test for Concurrent G-DA Groups

Test	(I) Level	(J) Level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% CI Lower	Upper
Pretest	Pre	Int	-5.50*	1.09	.000	-8.23	-2.77
	Pre	Up	-12.16*	1.09	.000	-14.90	-9.43
	Int	Up	-6.66*	1.09	.000	-9.40	-3.93
Posttest	Pre	Int	14.53*	1.98	.000	9.58	19.49
	Pre	Up	16.26*	1.98	.000	11.31	21.22
	Int	Up	1.73	1.98	.685	-3.22	6.69

***Significant at $p < .05$**

Post-hoc Scheffé tests (Table 3) clarified pairwise differences. On the pretest, all proficiency levels differed significantly ($p < .001$): pre-intermediate vs. intermediate (MD = -5.50), pre-intermediate vs. upper-intermediate (MD = -12.16), and intermediate vs. upper-intermediate (MD = -6.66). On the posttest, pre-intermediate learners significantly outperformed both intermediate (MD = 14.53, $p < .001$) and upper-intermediate (MD = 16.26, $p < .001$) groups, but the difference between intermediate and upper-intermediate was not significant (MD = 1.73, $p = .68$).

The results indicated that concurrent G-DA significantly improved ILP competence, with effects varying by proficiency level, particularly favoring pre-intermediate learners' post-intervention.

Research Question 2

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest Scores on the WDCT for the Cumulative G-DA Groups

Test	Proficiency	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% CI Lower	Upper
Pretest	Pre	30	132.00	8.24	1.50	128.92	135.08
	Int	30	140.47	2.08	0.38	139.69	141.24
	Up	30	146.07	7.77	1.41	143.16	148.97
	Total	90	139.51	8.77	0.92	137.67	141.35
Posttest	Pre	30	175.47	7.22	1.31	172.77	178.17
	Int	30	175.67	6.12	1.11	173.38	177.96
	Up	30	182.90	5.63	1.02	180.80	185.00
	Total	90	177.95	7.01	0.73	176.48	179.42

Descriptive statistics for the cumulative G-DA groups are shown in Table 4.

Table 5: ANOVA For Between-Group Differences in Cumulative G-DA Groups

Test	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η²
Pretest	3009.15	2	1504.57	34.00	.000	.43
Within	3849.33	87	44.24			
Total	6858.48	89				
Posttest	1135.62	2	567.81	19.56	.000	.31
Within	2524.70	87	29.02			
Total	3660.32	89				

ANOVA results (Table 5) indicated significant differences across proficiency levels: pretest, $F(2, 87) = 34.00$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .43$; posttest, $F(2, 87) = 19.56$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .31$, reflecting large and moderate effects for the differences across different proficiency levels, respectively. However, in order to detect the differences across the same proficiency levels during the pretest and posttest stages, more inspection of the data is needed.

Table 6: Post-Hoc Scheffé Test for Cumulative G-DA Groups

Test	(I) Level	(J) Level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% CI Lower	Upper
Pretest	Pre	Int	-8.46*	1.71	.000	-12.74	-4.19
	Pre	Up	-14.06*	1.71	.000	-18.34	-9.79
	Int	Up	-5.60*	1.71	.007	-9.88	-1.32
Posttest	Pre	Int	0.20	1.39	.990	-3.26	3.66
	Pre	Up	-7.43*	1.39	.000	-10.90	-3.97
	Int	Up	-7.63*	1.39	.000	-11.10	-4.17

***Significant at $p < .05$**

Post-hoc Scheffé tests (Table 6) showed significant pretest differences across all pairs ($p < .007$). On the posttest, upper-intermediate learners outperformed pre-intermediate (MD = 7.43, $p < .001$) and intermediate (MD = 7.63, $p < .001$) groups, but pre-intermediate and intermediate groups showed no significant difference (MD = 0.200, $p = .99$).

These results reject the null hypothesis for RQ2, confirming that cumulative G-DA significantly enhanced ILP competence, with effects varying by proficiency, particularly benefiting upper-intermediate learners' post-intervention.

Research Question 3

Table 7: MANOVA Results for Differences Between Groups and Levels

Effect	Pillai's Trace	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	*p*	η²
Prepost × Groups	.66	256.27	2	265	<.001	.659
Prepost × Levels	.11	16.14	2	265	<.001	.109

A MANOVA was conducted to compare the effects of concurrent and cumulative G-DA across proficiency levels, with pretest and posttest scores as dependent variables. Assumptions were met, as confirmed by Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices ($p > .05$). Results (Table 7) showed significant effects for the interaction between test occasion (pretest/posttest) and group type, Pillai's Trace = 0.66, F (2, 26) = 256.27, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .65$, indicating a large effect. The interaction with proficiency levels was also significant, Pillai's Trace = 0.11, F (2, 26) = 16.14, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .109$, reflecting a small-to-moderate effect.

Table 8: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Intercept	12843009.78	1	12843009.78	169673.42	.000	.99
Group Name	9659.29	2	4829.64	63.80	.000	.32
Level	9799.40	2	4899.70	64.73	.000	.32
Error	20058.51	265	75.69			

Tests of between-subjects effects (Table 8) confirmed significant differences across groups, F (2, 26) = 63.80, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .325$, and levels, F (2, 26) = 64.732, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .328$.

Table 9: Post-Hoc Scheffé Test for Group Differences

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% CI Lower	Upper
Concurrent	Cumulative	9.93*	0.91	.000	7.67	12.19
Concurrent	non-GDA	7.53*	0.91	.000	5.27	9.79
Cumulative	non-GDA	2.40*	0.91	.034	0.14	4.66

***Significant at $p < .05$**

Post-hoc Scheffé tests (Table 9) showed significant differences between all groups: concurrent G-DA outperformed cumulative G-DA (MD = 9.93, $p < .001$) and non-GDA (MD = 7.53, $p < .001$), and cumulative G-DA outperformed non-GDA (MD = 2.40, $p = .034$).

Table 10: Post-Hoc Scheffé Test for Proficiency Levels

(I) Level	(J) Level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% CI Lower	Upper
Int	Pre	5.74*	0.91	.000	3.48	8.00
Up	Pre	10.42*	0.91	.000	8.16	12.67
Up	Int	4.68*	0.91	.000	2.42	6.94

***Significant at $p < .05$**

Post-hoc tests for proficiency levels (Table 10) confirmed significant differences: upper-intermediate group outperformed intermediate group (MD = 4.68, $p < .001$) and pre-intermediate group (MD = 10.42, $p < .001$), and intermediate group outperformed pre-intermediate group (MD = 5.74, $p < .001$).

These results rejected the null hypothesis for RQ3, confirming that concurrent G-DA is more effective than cumulative G-DA, with both outperforming the non-GDA, and effects varying by proficiency level.

Research Question 4

Qualitative data were analyzed using microgenetic analysis to examine how mediation in concurrent and cumulative G-DA groups fostered ILP competence. Transcripts of classroom interactions (Episodes 1–18) (Appendix D) were coded thematically to identify mediation types and developmental patterns across proficiency levels and session stages (early, mid, final). The coding scheme categorized mediation into implicit prompts, explicit corrections, peer collaboration, and L1 use as a scaffold, with examples drawn from episodes to illustrate progression from other-regulation to self-regulation (Table 11).

Table 11. Summary of Microgenetic Development of Interlanguage Pragmatic Competence Across Sessions

Session Stage	Episodes	Key Learner Behaviors	Teacher Mediation	Developmental Observations
Early Sessions	1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16	Learners across all proficiency levels exhibited hesitation and reliance on teacher mediation. Pre-intermediate learners frequently used L1 to negotiate meaning. While intermediate and upper-intermediate learners attempted to repair the initial speech act for pragmatic appropriateness. Examples: Episodes 1 and 7.	Implicit and explicit mediations and corrections (e.g., translations, form corrections).	Heavy other-regulation and strong dependence on the teacher for accuracy.
Mid-Sessions	2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17	Learners demonstrated increased confidence and peer collaboration. In concurrent G-DA, intermediate learners, intermediate learners built on peer suggestions, reducing reliance on teacher prompts. Examples: Episodes 5 and 11.	Reduced explicit mediation and corrections	Emerging peer-driven interaction; shift to collaborative and other regulation gradually.
Final Sessions	3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18	Learners exhibited greater autonomy. Concurrent G-DA groups displayed contextually appropriate responses with confirmatory teacher feedback. Cumulative G-DA pre-intermediate learners internalized pragmatic norms, while upper-intermediate learners did not. Examples: Episodes 6 and 12.	Primarily confirmatory feedback (e.g., "GOOD JOB", "GREAT").	Transition to self-regulation and achieve internalization.

In summary, the microgenetic analysis revealed that concurrent G-DA fostered peer-driven pragmatic awareness, particularly for intermediate and upper-intermediate learners, due to real-time interaction. Cumulative G-DA supported pre-intermediate learners through structured scaffolding, promoting gradual internalization. Both approaches facilitated a transition from other-regulation to self-regulation, with L1 use diminishing over time and peer collaboration enhancing socio-pragmatic competence.

To sum up, the quantitative results confirmed that both G-DA approaches significantly improved ILP competence, with concurrent G-DA showing greater efficacy, especially for pre-intermediate learners. The qualitative findings elucidated how mediation types shaped

developmental trajectories, highlighting the role of tailored feedback and peer interaction in fostering pragmatic competence.

5. DISCUSSION

Grounded in Vygotsky (1978) Sociocultural Theory, this study sought to investigate the effectiveness of two mediation formats within a G-DA framework: concurrent and cumulative, as a means to foster ILP development. By employing an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design, the study aimed not only to quantify learning gains but also to trace the microgenetic processes through which mediation guides learners from other-regulation toward autonomous self-regulation. The research was guided by four questions concerning the effectiveness of each G-DA approach, their comparative impact across proficiency levels, and the qualitative nature of the developmental mediation they provide.

Results related to the first research question revealed that involvement in concurrent G-DA significantly improved Iranian EFL learners' ILP competence across all three proficiency levels, with particularly dramatic gains observed among pre-intermediate learners. Quantitatively, this group demonstrated the largest mean difference between pretest and posttest scores (see Table 1), and the post-hoc analysis showed that pre-intermediate learners in the concurrent condition even surpassed their intermediate and upper-intermediate peers at posttest (Table 3). This suggests that the real-time, dialogic mediation characteristic of concurrent G-DA was exceptionally effective at addressing foundational gaps in pragmatic knowledge, allowing lower-proficiency learners to make rapid, substantial progress.

Our results are collectively in agreement with those of Davin and Donato (2013) and Kao (2022), reporting that interactive, collectively-scaffolded mediation promotes higher levels of learner engagement and metacognitive awareness. The microgenetic data from this study corroborated this, revealing that concurrent sessions were marked by frequent peer-to-peer negotiation and co-construction of appropriate responses. For instance, when a pre-intermediate learner struggled with a refusal, peers often offered alternative formulations, a process that built collective understanding. This aligns with (Donato, 1994) concept of collective scaffolding, where group interaction itself becomes the primary engine for development. Furthermore, the finding that concurrent G-DA was highly effective resonates with Van Compernolle (2014) argument that mediation is most powerful when it is contingent and responsive to emerging learner needs during the task itself. In contrast, our results are in dissonance with those of studies that posit a linear relationship between proficiency and benefit from implicit or exploratory methods (Davin & Donato, 2013; Van Compernolle, 2014). One might assume that advanced learners would benefit most from the open-ended, negotiative space of concurrent G-DA. However, our upper-intermediate learners, while improving, showed more modest gains relative to their pre-intermediate counterparts in the same condition. The possible reasons are twofold. First, a ceiling effect may have been at play; their higher baseline left less room for dramatic score improvement on the WDCT measure. Second, the microgenetic transcripts suggested that these learners sometimes found the peer-negotiation process less cognitively challenging or efficient than more direct, analytical instruction, a variation highlighted by Poehner (2009) when discussing the need to tailor mediation to a group's collective ZPD.

Results related to research question two pointed to the clear efficacy of cumulative G-DA in enhancing ILP competence, though its impact profile differed from the concurrent approach. This format, characterized by a structured progression of mediation from implicit to explicit prompts directed at individual learners within the group setting, proved robust across proficiencies. However, its greatest strength appeared to be in consolidating the advantage of upper-intermediate

learners, who maintained a significant posttest lead over lower-level groups (Table 6). For pre-intermediate learners, cumulative G-DA provided the clear, sequential scaffolding necessary to build foundational knowledge, resulting in solid gains, though not as pronounced as those in the concurrent condition. This finding aligns well with the theoretical and empirical foundations of cumulative G-DA. Our results are collectively in agreement with those of Poehner (2009), who framed this approach as a systematic method for the teacher to diagnose and support individual learners while the group observes and indirectly benefits. The step-by-step, graduated prompts provided a clear "path to correctness" that was particularly valuable for learners who needed explicit guidance on pragmatic conventions. This supports Shakki et al. (2023) conclusion that cumulative mediation is especially beneficial for establishing clarity and accuracy. The microgenetic analysis from our mid-sessions showed learners in cumulative groups actively listening and noting the mediated interactions of their peers, effectively learning from others' diagnostic sessions, a process Davin (2011) identified as key to cumulative G-DA's group-wide utility.

Regarding which G-DA approach yielded the greatest gains, the omnibus MANOVA and subsequent post-hoc tests provided a clear hierarchy: concurrent G-DA was the most effective, followed by cumulative G-DA, with both significantly outperforming the non-GDA control condition (Table 9). The results confirmed DA's foundational argument for the synergy of teaching and assessment over discrete testing. Crucially, however, the significant interaction indicated that not all mediation was equal; the specific character of the support which may be concurrent or cumulative, was a decisive factor in its efficacy.

The superiority of the concurrent approach could be attributed to its immersive, interactive quality. It created a dynamic environment where pragmatic choices were constantly negotiated, justified, and refined, accelerating the internalization of sociopragmatic principles. As the microgenetic data showed, learners in concurrent groups moved more quickly from relying on teacher prompts to relying on peer collaboration and, finally, to independent self-regulation. This finding extends the work of Rezai (2023), who also found concurrent G-DA advantageous in pragmatics, by demonstrating its particular potency in speech act production (not just comprehension) and across a wider proficiency range. Furthermore, it addresses the scalability concern raised by (Poehner, 2009) by demonstrating that concurrent G-DA can effectively manage mediation in a whole-class setting by leveraging peer co-agency, thus alleviating the instructor bottleneck common in Iranian classrooms (Davin, 2011).

Responding to research question four, the qualitative, microgenetic analysis illuminated how the two G-DA approaches mediated development. The journey from other-regulation to self-regulation unfolded differently in each condition. In concurrent G-DA, mediation was a fluid, social process. Early sessions featured teacher-led prompts, but these rapidly yielded to rich peer dialogue. Learners questioned each other's formulations ("Is '*I want a pencil*' too direct for a teacher?"), offered metapragmatic explanations, and collaboratively rehearsed responses. This peer co-construction, evident in the mid-session transcripts, served as a powerful mediating tool, fostering not just accuracy but also pragmatic awareness and adaptability.

In cumulative G-DA, the path was more structured and individualized. Mediation followed a prescribed regulatory scale (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994), with the teacher carefully calibrating prompts for a focal learner. The group's role was primarily observational but engaged. This process provided a clear model of strategic problem-solving in pragmatics. Learners observed how their peers responded to increasingly explicit hints, internalizing a process for self-correction. This was particularly effective for internalizing complex pragmatic formulas, as observed in upper-intermediate learners' refined compliment responses by the final sessions. However, the

microgenetic data also revealed that spontaneous, learner-initiated pragmatic negotiation was less frequent in this setting compared to the concurrent groups.

A crucial cross-cutting finding was the strategic, diminishing use of L1 (Farsi) as a mediating tool, especially among pre-intermediate learners. In early sessions, learners used L1 to clarify context, negotiate meaning, and access sociocultural concepts (e.g., the nuance of taarof in refusals). This aligns with Sharifian (2005) perspective on cultural conceptualizations as resources. By the final sessions, this L1 scaffolding had largely been abandoned in favor of L2 negotiation, marking a clear developmental shift towards self-regulation within the L2 pragmatic system.

6. CONCLUSIONS

This study, grounded in Vygotsky (1978) SCT, demonstrated the transformative efficacy of G-DA in fostering ILP competence among Iranian EFL learners, focusing on requests, refusals, and compliment responses. Employing a microgenetic approach, the findings revealed that concurrent G-DA significantly enhances pragmatic proficiency, particularly for pre-intermediate and intermediate learners, as evidenced by superior WDCTs scores and robust self-regulatory behaviors. Cumulative G-DA, while effective for lower-proficiency learners in strengthening foundational pragmatic structures, yields more modest gains, with advanced learners retaining a statistical advantage at posttest. These outcomes highlighted the critical role of mediation tailored to learners' proficiency levels. The findings affirmed G-DA's capacity to propel learners from intermental collaboration to intramental self-regulation within their ZPD (Poehner, 2009; Swain, 2000).

Pedagogically, the results impel a significant shift from input-centric pragmatics to mediation-infused curricula. Additionally, concurrent G-DA alleviates the instructor bottleneck (of large class sizes and limited instructional time) in Iranian pedagogic arenas (Davin, 2011) by legitimizing peer co-agency, offsetting cultural reticence (i.e., reluctance to participate due to norms of deference and public face) (Behnam & Amizadeh, 2011). A proposed spiral syllabus combines concurrent cycles for awareness activation with cumulative consolidation for accuracy refinement, calibrated to proficiency: hybrid for intermediates, concurrent-dominant for advanced strata. Socioculturally, the study challenges deficit views of Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic competence, recasting L1 transfers (e.g., humility in compliments) as developmental affordances for mediated negotiation (Ramazanpour et al., 2025; Sharifian, 2005). Congruent with applied linguistics, G-DA manifests as an empowering approach, values learners' repertoires while amplifying semiotic agency, imperative amid Iran's intercultural globalization. Institutionally, it informs policy for DA integration in national curricula, fostering equity in pragmatic access (Azizi & Namaziandost, 2023).

Despite its contributions, the study has several limitations. First of all, the modest sample size (n = 90) and convenience sampling from a single private institute limit generalizability. Also, the wide age range (15–42 years) and heterogeneity in motivation and prior exposure may have introduced uncontrolled variables. Additionally, the researcher's dual role as a teacher and a mediator could have influenced mediation consistency, despite reliability checks. Moreover, the 10-session intervention was relatively brief, preventing examination of long-term retention and transfer to spontaneous speech. Besides, audio recording of classes may have caused a Hawthorne effect. Finally, the non-GDA purely explicit instruction might have reduced learner engagement, potentially inflating experimental gains.

Future research should address these constraints through (a) longitudinal designs incorporating post-tests and naturalistic discourse data to examine retention and transfer; (b) multi-site, probability-based sampling across public and private institutions to enhance generalizability;

(c) integration of oral production tasks (e.g., role-plays and computer-mediated communication) alongside WDCTs for multimodal triangulation; and (d) cross-cultural replications in diverse L2 contexts to test the universality of concurrent G-DA's superiority at lower proficiency levels. Such avenues may further refine mediation topologies and solidify G-DA's position as an innovative ILP, promising approach to instruction.

References

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*(4), 465-483. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02064.x

Amarien, N (1997). Interlanguage pragmatics: A study of the refusal strategies of Indonesian speakers speaking English. *TEFLIN Journal*, *8*(1), 1-144 .

Azizi, Z., & Namaziandost, E. (2023). Implementing peer-dynamic assessment to cultivate Iranian EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic competence: A mixed-methods approach. *International Journal of Language Testing*, *13*(1), 18-43. https://doi.org/10.22034/ijlt.2022.345372.1171

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford University Press .

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524797.005

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2013). Developing L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning*, *63*(1), 68-86. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00738.x

Behnam, B., & Amizadeh, N. (2011). A comparative study of the compliments and compliment responses between English and Persian TV interviews. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, *17*(1), 65-78 .

Davin, K. J. (2011). *Group dynamic assessment in an early foreign language learning program: Tracking movement through the zone of proximal development* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Davin, K. J., & Donato, R. (2013). Student collaboration and teacher-directed classroom dynamic assessment: A complementary pairing. *Foreign Language Annals*, *46*(1), 5-22. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12012

De Costa, P. I. (2007). Review of Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development. *Applied Linguistics*, *28*(3), 477-480. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm027

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–56). Ablex Publishing.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). Polity.

Jalilifar, A. (2009). Request strategies: Cross-sectional study of Iranian EFL learners and Australian native speakers. *English Language Teaching*, *2*(1), 46-61. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n1p46

Kao, Y. T. (2022). Effects of group dynamic assessment on L2 Chinese learners' literacy development: Learners' responsiveness to interactive mediation. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *13*(5), 843-871. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2019-0077

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002) Pragmatic development in a second language. *Language Learning*, *52* (Suppl 1), 1-352. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.2002.tb00022.x

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford University Press .

Lantolf, J. P., Thorne, S. L., & Poehner, M. E. (2015). Sociocultural theory and second language development. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (2nd ed., pp. 207–226). Routledge.

Lin, M. F. (2014). An interlanguage pragmatic study on Chinese EFL learners' refusal: Perception and performance. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(3), 642-650. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.3.642-653

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (1998). *Second language learning theories*. Arnold. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203770658

Olson, C. L. (1976). On choosing a test statistic in multivariate analysis of variance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *83*(4), 579-586. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.83.4.579

Poehner, M. E. (2009). Group dynamic assessment: Mediation for the L2 classroom .*TESOL Quarterly*, *43*(3), 471-491. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00245.x

Polit, D. F., Beck, C. T., & Owen, S. V. (2007). Is the CVI an acceptable indicator of content validity? Appraisal and recommendations. *Research in Nursing & Health*, *30*(4), 459–467. https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20199

Qian, T., Sha, S., & Wu, S. (2024). Pragmatic transfer in second language acquisition in intercultural communication. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences* ,*26* , 117-123. https://doi.org/10.54097/0jqsns16

Qin, T., & Van Compernolle, R. A. (2021). Computerized dynamic assessment of implicature comprehension in L2 Chinese. *Language Learning & Technology*, *25*(2), 55-74 .

Rahmani, P., Ebadi, S., & Eslami, Z. R .(2025) The impact of mobile-mediated dynamic assessment on EFL learners' pragmatic competence: The speech act of disagreement. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *38*(3), 421-448. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2025.2472062

Ramazanpour, R., Amouzadeh ,M., & Rezaei, H. (2025). A discourse-pragmatic study of in & ân (this & that) in daily Persian conversations. *Language Related Research*, *13*(2), 587-621. https://doi.org/10.52547/LRR.13.2.19

Rezai, A. (2023). Cultivating interlanguage pragmatic comprehension through concurrent and cumulative group dynamic assessment: A mixed-methods study. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *8*(1), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00179-w

Sahragard, R., & Javanmardi, F. (2011). English speech act realization of "Refusals" among Iranian EFL learners. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, *7*(2), 181-198. https://doi.org/10.3968/j.ccc.1923670020110702.021

Shakki, F., Naeini, J., Mazandarani, O., & Derakhshan, A. (2023). A meta-analysis on the instructed second language pragmatics for the speech acts of apology, request, and refusal in an Iranian EFL context. *Language Related Research*, *13*(5), 461-510. https://doi.org/10.52547/LRR.13.6.15

Sharifian, F. (2005). The Persian cultural schema of shekasteh-nafsi: A study of compliment responses in Persian and Anglo-Australian speakers. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, *13*(2), 337-361. https://doi.org/10.1075/pc.13.2.05sha

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford University Press.

Taguchi, N. (2006). Analysis of appropriateness in a speech act of request in L2 English. *Pragmatics*, *16*(4), 513-533. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.16.4.05tag

Taguchi, N. (2019). Introduction. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics* (pp. 1–14). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351164085-1

Tajeddin, Z., & Tayebipour, F. (2012). The effect of dynamic assessment on EFL learners' acquisition of request and apology. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, *4*(2), 88-118. https://doi.org/10.22099/jtls.2012.499

Tanck, S. (2002). Speech act sets of refusal and complaint: A comparison of native and non-native English speakers' production. *TESOL Working Papers*, *4*(2), 1-22 .

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 91-112. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.91

Ton-Nu, A. (2025). Why is L2 pragmatics still a neglected area in EFL teaching? Uncovered stories from Vietnamese EFL teachers. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *63*(3), 1915-1939. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2023-0172

Van Compernolle, R. A. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and L2 instructional pragmatics*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783091409

Van Compernolle, R. A. (2015). *Interaction and second language development: A Vygotskian perspective*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.44

Vygotsky, L. S .(1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4

Wilson, D., & Kolaiti, P. (2017). Lexical pragmatics and implicit communication. In Piotr Cap and Marta Dynel (Eds.), *Implicitness: From lexis to discourse* (pp. 147-176). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.276.07wil

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429488023

Zangoei, A., Zareian, G., Adel, S. M. R., & Amirian, S. M. R. (2019). The impact of computerized dynamic assessment on Iranian EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic development. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies*, *6*(4), 165-139. https://doi.org/10.30479/jmrels.2019.11536.1433

Zhang, Y. (2022). The influence of combining computer-assisted language learning with instruction on Chinese college students' L2 pragmatic ability. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *45*(2), 243-253. https://doi.org/10.1515/cjal-2022-0206

Appendices

Appendix A: Appendix A: Full Written Discourse Completion Task (WDCT) for Pretest/Posttest and Intervention

Instructions for participants: You will read short situations below. For each one, write what you would say in English as if you were really in that situation. Try to write a natural response (1-3 sentences). There are 30 situations: 10 about making requests, 10 about refusing something, and 10 about responding to a compliment.

- **Section 1: Requests (3 items)**
  1. You're on a crowded bus and want the person next to you (a stranger) to move their bag so you can sit down. Write what you would say: ----------
  2. You're in a group project at university and one of your classmates (equal status) hasn't completed their part. You want to ask them to send it by tomorrow. Write what you would say (email or message): ----------
  3. You're in a bookstore and can't reach a book on the top shelf. A stranger (older adult) is nearby. Write what you would say: ----------

- **Section 2: Refusals (3 items)**
  1. A neighbor asks: "Could you keep an eye on my house while I'm on vacation next week?" But you're going to be out of town yourself. Your response: ----------
  2. A friend asks: "Can you give me a ride to the station this evening?" Your car is in the repair shop. Your response: ----------
  3. A colleague asks: "Could you join the committee meeting this Friday?" You have a prior doctor's appointment. Your response: ----------

- **Section 3: Compliment Responses (3 items)**
  1. Your partner says: "I really appreciate how organized you are with our home tasks." Your response: ----------
  2. A client says: "Your advice on the project was really helpful. Thanks!" Your response:
  3. A teacher says: "You've made great progress in speaking this semester." Your response:

Appendix B: Sample of a 6-Point Likert Scale (Adopted from Taguchi et al., 2006, p. 382)

Score	Performance Level	Description
0	No performance at all	
1	Very poor performance	The expressions are very difficult to understand
2	Poor performance	Due to difficulty in determining correctness caused by interference from grammatical and sociolinguistic errors
3	Fair performance	Meaning that the expressions were only somewhat accurate and appropriate
4	Good performance	i.e., the expressions were mostly accurate and appropriate
5	Excellent performance	Meaning that the expressions were fully accurate and appropriate for the situation

- **Appendix C: Examples of Episodes**

Episode One

Episode 1 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the concurrent pre-intermediate group in the first session, focusing on instances of interaction, mediation, and the development of ILP competencies.

Nima: begim, saram kheili sholughe in hafte (let's say, I'm too busy this week)
Hossein: be englisi chi mishod? (In English?)
Nima: nemidunam (I don't know)
Hossein: mm teacher (.) mikhaim begim in hafte kheili hajme karam balas chi mishod? (we want to say the workload is a bit too much for me this week. What is translation?)
Teacher: the workload is a bit too much for me this week

Episode Two

Episode 2 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the concurrent pre-intermediate group in the middle session.

Mohammad Javad: thank you for :: (10) your suggestion
Sina: (.) thank you for your suggestion::
Teacher: ah-HA↑
Sina: but (.) I can't do it
Mohammad Javad: yeah (.) but I can't do it
Teacher: NO:
Mohammad Javad: mmm
Sina: (15)
Teacher: he is your boss↑
Mohammad Javad: (20) Mitunim begim in pishnehade khoubie? (Can we say it's a good suggestion)? ↑
Teacher: well done ↑ $

Episode Three

Episode 3 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the concurrent pre-intermediate group in the last session.

Teacher: be nazaret chi begim? (to you, what should we say?)
Shakiba: (20) I'm glad that i value your support ↓
Teacher: GREAT $

Episode Four

Episode 4 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the concurrent intermediate group in the first session.

Amin: ye chizi begu (say something) $
Reza: (10)
Teacher: he is your close friend
Reza: begim::

Amin: can you borrow me?
Reza: ah-ha

Episode Five

Episode 5 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the concurrent intermediate group in the middle session.

Amir Hossein: (.) I'm so sorry
Mahan: (15) I'd love to do it
Amir Hossein: I'd love to do it mm
Teacher: but:
Amir Hossein: my wife is sick
Mahan: (.) baiad beberamesh doctor (I should take her to the doctor)
Amir Hossein: (10) take her to the doctor
Teacher: Bravo

Episode Six

Episode 6 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the concurrent intermediate group in the final session.

Paniz: Your superior finds you very busy with your work and says to you, "You're a real hard worker↑
Raha: (10) thanks a lot ↑
Paniz: (hh.hm) AND: (5) be paie shoma ke nemirese (I'm not a patch on you)
Raha: i'm not a patch on you
Teacher: GOOD JOB

Episode Seven

Episode 7 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the concurrent upper-intermediate group in the first session.

Hossein: chetore begim lotfan medadeto bede (can we say please give me your pen) mm na behtare begim (no it's better to we say) (10) may you lend me your pen?
Farid: sab kon (wait) excuse me I lost my pen may you lend me you pen
Teacher: $

Episode Eight

Episode 8 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the concurrent upper-intermediate group in the middle session.

Amir: (14) thank you for your invitation
Pouya: thank you for your invitation, dear friend
Teacher: ah-ha
Amir: thank you for your invitation, dear friend but:
Pouya: but (.) I can't come
Teacher: well-done

Episode Nine

Episode 9 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the concurrent upper-intermediate group in the final session.

Sonia: (5) bia beghim ghorbunet beram (let's say i cherish you) (.) this is kind of you
Faezah: it's ok: then we can say: enjoy it (.) ok? ↑
Teacher: (hh.hm) $
Sonia: don't mention it ↑
Faezeh: A family friend compliments your cooking after dinner by saying, "Your food is so delicious. You're a fantastic cook: i cherish you this is kind of you↑ enjoy it's don't mention it↓ Is that ok↑
Teacher: OK $

Episode Ten

Episode 10 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the cumulative pre-intermediate group in the first session.

Reza: (20) Mmmmm. I'm sorry, I cannot come.
Teacher: Too frank↑
Reza: (30) Mmmm:
Teacher: Bearing in mind that he is your BOSS:
Amir: Ohh:
Teacher: You should use an appropriate expression for addressing your teacher.

Episode Eleven

Episode 11 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the cumulative pre-intermediate in the middle session.

Tahereh: is it ok↑
Teacher: Alireza↑who is your addressee:
Alireza: (10) Wow: we were very FRANK (hh.hm) we didn't make any PROMISE
Teacher: well done $

Episode Twelve

Episode 12 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the cumulative pre-intermediate group in the final session.

Azin: thanks a lot you have beautiful eyes im happy you think so:↓
Teacher: GREAT
Raena: (8) shoma mashaallh khodetun zibaeid (masha Allah you are beautiful)
Azin: hala shod: (now it's ok)

Episode Thirteen

Episode 13 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the cumulative intermediate group in the first session.

Hamid: Suppose you have been absent from previous session, and you have not understood a specific part on your own. How would you ask your teacher to give a brief explanation about that part↑ ostad mishe darse jalaseie ghabl ro tekrar konid (professor may you repeat the subject of the last session?↑
Elham: (5) of course we should say sorry↑
Teacher: who is your ADDRESSEE ↑
Hamid: chi begim? (what should we say?)↑
Elham: Suppose you have been absent from previous session, and you have not understood a specific part on your own. How would you ask your teacher to give a brief explanation about that part: vaisa: (be patient:) (20) yadame ye mokaleme to ketab bud ke darkhast az reisesh ro ba koli khahesh va tamna matrah mikard (I remember a conversation in the book where someone made a request to his boss with a lot of requests and reasons)
Teacher: WELL DONE

Episode Fourteen

Episode 14 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the cumulative intermediate group in the middle session.

Teacher: I'm so sorry dear professor I need more time I can't be ready in the coming week (.) God willing I will compensate with a satisfying lecture Ahmad jan is it ok:
Ahmad: dige chi mitunim ezfe konim ba tavajo be sharayet va mkhatab (what else we can add by considering addressee and situation) ↑

Episode Fifteen

Episode 15 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the cumulative intermediate group in the final session.

Sina: Well I say (.) I love it too
Teacher: Great.

Episode Sixteen

Episode 16 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the cumulative upper-intermediate group in the first session.

Teacher: AND:
Shadi: I acknowledge that you have enough on your plate right this moment
Fataneh: I know that you have other priorities, and it's so hard to change your program↓

Episode Seventeen

Episode 17 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the cumulative upper-intermediate group in the middle session.

Sahar: You feel very tired and are not in a good mood. One of your close friends the same age as you invite you to the movies with him/her this evening to make you feel

better. However, you'd prefer to stay home and rest. What would you say?↑
Neda: (hh.hm) (5) he is a CLOSE FRIEND ↑
Teacher: GREAT↑

Episode 17 portrays a lively and collaborative exchange among Neda, Sahar, and their teacher, focusing on the art of politely declining an invitation from a close friend.

Episode Eighteen

Episode 18 is an example of the collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the cumulative upper-intermediate group in the final session.

Bahar: Your friend is visiting your newly-built/bought house and says, "What a beautiful house:↓(5) don't mention it
Narges: to me it's GREAT↑
Teacher: $

Appendix D: Transcription Key

Partially adopted from Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) and Wong and Waring (2010)

Symbol	Name	Description
(1.8)	Timed Pause	Numbers enclosed in parentheses indicate a pause. The number represents the length of the pause in seconds.
?	Rising Intonation	Question mark expresses slight rising intonation (and sometimes questions).
.	Falling Intonation	A dot shows slight falling intonation.
::	Sound Prolongation	Colon(s) means prolonging of sound and the number of colons shows the length of the extension.
↑	High Pitch	High pitch on the word.
↓	Low Pitch	Low pitch on the word.
(hh.hm)	Audible Exhalation	Audible exhalation of air.
(.)	Micro-pause	Micro-pause (0.2 second or less).
(0.4)	Timed Silence	Numbers in parentheses demonstrate length of silence in tenths of a second.
(word)	Uncertain Hearing	Words in parenthesis show transcriptionist doubt.
$	Smiley Voice	Smiley expression of utterances.
WORD	Increased Volume	Capital letters show loud speech.