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Abstract

Dynamic Assessment (DA) has received a considerable amount of attention in SLA studies since 1990. Different communicative models have addressed pragmatic competence as a vital component in these models. Despite the importance of DA and Pragmatic competence, the relationship between these two areas has been partially explored. To address this issue, the present study intended to explore the effect of dynamic assessment on Iranian EFL learners’ pragmatic comprehension accuracy and speed. Toward this, 34 students were selected and classified into two groups, namely, DA and control groups, which were given a pragmatic comprehension listening test. ANCOVA was used to compare pragmatic accuracy and speed between DA and control groups. The results showed that although a significant difference was found in the pragmatic accuracy of the two groups, there was no significant difference in the pragmatic speed of two groups. In fact, the DA group outperformed the control group on the pragmatic accuracy test.
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