

An Investigation of Dynamic Assessment on EFL Learners' Speaking Performance

Dina Irmayanti Harahap¹, Yenita Uswar¹, Winda Syafitri², Lia Agustina³ & Dedi Sanjaya⁴

¹ University of Potensi Utama, Medan, Indonesia

² Politeknik Negeri Medan, Medan, Indonesia

³ State Polytechnic of Malang, Medan, Indonesia

⁴ University College of Yayasan Pahang, Kuantan, Malaysia

Correspondence: Dina Irmayanti Harahap. English Language Education Department, University of Potensi Utama, Medan, North Sumatera, Indonesia. E-mail: dinairmayanti4@gmail.com

Received: May 9, 2023

Accepted: October 4, 2023

Online Published: November 8, 2023

doi:10.5430/wjel.v14n1p121

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n1p121>

Abstract

This research investigates the effect of DA on increasing students' English-speaking performance as Foreign Language (EFL) learners in university. The research used a qualitative method involving four university learners from different faculties in the first semester. The participants received the same treatments through tests, self-evaluation, feedback and knowledge expansion, and semi-structured interviews. The instruments used in this research aim to analyze the learners' non-fluency and mastery problems. The finding showed some positive attitudes of DA on EFL learners' speaking performance. In interviews, learners showed positive experiences and attitudes toward DA since it served them as a comfortable, structured, practical, and meaningful platform to recognize their speaking behaviours, weaknesses, strength, and needs. Furthermore, it also helped them to get objective feedback with less anxiety. The researchers conclude that DA can be applied as a primary alternative assessment to increase English speaking performance.

Keywords: dynamic assessment, EFL Learners, speaking performance

1. Introduction

There was still a phenomenon that learning the language of English was challenging. It makes an educator and evaluator still need clarification about implementing an assessment to assess the learners' performance. In common, some educators and evaluators still implement assessment with an evaluator-centred approach in the educational system. Another indication of how challenging it is for learners to learn English is that most Indonesian students cannot speak it, despite having studied it for more than six years and reaching 17 (Pratolo, 2017). It means that there were crucial problems with the teaching and learning process. Ramdani & Rahmat (2018) found that some university students who struggled to speak English also encountered these problems.

In the 21st century, learners must have some skills, such as critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, communication, information, media, technology, skills, flexibility, leadership, initiative, productivity, and social skills. Those skills require an advanced level of speaking skills in mastery and performance. In short, speaking skills performance plays an essential role in the 21st century. "English as lingua franca" makes the English language speaking an indispensable part of these skills. With the advent of communicative language teaching, speaking skills performance is more emphasized in language classrooms. There are various definitions of speaking skills; however, broadly, speaking performance includes an interactive process in which learners produce, receive and process information while conveying and constructing the meaning (Brown, 1994). The definition above highlighted that speaking is an interactive and live process regarding physical and mental states. (Richards, 2006) defined the speaking skills process as the speaker's use of natural language in meaningful interaction. Additionally, Richard (2006) emphasizes comprehensible ongoing interaction between interlocutors despite speakers' communicative competence limitations.

The most common way to examine the EFL learners' knowledge, especially in speaking performance, can be done by using an assessment. In the Educational system, assessment is a method used to gauge a student's understanding of a specific topic (Black & William, 2018). The speaking performance assessment process in language teaching is complicated and intricate regarding both assessors and assesses (O'Sullivan, 2006). Cowen (2005) assessed that a vital way to identify uncertainty and gaps between what students are learning and what the teacher is teaching about a particular topic or material. Good assessment planning should get to the core of students' difficulties, where assessment makes students more comfortable with learning, honest about their weaknesses, more comfortable with the messiness of the material they are exposed to, and more enthusiastic about learning.

Assessing Indonesian EFL learners from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds can be challenging for assistants and educators. One of the assessments that can be given to examine the EFL learners, especially on their speaking performance, is Dynamic Assessment (DA).

For this reason, many scoring instruments are used to evaluate students' speaking and oral performances, such as checklists and two dominant types of rubrics, which are analytic and holistic. Standardized and dynamic assessments are seen as a dichotomy in language pedagogy similar to the field of education. (Daneshfar & Moharami, 2018) said that the lack of student immersion in the pedagogy and Lev Vygotsky's concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) led to the establishment of Dynamic Assessment (DA). In order to determine that the learners are making significant and constant progress in their learning process, the tasks or activities should be set for every learner (Veresov, 2004).

ZPD (Zone Proximal Development) is the difference between what a learner cannot do without help and what they can do while being facilitated by their educator, peer or other classroom resources (Veresov, 2004). The zone in which a learner's potential to learn appears through their interaction with the facilitator. The interaction between the learner and their facilitator is defined as a dynamic assessment (Bekka, 2010). DA facilitates the EFL learners' problems and their learning process individually. So, the core purpose of DA is to assess an individual's learning potential through interactions. Based on the reality above, this research is designed to answer the following questions:

- a. How does DA facilitate EFL learners' speaking performance?
- b. What are the learners' attitudes toward DA?

1.1 Dynamic Assessment

Dynamic Assessment (DA) is an assessment which interactively applied to education and ancillary occupations. DA is the product of a psychologist, Lev Vygotsky, which identifies a child's learning potential and skills to explore the feasibility of dynamic assessment procedures in English as a foreign language course (Kozulin & Garb, 2002). Vygotsky puts DA on the Zone Proximate Development (ZPD). Vygotsky did not use the term DA when discussing the importance of differentiating between diagnostic and prognostic testing in educational and laboratory settings on human cultural development. (Luria, 1961) one of Vygotsky's most prominent colleagues "contrasts statistical with dynamic techniques to assessment". Even though it is based on good psychometric concepts, Luria argues that the former needs to be revised because it believes that a person's test results indicate their full potential. If you want to get a whole picture, you need to know two other things: the person's performance with support from someone else and the amount to which they may profit from this aid not only on the same task or test but also multiple tasks or tests.

DA is a technique that examines the effects of an intervention in the prologue to their critical analysis of the research on DA since Luria's publication. Interventions like this are designed to help students improve their scores on specific questions or the whole test. The final score may be based on the difference between the pre-test and post-test scores (before and after learning), or it may be based only on the post-test score. While this is a more systematic explanation of DA than Luria provides, it must capture the full impact of Vygotsky's conception of progression in the ZPD. Vygotsky's development was not limited to a particular task or test, as Luria's remarks demonstrated; instead, it must consider the individual's capacity to transfer what has been absorbed via mediation beyond the present task to subsequent tasks.

In second-language teaching, DA can describe learners' practical and emergency abilities more profoundly and richly so that the program can design personalized teaching plans according to learners' needs (Antón, 2009). Nowadays, DA has been used in different clinical and educational groups and has been found to reflect learners' learning potential more accurately than static testing. At the same time, the DA approach helps assess the outcomes of cognitive education programs aimed at improving "learning how to learn" skills (Tzuriel, 2000). On the other hand, interactive DA in EFL classrooms can produce information about the language process. This information contributed to English foreign language learners' learning and found that Interactive DA has the potential to promote English language learning and support English teaching (Lin, 2010). It can be seen that DA is widely used in education.

The method of DA in dialect education emphasizes the method of learning, the intrigued of learners, and the learners' experiences along the method of DA sessions. The learners feel that not being judged by scores or the last choice of a test amid their ongoing improvement is essential in DA. Concerning this matter, (Narciss and Huth cited in Hasim, Di & Barnard, 2018) proposed that input ought to not generally conversation almost rectify erroneous replies but maybe, for the most part, talks around recommendations, inspirations and methodologies based on learners' interface and encounters in progressing capacity. Teo (2018) moreover, testing is fair as an apparatus and score; it is fair to a degree driven by judging and labelling. Though, in DA, the learners are arranged to recognize their botches or shortcomings and illuminate them through their inward voice and inventiveness within the intercession preparation. These ways undoubtedly make learning and educating prepare more situated and stream. In DA hones, learners who could get stuck within the test can be prepared with direct instruction, guided hone, and viable methodologies to manage their troubles whereas taking the test. Concerning this agreeable and responsive introduction, DA has been demonstrated to be an intelligent and valuable device for working with such learners (Kozulin, 2021 & Tzuriel, 2020).

Energetic Appraisal features a uniqueness to see not as it were in reverse but moreover forward (Sternberg, 2000) in a process-oriented approach to Appraisal, which is sometimes known as learning potential Appraisal (Dorfler & Golke; Artelt, 2009). It aims to bring around progressed execution through the examiner's help arrangement (or intercession) amid the test. DA claims it advocates that the learners' responsiveness to the intercession is a lot of what they are getting to be able to do as people in the direction to draw learners' cognizant consideration to the test assignment confronted separately (Leung, 2017 & Poehner 2010). In this way, the learner collaborates eagerly with the analyst as the arbiter along the test errand course. Other than that, DA is additionally connected to cause or boost a positive alter

within the learners by reorienting and diverting their capacity to memorize amid the execution of the errand.

DA is more centred on strengthening the person to advance learners' engagement within the evaluation handle (Nazari, 2017). In the meantime, conventional Appraisal more likely prioritizes test scores consistency because its reason may be a summative item which was utilized to compare among people for categorization or classification reasons. In this way, DA gives a tall appraisal capability since it examines learners' learning preparation and uniqueness premise as a person. Table 1 appears the comparison of conventional Appraisal and energetic evaluation.

Table 1. The comparison of traditional assessment and dynamic assessment

Criteria	Traditional assessment	Dynamic assessment
Participation	Passive participants	Active participants
Focus	On product	On process
Examining process	De-contextualized, objective, and standardized	Contextualized, interactive, and individualized/responsive
Role of examiner	Examiner observes	Examiner Participates
Orientation	Retrospective approach	Prospective approach
Interpretation of results	Limit on performance	Learning potential (obstacles and ways to overcome them)

Source: (Baek & Kyoung, 2003; Haywood & Lidz (2006).

Van der Veen, Dobber, & van Oers (2016) found that DA could be a potential appraisal and exceptionally energized to be connected in educating and learning hones. However, this Appraisal has yet to be connected or practised in numerous lessons and learning handles. This issue was developed since there are a few challenges in exchanging or changing the psycholinguistic setting of DA into the classroom setting. At last, there is a stress that the DA's strategy may challenge the unwavering quality and decency of the test (Murphy, 2011).

1.2 Components of Dynamic Assessment

Mediation

All DA procedures involved mediation; the person who provided this mediation was often called the mediator. Vygotsky (1978, p. 86) referred to the mediator as someone who provides adult guidance or a more capable peer. A mediator probes, questions and provides hints to help a learner perform a task within his or her ZPD, which the learner cannot complete alone (Poehner, 2008). With DA, a mediator gains a different understanding of a child's potential abilities than with a non-dynamic test, and the mediator is also able to facilitate development in the child by instructing at the same time as assessing (Feuerstein, 1997).

Mediation can be standardized or non-standardized, depending on the researcher's interpretation of DA. When mediation is standardized, all learners receive the same assisting prompts during an assessment. This approach to DA produces quantitative results and allows researchers to assess the psychometric properties of the assessment better. When mediation is not standardized, a mediator can create assisting prompts based on his or her assessment of the learner's needs. Each learner will receive a different quality and quantity of assistance.

As a result, it is impossible to assess psychometric properties such as validity and reliability in the traditional manner (Poehner, 2008). Results of non-standardized dynamic assessments are qualitative and require a detailed description of the learner. Lantolf and Poehner (2004) proposed the terms "interventionist" and "interactionist" to describe these two approaches to DA.

The critical point in mediation is inter-subjectivity, the formation of shared understanding or view between an expert and a learner in a problem-solving task (Rommetviet 1985, cited in Shabani et al., 2010). Verenikina (2003) stated that inter-subjectivity is considered a critical step in the internalization process as the adult gradually removes the assistance and transfers responsibility to the child. In the zone of proximal development, we look at how a learner's performance is mediated socially, that is, how shared understanding or intersubjectivity has been achieved through moving the learners from their current capabilities to a higher, culturally mediated level of development.

Internalization and transcendence

Internalization is a core concept proposed by Vygotsky and described as the —mechanism through which control of our natural mental endowments is established (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 153). At first, a person can only complete tasks that lie within their ZPD with the assistance of a more competent peer. As a result of interaction with this peer, and as long as the task was within the learner's ZPD, he or she should be able to internalize the assistance and complete the task alone eventually. This concept emerges from Vygotsky's theory that every psychological function appears twice, first on the inter-psychological plane through interaction with mediating artefacts and second on the intra-psychological plane within the individual's mind. Internalization is the development of the ability to carry out the mental plan activities that before could only be carried out inter psychologically (Galperin, 1992, cited in Davin, 2011). In his genetic law of development, Vygotsky expressed that before any higher mental functions become internal. It has to go through an external social stage in its development. Therefore, what is known as internalization is the process through which the function, which is at first social, becomes an internal function. The role of social mediation in internalization is strongly emphasized in sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978).

Transcendence or transfer is the second important component of DA which, in Feuerstein's approach to DA, is the Mediated Learning Experience (MLE). Feuerstein used this term to indicate that interaction had a purpose beyond the immediate need that elicited the interaction. An MLE interaction aims to produce long-term effects that result in higher levels of thinking (Feuerstein et al., 1997). Hence, in Feuerstein's approach to DA, after the initial training phase, additional tasks are given that become progressively more complex and require the transcendence of previous learning. The multiple transfers' approach was inspired by Brown and her colleagues, who viewed several transfer sessions as a highly desirable design feature of the DA framework and also used in several studies (Ableeva, 2010; Brown & Ferrara, 1985; Campione et al., 1984; Poehner, 2005).

Reciprocity

Two essential actions must be done during the reciprocity to record mediational moves during DA, and the other one is to note how learners respond to mediation. Lidz (1987) pointed out the active role that learners can take in DA interactions by realizing the importance of learner reciprocity. Before her research, the focus mainly centred on the quality of mediation. Lidz indicated that different learners respond to identical mediation prompts in different ways, in varying quantities and qualities. A learner's feelings toward a mediator can affect the learner's responsiveness and performance. Van Der Aalsvoort and Lidz (2002) developed a scale to capture these dimensions. The scale included responsiveness to the mediator, self-regulation of attention and impulses, comprehension of activity demands, and reaction to challenge. When using a qualitative approach, the mediator often includes observations and commentary on these dimensions to create a more complete picture of the learner. Poehner (2008) elaborated upon the work of Van Der Aalsvoort and Lidz and focused his analysis on five forms of reciprocity: negotiating mediation, using a mediator as a resource, creating opportunities to develop, seeking mediator approval and rejecting mediation. He expressed that "the signification of a given reciprocating act such as requesting mediator assistance can only be appropriately interpreted by contextualizing it within the mediator-learner dialogue (p. 53). Recording the context in which a learner rejects the assisting prompt of a mediator reveals much more than simply stating that the learner rejected mediation on two occasions. His work included experts from DA interactions so readers can contextualize reciprocating acts within the dialogue (Poehner, 2008).

1.3 Interactionist DA Vs Interventionist DA

Feuerstein's interactionist model

In this model, Feuerstein completely combines evaluation and guidance so that both are inseparable from the other (Poehner, 2008). Erstein & Feuerstein (2001) believe that human cognitive ability is not static and could be customized or improved through intervention. Therefore, general assumptions about the normal distribution of conventional models of psychometrics and intelligence are controversial. Such a significant problem is the cultural differences in the assessment (Lidz, 1983). Feuerstein's medium Learning Experience (MLE) model changed the stimulate-response method by cooperating with a more knowledgeable friend, who helped students select, change, strengthen and explain objects through the intermediary (Kozulin & Pressisen, 1995). Poehner (2008) also believed that this teaching model is different from other teaching models as it emphasizes ways for learners to learn to obtain more information. It seeks to improve the ability of learners to acquire essential skills and to find successful solutions to problems.

Brown's interventionist model

This model is based on the number of prompts needed to get the desired answer. Gutierrez (2000) asserted that the potential of students' learning is defined as a score that can achieve the required number of tips and the degree of learning to transfer to other tasks to predict. As Poehner (2008) thought, Brown's interventionist model and Feuerstein's interaction model are different because, in Brown's DA model, mediation is implied by the intermediary command to the most specific mediation and ends with an accurate response. In this model, the tests run in a roughly standardized way. If the student fails to complete the task successfully, the teacher will provide him/her with the tips he/she needs.

Table 2. Dynamic Testing Approaches

Approach and Developer	Method	Target Population	Format	Context	Outcome
Structural Cognitive Modifiability (Feuerstein)	Learning Potential Assessment Device (LPAD)	All individuals needing modification	Test-train-test	Outside of school	Structural cognitive changes
Prompt Approach (Brown)	Hinting procedure	Low-achieving students	Pre-test-mediated learning static testing and transfer testing-mediated maintenance and transfer.	Specific domains/ subjects	Measure of ZPD

The Interactionist Dynamic Assessment (DA), also called Feuerstein Interactionist Model, is a language teaching model that integrates assessment and instruction dialectically (Poehner, 2008). This model is based on a qualitative interpretation of Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which focuses on helping learners perform what they cannot do independently and develop their abilities to the next level through assistance and interactions with the mediator (Feuerstein & Feuerstein, 2001). Poehner (2008) believed that this teaching model emphasizes ways for learners to obtain more information since it aims at improving learners' abilities to acquire language skills and working on solving relevant problems. The interventionist model, also called Brown Interventionist Model, is based on the number of prompts needed to get the desired answer where the learner's potential is compared to specific scores (Gutierrez, 2000). In this

model, learners are required to achieve several tips. Therefore, the two models are different. Poehner (2008) said that the teacher's command implies mediation in the interventionist DA model and ends with an accurate response. This model provides the needed tips if a student fails to perform a task successfully.

1.4 Dynamic Assessment and Language Education

The development of two approaches to DA has occurred since Luria introduced instruction as mediation and evaluation are combined into a single action to identify learning potential and support growth in the wake of this potential in both directions. When a test is being completed item by item, one option is to use interventionist DA to provide learners with a defined set of clues and hints that have been prefabricated in advance and presented to them as they go through the exam. This scale of implicit to explicit mediation is used to organize the recommendations. It is based on the assumption that learners can respond appropriately to an implicit form of mediation; they have already achieved more significant control over the educational object than if they require more direct assistance. Interventionist DA has a particular benefit since the mediation is not personalized to the responsiveness of individual Learners.

The mediation gets clearer if the second effort does not result in a satisfactory response is not correct. Let us consider which rows are the most relevant to the ones that you are attempting to finish in the first place. The fifth and final kind of mediation gives the proper response and explains why the answer is accurate. After that, the exam moves on to the next item. Although the LLT's purpose is to examine linguistic aptitude, the fact that it is based on the ZPD means that aptitude is not a static attribute but rather a dynamic ability that may grow during the same examination intended to assess it. As a result, it is expected that as learners go through the exam, they will need fewer suggestions and less explicit mediation, which will indicate that their language aptitude is increasing.

Uztosun (2020) said that the interactionist in DA prefers "qualitative evaluation of psychological processes and dynamics of their qualitative growth" over "quantitative assessment of psychological processes and dynamics of their qualitative development". Regarding education, Vygotsky & Cole (1978) maintained that we should not measure but understand pupils and that this could only be done via contact and collaboration. Consequently, mediation in interactionist DA cannot be predicted before but must be negotiated with the person and continuously altered according to the learner's responsiveness to the situation. According to Reuven Feuerstein's version of DA, known as the mediated learning experience (MLE), the traditional examiner/examinee roles are abandoned in favour of a teacher-student relationship in which both individuals work toward the ultimate success of the learner.

1.5 Dynamic Assessment and Speaking Performance

A justification for the investigation of DA for L2 speaking might be argued that speaking is usually considered one of the most important skills by L2 learners, who may consider L2 speaking equal to success in acquiring the language (Richards, 2008). However, the ability to speak in L2 is a very complicated and multi-dimensional process for pre-intermediate EFL learners who need more opportunities to produce output (Bygate, 2009). Pre-intermediate or not proficient EFL learners cannot revise and edit the output as speaking is usually transient, unpredictable and occurs in real-time (Bailey, 2006). Regarding assessment, all language skills and components are essential, and speaking is no exception. Due to its importance, speaking has recently been subject to numerous studies (e.g., Marashi & Dolatdoost, 2016; Wahyurianto, 2018; Yufrizal, 2018).

Speaking is a significant skill in second language learning since the ability to communicate in a foreign language lies at the heart of foreign language learning (Marashi & Dolatdoost, 2016). The two main components of speaking are fluency and accuracy. Fluency is "the ability to keep going when speaking spontaneously with all available linguistic resources and regardless of grammatical mistakes" (Gower et al., 2005, p. 100). Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005, p. 139) consider fluency "the production of language in real-time without undue pausing or hesitation." Due to the importance of speaking, fluency has been investigated by many researchers (e.g., Syamdianita et al., 2018; Thomson, 2018; Wahyurianto, 2018; Yufrizal, 2018). Accuracy is "the extent to which the language produced in performing a task conforms to target language norms" (Ellis, 2003, p. 339). Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005, p. 139) defined accuracy as "how well the target language is produced concerning the rule system of the target language". Like fluency, accuracy has also been the subject of many studies (e.g., Navidinia et al., 2018; Pourdana & Bahram, 2017; Toni et al., 2017).

Quite relevant to the title of the present study, Ebadi & Asakereh (2017) investigated the effect of DA on the development of speaking skills. Microgenetic and thematic analyses were employed to probe any possible changes in the participants' cognition development regarding speaking performance. The findings showed a significant impact on the development of the participant's cognition and movement toward further self-regulation and the findings of the thematic analysis of the participants' satisfaction with DA. Another study Ebrahimi (2015) revealed that implementing DA to enhance oral proficiency improved complexity and accuracy, but mediation through DA did not affect fluency. However, DA has gained a lot of interest and attention in all educational contexts in general and in applied linguistics in particular.

2. Method

This research used a qualitative method involving four university learners from different faculties in the first semester. An open-ended interview was utilized in the interventionist dynamic assessment process. Their ages are varied from 17 to 21 years old. They all were supposed to have the same educational background. The qualitative data in this research were analyzed through the content analysis method. Themes and codes were created and used while analyzing the qualitative data collected through the interviews.

2.1 Participants

The participants of this research were university learners who were selected using a purposive sampling technique. The researchers investigated four EFL learners as participants. The participants were also the first-semester of university learners from the same English education department classes at a Medan private university.

2.2 Instruments

In this research, the researchers applied descriptive-qualitative research instruments for collecting the data (Cresswell, 2014). Qualitative instruments included stimulating information, pre-test, post-test, feedback and knowledge expansion, and semi-structured interviews. Meanwhile, the data was in the form of profound elaboration or description rather than numbers (Punch, 2014). Participants' speaking performances in DA sessions were video-recorded (with the participant's permission). Each participant watched the video of themselves and immediately did the task. So the participants could follow their thinking process and apply it verbally. Pre-test and post-test were employed not for scoring. Nevertheless, to obtain the speaking records and transcriptions to be analyzed in the self-correction and self-feedback sessions and as the sources of mediator's analysis and feedback toward the learners. The semi-structured interviews are employed to gather further information based on their verbal self-report. The participants were asked to have self-evaluation as the supporting information to be inserted or cross-referenced with other data to get valid data.

2.3 Procedures

During the DA sessions, the participants were given a speaking test to measure their performance in speaking. Then, the researcher classified the error and non-fluency of their works. Then, the researchers noticed the participant's difficulties by asking them to self-evaluate their insight problems, gaps, or difficulties after the tests. Meanwhile, the participants' attitude toward DA was measured through individual oral interviews. The semi-structured interviews were employed and recorded for data collection. The researchers classified the participants' data through coding. The results of the interviews showed apparent aspects concerning participants' difficulties, non-fluency, needs, ability, and insight into their attitude toward the DA. Then, the researchers provided speaking encouragement during DA through knowledge expansion and feedback regarding learners' behaviours, routines, and other specific features or characteristics that influence their development in speaking performance. Before training them for the speaking task in DA sessions, they were provided information about DA, the objectives, processes and time frame. Unexpectedly, the participants had well-prepared to cooperate with the researchers to answer the interview questions.

2.4 Data Analysis

The qualitative data of this research were categorized based on the criteria of fluency and non-fluency participants. The participants were informed that all parts of the speaking pre-test and post-test during the DA sessions were not for evaluative purposes. The criteria of non-fluency are filled pause, repetition, retraced false start, and interjection. The data from participants' non-fluency, self-reflection, attitude while accepting knowledge expansion, and feedback are analyzed, coded, and categorized to recognize participants' strengths, weaknesses, and needs in speaking skills. Besides that, the data from participants' interviews and further self-reflections are also coded and categorized to get a deeper description of participants' change, motivation, effort, and development in their performance in speaking skills. Selective and open coding was employed to recognize the critical points of participants' language, reason, difficulties, routine, and efforts (Cohen, 2011).

3. Results

3.1 The Participants' Improvements in Speaking Performance in DA Sessions

During DA sessions, the qualitative data showed some improvements in participants' speaking performance. The participants were more concerned about their non-fluency problem. Their confidence in speaking increased significantly, and they got used to encouraging themselves to speak openly based on their thoughts. Furthermore, the participants believed that DA encouraged them to be more careful in every step of treatment and assessment during DA sessions, especially in making repetitions, filling, retracing false starts, and interjections. The results of the participants speaking performance can be seen in their following statement regarding the first research problem:

P1 = (SW) I feel my speaking performance improved since the session gave me some chances to fix my non-fluency in speaking. Right now, I know how to analyze my mistakes and change my speaking methods later.

P2 = (DA) I know my mistake now; I make many mistakes, such as filling in and repeating particular words while speaking English.

P3 = (IG) During the self-correction and feedback session, it makes me understand how to use coherence between sentences in my speaking.

In addition, a participant stated that DA contributed to his/her perception and believed that speaking English could be improved easily if there was immediate feedback on what they had done and treated consistently. This perception can be seen in the following statement:

P4 = (NK) I understand faster since I have some chances to correct my mistakes directly and get much feedback related to what I should improve

Based on the previous statements, it was also in line with Nazari (2017), who said that learners must feel free to make mistakes and practising their oral performances; their mistakes can be corrected immediately so that they will not be an obstacle for learners to

understand and to be understood. Furthermore, there was a view that a learner's mistakes can be a valid confirmation for the assessor or evaluator on which concepts or aspects the learners need to understand (Pratolo,2019). The evidence which showed participants' improvement in speaking was obtained from their non-fluency analysis in the result of pre-test and post-test, self-correction and the correction from the mediator. The treatments were given in the form of feedback on the correction, the test, feedback on further improvement, self-reflection, motivation, and knowledge expansion. Haywood & Lidz (2009) believed that the core of DA's characteristics is its function as a responsive or collaborative model to provide motivation, feedback, and guidance to obtain the finest achievement.

The participant's performance was improved after experiencing the DA session can be seen in the following Table:

Table 3. Non-fluency of participants' speaking performance

Participant s	Non-fluency	Syllables, Words, and Phrases which Showed Non-fluency	Pre-Test	Post-Test
P1 = (SW)	Filled pause	eee, eemm	24x	18x
	Repetition	not thrifty, better if, what they need, it is	9x	6x
	Retraced false start	be give-be given, several of them-many of them, all of their time, to-or	7x	3x
	Interjection	eh	2x	1x
P2 = (DA)	Filled pause	eee, emm, aaa,yeahh	28x	12x
	Repetition	we have to, we we, in, like, for example, will try, with, it is, online, will get	14x	10x
	Retraced false start	have to use-it doesn't matter, without-monday, like-so, have to and we, depend on-if evaluator, one their-one hours, of us-for us, in our-like participants, laptop to-we have, so it is not-but depend, the evaluator-all evaluator, depend-dependent, will make-will waste, so-that is-but,is-was,	12x	5x
	Interjection	when the, will, harmonies, many, there are, to accept, their, I believe that.....	0	0
P3 = (IG)	Filled pause	eee, emm, aaa,yeahh	84x	20x
	Repetition	-	43x	10x
	Retraced false start	when they –and they, when the tea-when the student, as rich-rich people, they are-you wear, when the policy-when the environments, iam-i, their think-their thinking, investyinvestment, then so-then I, a idea-an idea, not only when they not only after, for-from, invest-investatation, and a-and the learner, make-they are made	15x	4x
	Interjection	eh	2x	0
P4 = (NK)	Filled pause	eee, emm, aaa,yeahh	30x	18x
	Repetition	and for,	2x	0
	Retraced false start	about the uniform-the same uniform, the material-this material, about-for example, give-for-and, minimalist-minimize, a make-a good	7x	3x
	Interjection	ou	2	0

Note: P = Participant; x = Times; SW, DA, IG, NK = Participant's initials

The learners' non-fluency was recognized to encourage learners' awareness in overcoming their weaknesses. Recognizing learners' weaknesses in speaking could be obtained through learners' speech or narration. It was in line with Ebadi & Asakareh (2017), which explained that the types and frequency of learners' errors in language were extracted from learners' narration in a test. The researchers provided a speaking test through narration to make a collaborative talk, making the test more comfortable and directed (Mitchell, 2013). As a further consequence, learners could be an analyzer for themselves in solving their non-fluency and improving their speaking performances. In this context, learners' potential development was directed at the problem-solving stage in analyzing their non-fluency under field-expert guidance or in collaboration with lecturers (Vygotsky,1978).

3.2 The Participants' Self-Evaluation on Speaking Performance in DA Sessions

Participants' self-evaluation was conducted to increase their confidence and maintain their responsibility toward their speaking performance in a comfortable way. In facing pre-test and post-test, participants learnt how to explore their learning style and self-control through some assistance in DA sessions. The participants' statements can be seen in the following statements:

P3 = (IG) After listening to the records of my speaking performance in the post-test, my performance on the post-test was better than the pre-test records in many ways, even though I still made some mistakes.

P1 = (SW) My doubt and nervousness decreased, and I can create ways to perform better after finding out my mistakes and how to fix them in a self-evaluation session.

P4 = (NK) I am aware of my speaking performance weaknesses after self-correction on my speaking performance pre-test records and transcription. I find that I always do repetition such as ...like eee., will get....and will try..... Then, I also found that I made I made many mistakes in using conjunction and vocabulary, made me frequently fill in pauses such as ...eeee..., ... umm..., and ...aaaa... during the pre-test.

P2 = (DA) Right now, I know how to manage or cope with my vital mistakes after discovering the causes of my mistakes through self-correction, self-feedback, and direct feedback ...

Those statements above showed some implications of DA sessions on participants' self-evaluation in performing their speaking ability. It was in line with Ebadi & Asakareh (2017) that an inner voice could be developed through assistance during encounters with complex tasks or experiences. The ability of self-evaluation to recognize the problem is a product of self-regulation. Self-regulation created learners' awareness to encourage their responsibility toward their performance. Therefore, assistance to develop learners' inner voice can be provided through self-evaluation to gain self-regulation.

3.3 Feedback and Knowledge Expansion on Participant's Difficulties towards Speaking Performance in DA Sessions

After doing the self-reflection from the participants, the researchers gave feedback to solve the participants' problem based on participants' speaking non-fluency analysis (shown in Table 2) and from their self-reflection. The feedback was collected to recognize the participants' understanding and find the easiest and the most effective strategies to improve their speaking performance. Concerning the problem in speaking performance faced by the participants, the feedback made them open-minded about their weaknesses and what they need to improve. The researchers investigated what the participants' said in their inner voice about their speaking performance during the DA session. In this way, the participants were fully involved in the assessment process. (Sun and Wen, 2018) highlighted that the involvement of learners in the assessment process can increase learners' self-responsibility and autonomy in learning, and it also assists them in analyzing language features more deeply.

Participants' involvement in the assessment process in the form of self-reflection and self-feedback allowed them to be enthusiastic, open-minded and comfortable and to get an opportunity for the evaluator to identify the participants' speaking difficulties deeply. Regarding feedback, Nazari (2017) argued that the implementation of feedback in DA is intensely fair since it provides feedback proportionally or based on participants' needs to accomplish their potential. The Followings are participants' feedback and knowledge expansion reports regarding their difficulties in speaking:

P1 = (SW) I often overthink; I am afraid of making mistakes while speaking, especially in constructing sentences.

P3 = (IG) I always do repetitions and use the double verb. My point is sometimes irrelevant to another point. The vocabularies that I use are too monotonous.

P2 = (DA) I am a little bit confused in using the exact or proper vocabulary while speaking. Meanwhile, the followings are the participant's responses after having Knowledge Expansion and Feedback:

P4 = (NK) The activities motivated me to study hard since I can recognize my own mistake. I also will be more careful about using grammar later. I will try to minimize filled pauses, such as saying eee.. mm.

Based on those participants' statements above, by giving feedback and knowledge expansion, the participants felt encouraged to speak face to face spontaneously, and undoubtedly their capability to speak in a foreign language. Another participant said that their speaking performance was not judged because they felt that DA sessions did not focus on the level or the score they got; instead, it was focused on developing their potential. It is similar to Ningrat & Mayasari (2019), who said that the essential point of learning is the process, not the score of the final result. At last, they believed that when the learning and teaching process works well, it will have more impact on the result.

Q2: What are the learners' attitudes toward DA?

After conducting DA sessions, the participants reported their thought, experience, feeling, and attitude toward DA sessions in the semi-structured interviews. During the interviews, the participants reported that they felt more motivated to speak along the process while participating in the DA session. Most participants reported that they would be pleased if their speaking performance were encouraged through the DA sessions because the sessions provided complete self-improvement and evaluation rather than competition. So, this participant felt that their level of speaking performance would not be judged as a scoring contest. In the DA session, they did not have to think about the other participants' speaking performance but instead focused on their performance and improvement. The participant's responses during the interview can be seen in the following statements:

P2 = (DA) After finding out my improvement in a particular part of my speaking performance, this session enhanced my willingness to practice more based on the steps provided.

P3 = (IG). When I know how to correct my mistakes step by step during the session, I feel encouraged to fix the mistakes that I have found immediately and try to practice again for better results.

P2 = (DA) I am pleased that I could choose any topics for my speaking practices in the session, and I was also triggered to practice my speaking when the mediator gave me a clear example of how to speak well by demonstrating his speech before asking me to perform in the pre-test and post-test session.

P1= (SW) The self-evaluations session gives me more space to explore my unidentified mistakes that I never realized. I can learn how to analyze, correct, and develop my speaking skill by myself through feedback and practices given.

P3 = (IG) I can be involved in making a simple correction for my mistakes through transcriptions provided and ask whatever questions regarding the mistakes I have made in my speech.

P1= (SW) I feel comfortable that the assessment has no score and is conducted one by one; it is more personal, I think. I feel down when my bad English speaking is scored or judged as my final ability. So, I feel not be shy and be compared with other students in the session.

P4 = (NK) I am relieved that the sessions do not give the score for my speech. In this way, I can focus to practice and practice for myself.

P4 = (NK) The session teaches me how to think in sequence or with clear steps to deliver the speech. I thought that I got a lot of practice in this session shortly.

Those conditions above were in line with Shafiee, Talakoob, & Fatahi (2017), who said that the learners needed to feel free to practice their oral production to develop their accuracy. Therefore, they felt they were not being compared or judged with the other participants regarding their speaking performance. The learners naturally needed freedom in synchronous with their self-orientation in learning.

Besides being free with their self-orientation in learning, some participants felt afraid to deal with their mistakes in speaking. They felt afraid of making mistakes in speech, improper words and unorganized sentences, embarrassed to make the same error and filled pauses while speaking. However, after experiencing intensive DA sessions, those participants felt more confident to speak about the topic. Thus, they were not afraid or embarrassed anymore to perform or worry about being labelled or judged about how many mistakes or non-fluency they had made in DA sessions. All of these problems can be seen in the following statements:

P2 = (DA) DA sessions make me easy to fix some errors in my speech because the corrections and feedback were given directly and immediately... I also can ask whatever the question related to my development.

P3 = (IG) Long time ago, I did many filled pauses and repetitions, as I saw in the transcriptions and records of the pre-test. I also see that I often use double verbs improperly. Recognizing these mistakes in the session gave me immediate action to correct and minimize the non-fluency in my speech.

P1= (SW) I am always thinking in my mind about how I make many mistakes in my speech. I am really afraid that my speaking ability is very bad, especially in constructing the sentence in speech. The session served me the opportunity to fix my mistakes and change my mind to not worry about being judged anymore while performing a speech.

P1= (SW) After listening to the records and reading the transcriptions of my speaking performance in the post-test, I can clearly listen and see the improvement in my speech. I see that I only make little mistakes in the transcriptions. My performance was also more active and confident as I listened to the speaking records. I thought that I could manage my mistakes if the steps were clear.

P4 = (NK) The given topics are interesting and have clear steps to explore them; it gives me the willingness to talk about them, especially the optional and free topics.

P3 = (IG) I am afraid of being labelled as a bad English speaker when having a conversation about some topics. But I feel relief when I can fix it and find out that my English speaking was improved as I read and listened to my speaking transcriptions and speaking records in the post-test stage.

It was in line with Teo (2018) regarding labelling; creating a labels for learners will lead to a negative paradigm that low achiever learners remain low in their performance. Therefore, DA is an excellent alternative to improve learners' performance in English speaking. The result also showed that DA encouraged learners' confidence, motivation, and speaking abilities during the sessions. The learners obtained confidence and self-esteem when they discovered some improvement in their language skills caused by DA (Yakisik & Cakir, 2017). The learners felt less pressure and more learning advantage in DA, where learners' performance increases significantly through maintaining suitable mediation in the learning process compared with focusing on the score orientation (Nazari,2017). DA helped the learners to encourage themselves to believe in their existing sources and improve their self-spontaneous or natural learning (Ebadi & Asakereh, 2017).

During the interview in DA sessions, one participant reported that the sessions should be conducted consistently and with a well-structural session as part of the teaching and learning process. This report showed participants' good portrayal that DA sessions had increased positively. It showed that the more the participants participated in DA sessions, the more they expected to improve themselves as they felt closer to a fluent lecturer. The participants also stated that it enabled them to recognize their mistakes or speaking errors. All these findings showed that strong learners' attitudes toward the application of DA can be seen in learners' positive reflections in the following statements:

P3 = (IG) I thought that this session should be applied as frequently as possible to get a better performance for my speech.

P4 = (NK) This session provides me with a lot of experience of how to recognize or identify my mistakes in performing speaking.

P2 = (DA) Many things I can learn in this session. First, I learn how to select the proper vocabulary in a particular context. Second, I learn how to overcome my repetition during performing speaking. Third, I learn how to construct a well-speech structure with

proper coherence among the paragraphs. Fourth, I learn how to get a fluency booster through body gestures in comfortable ways. So this way helps me to minimize the non-fluency of my speech.

P2 = (DA) I have a chance to learn about making an analysis of my speaking ability through the records and speaking transcriptions.

P1= (SW) Personally, I thought that my lecturers can use this session to get deeper identification on their students' development and improvement in speaking performance. Even it is participants' expectation toward DA intensively benefited learning styles.

All the reports above showed how participants' expectation toward DA intensively benefited their speaking performance, regarding the positive attitude reflected by the participants.

4. Discussion

The discussion from the analysis of non-fluency speaking performance across the pre-test and post-test results showed a noticeable improvement in the participants' performance. There were significant differences in speaking non-fluency of all participants' performance. At the post-test, the first participant showed there was a nine times difference in non-fluency and doing interjection one time. Moreover, repetition and retraced false starts were almost the same. Meanwhile, the second, third, and fourth participants showed more significant non-fluency differences. For example, the filled pause that the second participant had made had dropped to twelve times, the third participant dropped to twenty times, and the last participant had dropped to eighteen times. Furthermore, the third participant showed the highest repetition difference, with a difference of forty-three times. All of these data and analysis showed a significant improvement in participants speaking performance, which was encouraged through DA as seen in Table 3 (the difference of participants' non-fluency in speaking performance).

During the pre-test and post-test, researchers assisted participants in evaluating their speaking through transcription and their speaking record. The participants were expected to reflect on what they were speaking about and the error they had made. The researchers provided specific instructions for the participants to do self-reflection or self-evaluation. After the participants evaluated themselves, researchers immediately asked them to tell what they felt, needed, should do, their lack, and their satisfaction regarding the level of their achievement in speaking performance. In the pre-test, two participants were satisfied since they could recognize their mistakes clearly from their speaking transcription and record provided by researchers. The statements of participants' self-evaluation described participants' points of view of what they had done in DA sessions. Previously, most participants needed to realize which part of their weaknesses occurred and how to deal with them. However, after having a self-evaluation session, participants got a clear description of what their weaknesses are and where their weaknesses specifically occur. Thus, these matters helped them to have self-awareness of their weaknesses.

During the DA session, the participants were given reasonable strategies and knowledge to overcome difficulties based on their interests and needs. Providing knowledge expansion is very beneficial for the participants' preparation for performing a speech. They were inherently not afraid anymore since the process of speaking performance was prepared appropriately. In this context, the mediator gave the learners a clear introduction about performing speaking and some materials. The mediator also provided a well-organized procedure for performing speaking and provided the opportunity for the learners to correct themselves. As a result, it made the learners more responsible for their mistakes without feeling judged by the mediator. The learners were more curious and enthusiastic to express or ask directly to their mediator what they needed and what they should do to reduce filled, reduce repetition, and retraced false starts while speaking. In this way, the implementation of DA extremely encouraged learners' potential based on their ZPD. In other words, the engagement could be more effective when the learners' potential orientation aligned with their ZPD regarding their needs, interest, self-regulation and ability (Shafiee, 2014).

5. Conclusion

Speaking skill is perceived as one of the challenging skills in the foreign language learning process, and it is generally neglected in language classrooms by teachers and students due to various factors (Çetin et al., 2017). Students' speaking ability is affected by physical, psychological and environmental factors, and these factors affect students' oral performance positively or negatively (Çetin et al., 2018). In traditional tests of speaking skills, the student is expected to talk about a given topic in a given time. At this point, the dynamic assessment in Vygotsky's sociocultural theory provides mediation and scaffolding to language learners and combines assessment and instruction (Vygotsky, 1978).

The Dynamic Assessment affects university EFL learners who have faced difficulties, especially in performing English speaking. It is necessary to be concerned since there was no significant attempt of speaking class to apply DA for EFL learners at a previous time. The result showed that DA significantly facilitates participants to improve their speaking performance. The participants showed that they boosted their inner self-esteem on their speaking performance and showed their attention to their improvement. Moreover, this statement was supported by evidence from participants' self-evaluation and feedback. Participants firmly stated that DA session could be their learning platform for improving their speaking performance.

Acknowledgments

We greatly appreciate the valuable contribution of our Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM) who had given us a chance to write this article. We would also like to thank the Potensi Utama Foundation and every team member who took the time to participate in this study.

Authors contributions

Dina Irmayanti Harahap was responsible for research design and revising. Yenita Uswar was responsible in data analysis & drafting the manuscript. Winda Syafitri and Lia Agustinawere responsible in data collection and analysis. Dedi Sanjaya contributed in revising the article based on reviewers' comments and suggestions and editing the manuscript based on the editors' comments and suggestions. All authors read and approved the paper for publication. All authors contributed equally to complete the research and article.

Funding

This work was supported by University of Potensi Utama Foundation as the partial fulfillment of the requirements for lecturer performance obligation and as the obligation for the standard of accreditation for our institution.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Sciedu Press.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

Open access

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

References

- A. R. Luria. (1961). Study of the abnormal child. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. A Journal of Human Behavior*, 31, 1-16.
- Ableeva, R. (2010). Dynamic assessment of speaking comprehension in second language learning. Pennsylvania State University.
- Anton, M. (2009). Dynamic assessment of advanced second language learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42, 576-598. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2009.01030.x>
- Baek, S. G., & Kyoung, J. K. (2003). The effect of dynamic assessment-based instruction on children's learning. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 4(2), 189-198. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03025361>
- Bailey, K. M. (2006). Issues in teaching speaking skills to adult ESOL learners. *Review of Adult Learning and Literacy*, 6(2), 113-164. Retrieved from http://imgs.khuyenmai.zing.vn/files/tailieu/tieng-anh-ngoai-ngu/ky-nang-nghetieng-anh/comings_ch5_6609.pdf.
- Bekka, K. G. (2010). Dynamic assessment for learning potential: A shift in the focus and practice of evaluating Japanese oral proficiency. *Japanese Journal of Education*, 10, 53-66.
- Black, P., & William, D. (2018). Classroom assessment and pedagogy. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 25(6), 551-575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807>
- Brown, A. L., & Ferrara, R. A. (1985). Diagnosing zones of proximal development. *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives*, 273-305. Pennsylvania State University.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching By Principles: an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Bygate, M. (2009). Teaching and testing speaking. In M. H. Long, & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The Handbook of language teaching* (pp. 412-440). New Jersey: Wiley Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444315783.ch23>

- Campione, J. C., A. L. Brown, R. A. Ferrera, & N. R. Bryant. (1984). The Zone of Proximal Development: Implications for Individual Differences and Learning. In Poehner, M. E. (2005), *Dynamic assessment of oral proficiency among advanced L2 learners of French*. The Pennsylvania State University. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.23219842308>
- Cohen, L. et al. (2011). *Research Method in Education* (7th ed). London and New York: Routledge Falmer, 2011.
- Cowen J. (2005). *Designing assessment to enhance student learning*. Retrieved from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/ps/documents/practice_guides/practice_guides/ps0069_designing_assessment_to_improve_physical_sciences_learning_march_2009.pdf
- Cresswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (4th ed.). London: SAGE, 2014.
- Daneshfar, S., & Moharami, M. (2018). Dynamic Assessment in Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory: Origins and Main Concepts. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(3), 600-607. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0903.20>
- Davin, K. J. (2011). *Group dynamic assessment in an early foreign language learning program: Tracking movement through the zone of proximal development—University of Pittsburgh*.
- Dorfler, T., Golke, S., & Artelt, C. (2009). Dynamic assessment and its potential for the assessment of reading competence. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 35(2), 77-82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2009.10.005>
- Ebadi, S., & Asakereh, A. (2017). Developing EFL learners' speaking skills through dynamic assessment: A case of a beginner and an advanced learner. *Educational Assessment & Evaluation*, 2017(4), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1419796>
- Ebrahimi, E. (2015). The effect of dynamic assessment on complexity, accuracy, and fluency in EFL learners' oral production. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 4(3), 107-123. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2015.982>
- Ellis, R. (2009). The differential effects of three types of task planning on the fluency, complexity, and accuracy in L2 oral production. *Applied Linguistics*, 30, 474-509. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp042>
- Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analyzing learner language*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511526794.008>
- Feuerstein, R., & Feuerstein, R. S. (2001). Is Dynamic Assessment Compatible with The Psychometric Model? In A. S. Kaufman, & N. L. Kaufman (Eds.), *Specific learning disabilities and difficulties in children and adolescents: Psychological assessment and evaluation* (pp. 218-246). New York: CUP.
- Galperin, P. (1992). Linguistic consciousness and some questions of the relationships between language and thought. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 30(4), 28-49. <https://doi.org/10.2753/RPO1061-0405300481>
- Guthke, J. (1992). The learning test concept: origins, state of the art, and trends," in *Interactive Assessment*, H. C. Haywood and D. Tzuriel, Eds., Springer, Berlin, Germany. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-4392-2_3
- Gutierrez, F. (2000). *Dynamic Assessment: An Approach to Assessing Children's Language Learning Potential*. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 21(3), 214-223.
- Hasim, Z., Di, S., & Barnard, R. (2018). Eliciting teachers' understanding and their reported practices on school-based formative assessment: Methodological challenges. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 158-166. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i1.11476>
- Haywood, H. C., & Lidz, C. S. (2006). *Dynamic assessment in practice: Clinical and educational applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607516>
- Kozulin, A. (2001). *Mediated learning experience and cultural diversity*. *Unlocking The Human Potential Conference* (August 18-20, 2001), Royal Crown Conference Centre, Winnipeg, 2001.
- Kozulin, A., & Garb, E. (2002). Dynamic assessment of EFL text comprehension. *School Psychology International*, 23(1), 112-127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034302023001733>
- Kozulin, A., & Pressisen, B. Z. (1995). Mediated learning experience and psychological tools: Vygotsky's and Feuerstein's perspectives in a study of student learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 30(2), 67-75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3002_3
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2004). Dynamic assessment of L2 development: Bringing the past into the future. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 49-72. <https://doi.org/10.1558/japl.1.1.49.55872>
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2011). Dynamic assessment in the classroom: Vygotskian praxis for second language development. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(1), 11-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810383328>
- Leung, C. (2007). Dynamic assessment: Assessment for and as teaching? *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 4(3), 257-278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434300701481127>
- Lidz, C. S. (1991). *Practitioners guide to dynamic assessment'*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Lidz, C. S., & Gindis, B. (2003). Dynamic assessment of the evolving cognitive functions in children. *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*, 99-116. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511840975.007>
- Lidz, C. S., & Pena, E. D. (2009). *Response to intervention and dynamic assessment: Do we just appear to be speaking the same language?"*

- Seminars in Speech and Language, 30(2), 121-133. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0029-1215719>
- Lin, Z. (2010). Interactive dynamic assessment with children learning EFL in kindergarten. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 37(4), 279. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-009-0356-6>
- Marashi, H., & Dolatdoost, M. (2016). ADHD and adolescent EFL learners' speaking complexity, accuracy, and fluency in English. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 4(2), 105-126. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2016.20368>
- Mitchell, R. et al. (2013). *Second language learning theories* (3rd ed). London and New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203770795>
- Murphy, R. (2011). *Dynamic assessment, intelligence, and measurement*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Navidinia, H., Mobaraki, M., & Malekzadeh, F. (2018). Investigating the effect of noticing on EFL students' speaking accuracy. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 83-98. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.1216a>
- Nazari, A. (2017). Dynamic assessment in higher education English language classes: a lecturer perspective. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 7(1), 100-118.
- Nazari, B. (2012). Teach-to-test instruction of dynamic assessment: A critical overview. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching and Learning Language and Literature*, 5(4), 56-68. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.468>
- O'Sullivan, B. (2006). *Modelling Performance in Oral Language Tests: Language Testing and Evaluation*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic Assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting second language development*. Berlin: Springer Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-75775-9>
- Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2005). Dynamic assessment in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(3), 233-265. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168805lr166oa>
- Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2010). Vygotsky's teaching-assessment dialectic and L2 education: The case for dynamic assessment. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 17(4), 312-330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10749030903338509>
- Pourdana, N., & Bahram, M. (2017). Student team achievement divisions (STAD) and improvement of L2 speaking accuracy in mixed-ability EFL classrooms.
- Pratolo, B. W. (2017). "Exploring Indonesian Learners' Beliefs about Language Learning Strategies through Reflection," Figshare. Doctoral Thesis, Monash University, Clayton, Australia, 2017. [Online]. Retrieved from <http://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/159308/adbi-financial-inclusion-asia.pdf>
- Pratolo, B. W. (2019). How Would Our Students Like to Be Corrected? A Study on Learners' Beliefs about Language Learning Strategy. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(3), 274-281. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7342>
- Punch, K. F., & Oancea, A. (2014). *Introduction to Research Methods in Education* (2nd ed). Los Angeles and London: SAGE, 2014.
- Ramdani, J. M., & Rahmat. (2018). Promoting speaking spontaneity in large classes: An action research approach in an Indonesian EFL setting. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 388-401. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i2.13304>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). Second language teacher education today. *RELC Journal*, 39(2), 158-177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688208092182>
- Royal Crown Conference Centre, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.umanitoba.ca/unevoc/conference/papers/kozulin.pdf>
- Shabani, K. (2016). Implications of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory for second language (L2) assessment. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), 1242459. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1242459>
- Shafiee, S. et al. (2018). Effects of dynamic assessment on the acquisition of the rhythm of English: the case of EFL learners' attitudes. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 8(5), 181-191. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n5p181>
- Sternberg, R. J. (2000) Prologue. In C. S. Lidz and J. G. Elliot (Eds.), *Dynamic assessment: Prevailing models and applications*. Amsterdam: JAI.
- Sun, S. G., & Wen, Q. F. (2018). Teacher-student collaborative assessment (TSCA) in integrated language classrooms. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 369-379. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i2.13301>
- Syamdianita, S., Ismail, N., & Nur, D. R. (2018). Pair taping for undergraduate EFL students' speaking fluency and self-confidence. *Script Journal: Journal of Linguistic and English Teaching*, 3(2), 163-174. <https://doi.org/10.24903/sj.v3i2.203>
- Teo, T. W. (2018). Broadening and deepening the dialogue about low achievers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 38(3), 275-278.
- Thomson, W. (2018). *Theory of vibration with applications*. CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780203718841>
- Toni, A., Hassaskhah, J., & Birjandi, P. (2017). The impressibility of speaking accuracy/fluency among EFL undergraduates: A

- meta-analysis. *The Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 10(21), 184-225. Retrieved from http://jal.iaut.ac.ir/article_535822_29ab97998e40c785e85cf7077448559e.pdf
- Tzurriel, D. (2000). Dynamic assessment of young children: Educational and intervention perspectives. *Educational Psychology Review*, 12(4), 385-435. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009032414088>
- Uztosun, M. S. (2020). The development of a scale for measuring the self-regulated motivation for improving speaking English as a foreign language. *7e Language Learning Journal*, 48(2), 213-225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2017.1335766>
- Van der Aalsvoort, G. M., & Lidz, C. S. (2002). Reciprocity in dynamic assessment in classrooms taking contextual influences on individual learning into account. In Davin, K. J. (2011). *Group dynamic assessment in an early foreign language learning program: Tracking movement through the zone of proximal development*. The University of Pittsburgh.
- VanderVeen, C., Dobber, M., & van Oers, B. (2016). Implementing dynamic assessment of vocabulary development as a dialogical learning process: A practice of Evaluator support in primary education schools. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 13(4), 329-340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2016.1235577>
- Verenikina, I. (2003). Understanding scaffolding and the ZPD in educational research. Proceedings of The Joint AARE/NZARE Conference. [viewed 13 Oct 2007]. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/03pap/ver03682.pdf>
- Veresov, N. (2004). Zone of proximal development (ZPD): the hidden dimension? *Language as culture tensions in time and space*, 1, 13-30.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society* in M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, and E. Souberman, (Eds), *The development of higher psychological processes*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Wahyurianto, I. (2018). Using group discussion to improve students' speaking fluency. *Journal of English for Academic and Specific Purposes*, 1(1), 13-21. <https://doi.org/10.18860/jeasp.v1i1.5242>
- Yakisik, B. Y., & Cakir, A. (2017). Dynamic assessment of prospective English teachers' speaking skills. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 22-49.
- Yufrizal, H. (2018). The application of the 4/3/2 technique to enhance speaking fluency of EFL students in Indonesia. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 5(10), 99-107. <https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.510.5265>