

A RESULT AND DISCUSSION OF THE DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT APPROACH IN LANGUAGE TEACHING: A LITERATURE REVIEW STUDY

Nurhafisah

UIN Antasari Banjarmasin, Indonesia
(nhafisah89s@gmail.com)

M. Arinal Rahman

Akademi Maritim Nusantara Banjarmasin, Indonesia
(arinalrahman@gmail.com)

Shahid Rasool

Florida Gulf Coast University, United States
(srasool1201@eagle.fgcu.edu)

Izzah Supeni

Sultan Idris Education University
(izzahsupeni75@gmail.com)

Abstract: *Dynamic assessment is conceptually based on the sociocultural theory of Lev Vygotsky in the Zone Proximal Development. This paper aimed to discuss dynamic assessment in assessing students' reading comprehension. The limitation of this article will only discuss the definition of dynamic assessment, the historical framework of dynamic assessment, teacher roles in dynamic assessment, dynamic assessment in a foreign language, dynamic assessment of writing, dynamic assessment of reading comprehension, and the advantages and disadvantages of dynamic assessment. Based on literature studies, the dynamic assessment approach is effective in English teaching. It can conclude that this approach can be adopted and developed by English teachers to encourage students' motivation and participation in learning English.*

Keywords: *Dynamic assessment; Language teaching; Teacher roles*

First Received:
(May 26, 2022)

Final Proof Received:
(September 30, 2022)

INTRODUCTION

Assessments can appraise students' knowledge and abilities (Matthew E. Poehner, 2007). Assessment is important in teaching and learning to measure students' capability. Moreover, the assessment provides information on the effectiveness of the teaching program employed, students' progress, and their performance in learning (Cameron, 2001; Douglas, 2014). This information can be used to lead to better improvement in teaching and learning. Thus, assessment is essential and inseparable from teaching and learning (O'Malley & Pierce, 1996; Tiara, Rahman, & Handrianto, 2021).

Several assessment forms have been implemented to satisfy the need to evaluate students' development in the teaching and learning process; the most commonly used is

Static Assessment (SA), better known as traditional assessment (Antón, 2009; Birjandi & Ebadi, 2009; Feuerstein, Feuerstein, Falik, & Rand, 2002; Handrianto & Rahman, 2018; Lussier & Swanson, 2005; Mahdavi, 2014; Murphy, 2011). However, an alternative form is to assess students' learning, called Dynamic Assessment (DA), based on Vygotsky's sociocultural theory. This study presents an overview of Dynamic Assessment and its application in language teaching, especially in improving reading and writing skills. As a main result, the literature reveals that implementing DA in writing and reading skills is effective. It works as a functional complement to traditional assessment. However, some factors such as context, number of hours, teachers' competencies, and training have to be considered to ensure the effectiveness of this approach to assessment (Antón, 2009; Birjandi & Ebadi, 2009; Feuerstein et al., 2002; Handrianto & Rahman, 2018; Lussier & Swanson, 2005; Mahdavi, 2014; Murphy, 2011).

The assessment of students' learning constitutes a crucial part of the field of instruction since it is to authenticate the accomplishment of the previously set objectives (Habibullah, 2012; Pernantah, Rizatunnita, Kusnilawati, & Handrianto, 2022). It is conceivable to analyze the method of educating and learning through assessment and then address these issues and give them a conceivable arrangement. In any case, building up the causes of students' learning issues, and working on them, can be a complex task.

Customarily, the foremost common strategy to assess understudies has been Inactive Appraisal (from now on, Static Assessment), which is ordinarily actualized after the learning is handled and isolates testing from education (Rita & Handrianto, 2021). Given the need to measure students' execution across the learning process, Energetic Evaluation (henceforth referred to as Dynamic Assessment) is recommended (Musta'in & Handrianto, 2020). Dynamic Assessment (DA) could be a modern concept within the field of dialect learning, and it rises as a way to alter the conventional evaluation with the thought that appraisal and instructing are indivisible substances. (Nazari, 2012) states that "appraisal and instruction are immovable coordinates as a portion of a single movement as can be seen in DA." Static Assessment (SA) demonstrates that what understudies have learned in differentiating DA makes a difference in distinguishing students' execution based on what they are learning or what they can learn through interaction (Ramadhani, Kenedi, Helsa, Handrianto, & Wardana, 2021; Tabatabaei & Bakhtiarvand, 2014).

Taking past thoughts into thought, the objective of this paper is to depict Dynamic Evaluation and its potential applications in dialect instruction, particularly within the advancement of perusing and composing abilities. The consideration starts by announcing the verifiable system and diverse author's definitions of this concept; at that point, a portrayal of the teacher's part and DA application in the moment and outside dialect

education is displayed. At long last, the consider concentrates on perusing and composing appraisal forms.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Dynamic Assessment

Dynamic assessment is no longer a new psychological and educational assessment; some of its current applications have been around for more than a half-century (Guthke & Wingefeld, 1992). Despite its relatively long history, it is still not widely practiced worldwide (Ibrahim, Hock, Handrianto, Rahman, & Dagdag, 2021; Nengsih, Hendrianto, Pernantah, & Tannoubi, 2022; Ramadhani et al., 2021). In April 2005, 588 literature citations relating to dynamic assessment were listed on www.dynamicassessment.com. The majority of those are recent, suggesting a rapid growth of interest in this topic in the last 10 to 15 years. A much broader search engine (www.google.com) produced 17,800,000 hits for this term; to be sure, the overwhelming majority of these did not relate to "dynamic assessment of learning potential."

According to (Habibullah, Baidawi, Fadilah, & W.S. Alim, 2020), DA is an interactive approach to conducting assessments within the domains of psychology, speech/language, or education that focuses on the ability of the learner to respond to intervention. Others have defined it variously, but the constant aspect of the definition is an active intervention by examiners and assessment of examinees' response to intervention. (Haywood, 1993) suggested that dynamic assessment is a subset of the more generic concept of interactive assessment. He further suggested that "It might be useful to characterize as interactive any approach to psychological or psychoeducational assessment in which the examiner is inserted into an active relationship with a subject and does more than give instructions, pose questions, and record responses (Adam et al., 2022; Sarte, Santiago, Dagdag, & Handrianto, 2021). "Dynamic" should probably be reserved for those approaches in which the interaction is richer, in which there is actual teaching (not of answers but cognitive tools) within the interaction, and in which there is conscious, purposeful, and deliberate effort to produce a change in the subject."

Haywood & Lidz, (2006) defined dynamic assessment as "a subset of interactive assessment that includes deliberate and planned mediational teaching and the assessment of the effects of that teaching on subsequent performance" In current use, the two terms appear to be used interchangeably, together with such others as "dynamic testing" (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2002; Wiedl, 2003) and "learning potential assessment" (Budoff & Friedman, 1964). For further definition, see (Carlson & Wiedl, 1992a), (Carlson & Wiedl, 1992b), (Guthke & Wingefeld, 1992), (Lidz, 1987), and (Tzuriel, 2001). In some sense, all of these approaches are "mediational," but there are other approaches to assessment that

include intervention and response to intervention but are not mediational. These would fit within the broad definition of DA.

Historical Framework of Dynamic Assessment

A historical examination of formal evaluation is essential to present the notion of DA properly. Gould (1996) in (Nazari, 2012) claims that "It was about the late nineteenth century that assessment appeared as a domain of interest for researchers and educators, and standardized assessment was first implemented in the twentieth century". Therefore, during the 1900s, standardized assessment was widespread in the United States, and general intelligence tests were used to evaluate immigrants and new army members. Later on, these tests were also used in education.

According to (Fatemipour & Jafari, 2015), "Static assessment (SA) can only measure the learner's actual level of performance (what they can perform independently) but cannot assess their potential level of performance (what they can perform with assistance)." SA does not care about the particular individuality of students. It focuses on test results without considering the development of students' performance. It also separates instruction from assessment.

In response to the disadvantages of SA, DA appeared. This concept is grounded in the theory of mental development elaborated by the Russian psychologist, L. S. Vygotsky, who produced a vibrant body of work on the nature and development of the human mind (Herwanis, Irham, & Handrianto, 2021; Lantolf & Poehner, 2010). As a result of these studies, Vygotsky presented the Theory of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Vygotsky defines this metaphor as "the difference between what a person can achieve when acting alone and what the same person can accomplish when acting with support from someone else and/or cultural artifacts." (Lantolf, 2000)

Even though DA is based on Vygotsky's theories, it was not established (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004). It was introduced by Vygotsky's colleagues Alexander Luria and popularized by (Feuerstein et al., 2002). Luria (1961) introduced the idea of DA to the western research community. The concept merged the instruction and assessment to re-emerge them as a learning/assessment (Mehri & American, 2015).

During the 1970s, people saw the deployment of DA methods of mental abilities. Feuerstein's studies are part of the results that support this new approach, which prepared the groundwork decades earlier, and (Budoff & Friedman, 1964; Campione, 1989) brought this work to the United States (Murphy, 2011). Additionally, Feuerstein's contribution to DA through the Mediated Learning Experience approach (MLE) developed by him and his colleagues is worth mentioning. "The basic belief of this approach is that people's cognitive

abilities are changeable. MLE is the interaction between the learner and the teacher that ends in the learner's cognitive development" (Arafani, Handrianto, Ucar, & Karneli, 2021; Mahdavi, 2014)

In addition, Carl and Wiedl, between the 1970s and 1980s, provided evidence for the validity of dynamic assessment as an alternative approach, working specifically within the information processing paradigm (Murphy, 2011). During this period, various research groups became prominent under "Dynamic Assessment." Between these groups are the works of (Feuerstein, Falik, Rand, & Feuerstein, 2006).

In the following decades (the 1990s) and early years of the twenty-first century, DA started to take off in South Africa and expand its field of research to different contexts. It is a relatively new approach to second language assessment introduced to second language research and the educational community by (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004).

Teacher's Role in Dynamic Assessment

A scaffolding process from teachers to support students' learning is a characteristic of this assessment. (Tabatabaei & Bakhtiarvand, 2014) point out that the role of the teacher in DA is to be an examiner with a higher knowledge that interacts with the learner. "In DA, an examiner not only gives performance contingent feedback but also offers instruction in response to student failure to change or improve the student's attainment" The same authors mentioned that "The assumption behind dynamic assessment is that all learners are capable of some level of learning (change and modifiability). According to systematic psychometric testing, the great majority of people's capacity to learn is innately stable." Students are also active participants in their process.

As a mediator, the teacher is always aware of the context that surrounds the student, in this case, the Zone of Proximal Development, which Vygotsky claims is "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more scientists" (Hizriani, Khairatunnisa, & Handrianto, 2022; Vygotsky, 1978).

DA has gained prominence and has been welcomed by many educators and teachers. It is not intended to replace other test types but as a complement. In the DA approach, learners' abilities are easily influenced or changed and can be flexible; that is why it is said that abilities are not fixed (Salamah, Rumadan, Handrianto, & Alfurqan, 2022; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2002).

Dynamic Assessment Implementations in Second and Foreign Language

When we talk about DA, it is necessary to highlight that it can be used in conjunction with other forms of assessment, such as standardized testing, observation of performance in learning situations, and data gathered (Haywood & Lidz, 2006). It is worth mentioning that implementing DA is not easy, especially for those teachers who have been working with static assessment. However, the idea is not to change but to collaborate with them.

Many approaches explain L2 acquisition, but only one relies on how L2 knowledge is internalized through experiences. This approach is known as "The theory of mind" or Sociocultural Theory by Lev Vygotsky (henceforth SCT). SCT is based on the development of human cognitive and higher mental function. The theory argues that human cognitive and higher mental function development comes from social interactions and participation in activities requiring cognitive and communicative functions. Individuals are drawn into using these functions in ways that nurture and "scaffold" them. Vygotsky also introduced the theory of Zone of Proximal Development ZPD. This theory makes it possible to know the students' capabilities in both potential and actual sections. Also, teachers should find information about the learners' existing and future abilities (Vygotsky, 1978).

(Lantolf & Thorne, 2007) claim that the principles of the SCT can also be applied to Second Language Acquisition (SLA). They argue that "SCT is grounded in a perspective that does not separate the individual from the social and in fact argue that the individual emerges from social interaction and as such is always fundamentally a social being."

Following these ideas, it was required to offer a method for transitioning from a static and unjust manner of assessing pupils to a dynamic one that would allow learners to perform independently and with assistance; this method is known as Dynamic Assessment (DA). According to (Lussier & Swanson, 2005), it is an approach that encourages promoting performance through an examiner's help and mediation to comprehend the potential for the development of learning. DA is different from the conventional views of teaching and assessment because it states that instruction and assessment should not be considered separate activities; instead, they should be fully assumed as integrated ones. According to (M.E. Poehner, 2008), this integration occurs when an intervention is embedded within the assessment procedure to reinterpret individuals' abilities, leading them to higher functioning levels. However, the point is not to discriminate against traditional assessments. Dynamic assessment is not intended as a replacement for other types of testing but as a complement to them (Anton, 2009; Habibullah, 2012).

Some applications of DA have been made in foreign and second languages. Matthew E. Poehner (2007) focuses on dynamic and non-dynamic assessment contributions to L2 assessment and its implementation in the L2 field. The examples of L2 DA discussed in his

article powerfully illustrate the benefits of moving interaction, rather than standardization, to the fore of the procedure. One of the examples is a study about a program for advanced (seventh semester) undergraduate learners of L2 French. Donna and Jess were two students who participated in the DA program, which supplemented regular classroom activities by meeting with a mediator outside of class to help them develop their oral abilities in French. The mediation was conducted in English to ensure the students understood and could respond to assistance. The task given to participants was to compose an oral past-tense narrative recounting events from a video clip they were shown. The study results showed that mediator-learner interactions promoted development and provided insights into the learner's functioning.

Kozulin & Garb (2002) on the other hand, examined whether dynamic assessment could be used in Israel with at-risk students by utilizing a pre-test, a mediation phase, and a post-test for the learners' growth and implementation. They concluded that dynamic assessment provides useful information on learners' learning process and potential, which is impossible through static assessment. Another study by Sadeghi & Khanahmadi, (2011) proved the role of mediated learning experience in L2 grammar of Iranian EFL learners. Sixty EFL learners (30 males and 30 females) in two institutes in Iran were the study participants. The results showed that the type of assessment-based instruction or mediation (DA-based versus NDA-based) significantly affected grammar learning by Iranian EFL learners.

METHOD

The study reviewed the literature on dynamic assessment from 2000 to 2021. Google Scholars, ERIC, Science Direct, Dimension, Sage Journal Online, Web of Science, and Scopus were the databases examined for information using electronic search engines. To discover similar materials, the phrases "dynamic assessment," "dynamic assessment of writing," "dynamic assessment of reading," and "dynamic assessment implementation" were used. During the search phase, 70 articles were downloaded from the database. 40 articles were removed because they were review studies, editorial pieces, or lacked the empirical data required for this investigation. Several works that discussed dynamic evaluation in situations other than those in which English was a foreign language were also left out. Furthermore, Lincoln and Guba's continual comparison technique was used to vet and evaluate the chosen articles (1985).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Dynamic Assessment of Writing

Writing skill is one of the most frequently evaluated languages features in a foreign language learning process since learners tend to have linguistic problems conveying their messages in a written form. EFL writing is a complex social activity that requires various talents, such as selecting appropriate themes for a certain audience, developing logical and clear ideas, constructing rich and appropriate material, exhibiting precise language expressions, and so on Banseng, Sandai, & Handrianto (2021). Xiaoxiao & Yan, (2010) and Elliot (2000) in Xiaoxiao & Yan (2010) state that DA is a practical method to use in writing since it aids learners' cognitive growth. "Elliott designs a practical DA framework for the EFL writing process. The purpose of the design is not just to get feedback from the learners' work; the idea is to promote learners' writing ability through feedback" (Xiaoxiao & Yan, 2010).

Shrestha & Coffin (2012) investigated the value of tutor mediation in text-based interaction about the assignments in academic writing development among undergraduate business studies students in open and distance learning, following the DA. Tutor mediation is an essential process in DA in second language teaching, but it is worth mentioning that students receive instructions from the teacher. They can also receive instructions from other, more capable peers. The analysis of interactions suggested that DA could help identify and respond to students' areas needing support (Hafnidar, Harniati, Hailemariam, & Handrianto, 2021). Finally, they argued that a learning theory-driven approach such as DA could contribute to students' academic writing development. Also, results indicated that traditional assessment methods could not support students sufficiently. DA is focused on learning and development, and it helps to identify participants' evolving writing abilities.

In the following study, Zhang (2010) constructed a dynamic assessment mode in a college English writing class. This study suggested that when presenting dynamic assessments to the students, instructional and graduated mediation should be offered based on the learners' developmental requirements in the writing process. Consequently, instruction and assessment are merged, and both the learner's growth and the teaching are enhanced (Handrianto, Salleh, & Chedi, 2020).

In another study, Xiaoxiao & Yan (2010) produced a simple framework for English writing instruction. The framework, dynamic mediation process, focuses on three stages: (a) topic choice stage, (b) idea generation and structuring stage, and (c) macro- revising stage in which each stage is designed in three steps the pre-task, mediation, and the post-task. In this study, DA mediation was presented to the learners in dialogues between teacher and students or mediational tools (For example, guidelines, reading materials, and

samples.), and nothing was done regarding assessing the participants' performance. In other words, Xiaoxiao & Yan (2010) focused only on the scaffolding aspect of DA during the writing process instruction, and no assessment was performed concerning the participants' ZPD. Their study indicated that dialogic teaching helped enhance participants' learning interests and improve their writing competence (Rita & Handrianto, 2021).

All these studies related to DA in the writing process showed that it is an excellent approach to solve, improve and enhance the writing process in second language teaching through instructional mediation, taking into account that it facilitates student's cognitive development and it also helps learners to reinforce their writing production through the use of scaffolding techniques.

Dynamic Assessment of Reading Comprehension

DA can be helpful in teaching reading comprehension since it helps improve this skill regarding vocabulary acquisition or in-text contextualization. When discussing DA in reading comprehension, it is essential to know that teachers are mediators in this process. However, in reading comprehension activities with DA, the idea is not to give awareness but to guide the children to create their questions and answer them by themselves. Ajideh & Nourdad (2012) studied the difference between applying dynamic and non-dynamic assessment of EFL reading comprehension ability and examining its immediate and delayed effect. They claim:

The study revealed that while applying DA has an immediate and delayed effect on improving the EFL learners' reading comprehension, no significant difference was observed among different proficiency levels. In other words, there is no significant difference in the immediate and delayed effect of DA of EFL (English as a foreign language) learners' reading comprehension ability at low, mid, and high-proficiency levels. That is to say, DA can be beneficial for EFL readers, and its effect remains over time. Furthermore, low, mid, and high-proficiency learners improve their reading comprehension ability almost equally. The proficiency level does not affect the amount of taking advantage of dynamic assessment.

DA aids in the improvement of reading abilities at various degrees of proficiency. No matter if the student has an intermediate or low English level, they can significantly improve their reading comprehension with the help of this approach. Swanson & Howard (2005) used DA to improve the ability to read in children with some disabilities. The idea is to separate or classify children using this approach and put them in different groups where the type of mediation will be different and focus on students' needs according to their levels by using testing focused on DA. This recognizes good and poor readers' cognitive performance and puts them in different groups where they help each other in activities where DA is an essential part of the process.

According to Guthke & Beckmann (2000) in Jarrahzadeh & Tabatabaei (2014), "a list of standardized hints was applied during a reading test to run DA the treatment group received intervention that is Guthke's Lerntest approach which is known as Leipzig Learning Test (LLT)". These approaches are based on testing or tests where DA is the only focus, so mediation between the teacher and the students is necessary for these activities. Guthke's Lerntest Approach is considered to enhance reading in EFL learners. Focusing the test on the specific ability that the student or instructor wishes to develop is vital.

In order to assist students overcome any performance issues and attaining their full potential, DA is a development-oriented technique (Shrestha & Coffin, 2012). In other words, the main idea of DA is to promote and support the learner's development. Davin (2011) states that "an important advantage of DA is making recommendations based on developmental potential which is not revealed by traditional non-dynamic tests" (Jarrahzadeh & Tabatabaei, 2014).

Therefore, static assessment fails to address L2 learners' instructional needs or the responsiveness of a learner to instruction. In other words, SA is only quantitative, considering that numbers cannot measure knowledge and the student's ideas. DA is more qualitative since, with this method, the teacher may be aware of the requirements of the students due to the ongoing interaction between the instructor and the students. That is why Guthke's Lerntest approach is part of improving reading comprehension, considering that the tests and pre-tests are based on DA and teachers' preparation. In the words of Jarrahzadeh & Tabatabaei, O. (2014) "reading comprehension ability is one of the language skills which learners need to have mastery over... Knowing how to assess the reading process helps the instructor find out where learners have problems and need support."

DA has also been implemented in technological contexts, focusing on the Vygotskian perspective and reading comprehension (Utami, Prihantoro, Apriani, Hidayah, & Handrianto, 2021). Shabani (2011) conducted a study focused on the feasibility of computerized Dynamic Assessment (C-DA) in reading comprehension and, more precisely, the effects of electronically delivering textual and visual scaffolding on L2 readers' comprehension processes. The assessment procedure included a short reading text with its manipulated version and visual prompts, gradually offered upon the students' failure to provide the correct answer. The results showed that electronically delivered mediatory scaffolding could enhance the students' reading comprehension processes, and computers can replace humans in raising readers' consciousness by directing their attention to the critical sections of the text and assisting them in understanding the text better.

Model of Dynamic Assessment

Dynamic assessment has many different approaches but differs in how they approach mediation. Mediation is something similar to interposition. Dynamic assessment leads to mediation to help learners reconsider the problems and think them through. It enables the mediator to recognize the level of learners' understanding of relevant linguistic features. Its emphasis is on instruction. The individualized view of dynamic assessment toward instruction and assessment results are interventionist within the assessment procedure. In this regard, individual differences are identified, and appropriate actions are taken for each learner based on his or her ZPD (Ajideh & Nourdad, 2012).

During mediation, the role of the mediator is to comfort consensus-building discussion. Mediators must not arbitrate disputes. This paper has represented two models of DA, which are as follows:

1. Feuerstein's Interactionist Model

Feuerstein's model integrates assessment and instruction, which cannot appear separately. This model claims that human cognitive abilities are not fixed and can be classified through interventions. Cultural differences are one of the biggest concerns in this model of assessment. In fact, in this model, the stimulus-response model is changed. It means that the child is interacting with a more competent peer; they would help the child select, change, amplify, and interpret the objects with the child through mediations.

2. Brown's Interventionist Model.

This model is constructed based on the number of prompts needed to extract the desired response. Student's learning potential is evaluated by the number of prompts needed to get the goal. Feuerstein's model is different from this model because, in this model of dynamic assessment, mediation is ordered from most implicit to most explicit and culminates in a correct answer.

Dynamic assessment has some advantages and disadvantages, which are as follows:
Advantages: (1) Dynamic assessment is a link between assessment and intervention; (2) It can gather data about children's learning potential; (3) It is sensitive to progress; and (4) It can include adaptations and accommodations. Disadvantages: (1) Dynamic assessment reduces efficiency; (2) It requires experience and expertise; and (3) It limits practicality (Losardo & Notari-Syverson, 2001).

CONCLUSION

Dynamic assessment may be a sort of challenge for common sees almost evaluation. It steadily assesses everything about a field. In the energetic evaluation field, we are confronted with a zone of proximal advancement related to a person's formative potential obtained through a grown-up direction or collaborating with an experienced peer. Through ZPD, the assessor finds what a learner can do without offering assistance and what he or she can do with offering assistance. Numerous specialists concur on utilizing dynamic assessment rather than non-dynamic assessment because it lets students prepare what they are doing and gives them apart. This strategy included understudies in the environment altogether. Understudies and their educators have a great relationship with each other, and the point is to help students extend their level of learning and make them more learned. Dynamic assessment has made a difference in instruction through gathering information about students' potential.

Additionally, it is able to adapt and oblige understudies to the environment. Because it said over, most specialists concurred around this kind of assessment since it pays consideration to students' capacity through ZPD and chooses or evaluates based on it. As an offer, it is sweet to consider energetic appraisal in the talking field since understudies are more concerned with it. Moreover, a few specialists thought energetic evaluation should be predesigned by illustrating some psychometric developments in their framework, which considers unwavering quality, generalizability, and legitimacy. Dynamic assessment can assist understudies in extending their capabilities and creating them.

REFERENCES

- Adam, N. F. M., Rusli, N. F. M., Salleh, N. S., Mokhtar, W. K. W., Abdullah, S., & Handrianto, C. (2022). *Kensiu Language Preservation: An Analysis Based on the Typological Framework of Language Threats*. 15(1), 2640–2659.
- Ajideh, P., & Nourdad, N. (2012). *The Immediate and Delayed Effect of Dynamic Assessment on EFL Reading Ability*. 12(5), 141–151.
- Anton, M. (2009). *Anton, M. (2009). Dynamic assessment of advanced second language learners. , 42(3), 576-598. 42(3), 576–598.*
- Antón, M. (2009). *Dynamic Assessment of Advanced Second Language Learners*. 42(3), 576–598.
- Arafani, A., Handrianto, C., Ucar, A. S., & Karneli, Y. (2021). *Disputing Irrational Belief in Adolescent Using Cognitive Simulation: A Case Study*. 9(2), 230–236. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24036/spektrumpls.v9i2.112598>
- Banseng, S., Sandai, R., & Handrianto, C. (2021). *Language of Strata and Expression in the Construction of Sampi amongst Iban Community in Malaysia*. 4(3), 417–427. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5169017>

- Birjandi, P., & Ebadi, S. (2009). *Issues in Dynamic Assessment*. 2(4), 188–198.
- Budoff, M., & Friedman, M. (1964). "Learning Potential" as An Assessment Approach to the Adolescent Mentally Retarded. 28(5), 434–439. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040631>
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Campione, J. C. (1989). *Assisted Assessment: A Taxonomy of Approaches and an Outline of Strengths and Weaknesses*. 22, 151–165.
- Carlson, J. S., & Wiedl, K. H. (1992a). *Principles of Dynamic Assessment: The Application of a Specific Model*. 4(2), 153–166.
- Carlson, J. S., & Wiedl, K. H. (1992b). The dynamic assessment of intelligence. In *Interactive Assessment* (pp. 167–186). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Douglas, D. (2014). *Understanding Language Testing*. New York: Routledge.
- Fatemipour, H., & Jafari, F. (2015). *The Effect of Dynamic-Assessment on the Development of Passive Vocabulary of Intermediate EFL Learners*. 5(1), 41–51.
- Feuerstein, R., Falik, L., Rand, Y., & Feuerstein, R. S. (2006). *Creating and Enhancing Cognitive Modifiability: The Feuerstein Instrumental Enrichment Program*. Jerusalem: ICELP Press.
- Feuerstein, R., Feuerstein, R. S., Falik, L., & Rand, Y. (2002). *The Dynamic Assessment of Cognitive Modifiability*. Jerusalem: ICELP Press.
- Guthke, J., & Wingenfeld, S. (1992). The Learning Test Concept: Origins, State of the Art, and Trends. In *Interactive Assessment* (pp. 64–93). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Habibullah, M. (2012). *Techniques in Teaching Reading Comprehension*. 6(2), 221–228.
- Habibullah, M., Baidawi, A., Fadilah, F., & W.S. Alim. (2020). *Pendampingan Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris Bagi Murid Melalui Metode Cerita Legend of Madura di Madrasah Tsanawiyah Miftahul Ulum Gunung Tangis Desa Rek-Kerrek Kecamatan Palengaan*. 2(2), 87–94.
- Hafnidar, H., Harniati, I., Hailemariam, M., & Handrianto, C. (2021). *Hafnidar, H., Harniati, I., Hailemariam, M., & Handrianto, C. (2021). Students self-regulation: An analysis of exploratory factors of self-regulation scale*. 9(2), 220–225. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24036/spektrumpls.v9i2.112589>
- Handrianto, C., & Rahman, M. A. (2018). *Project Based Learning: A Review of Literature on Its Outcomes and Implementation Issues*. 8(2), 110–129. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18592/let.v8i2.2394>
- Handrianto, C., Salleh, S. M., & Chedi, J. M. (2020). *The correlation between teaching learning quality and students` motivation to study in Yogyakarta`s bimbil. (PLS)*, 8(4), 527–537. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24036/spektrumpls.v8i4.110158>
- Haywood, H. C. (1993). *A Mediational Teaching Style*. 3(1), 27–38.
- Haywood, H. C., & Lidz, C. (2006). *Dynamic Assessment in Practice Clinical and Educational Applications*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Herwanis, D., Irham, I., & Handrianto, C. (2021). *Religious Commitment Inventory-10: On Comparison Result between Minangkabau Nomad Traders and Java Transmigrants*. 9(2), 95–101. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24036/kolokium-pls.v9i2.484>

- Hizriani, N., Khairatunnisa, K., & Handrianto, C. (2022). *Online and Offline Students' Presentation in Thesis Proposal: Challenges and Solution*. 3(3), 549–560. doi: <https://doi.org/10.47175/rissj.v3i3.501>
- Ibrahim, R., Hock, K. E., Handrianto, C., Rahman, M. A., & Dagdag, J. (2021). *Perceptions of Parents and Teachers on Students with Learning Disabilities (SLD) in Malaysia*. 4(2), 287–298. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5057585>
- Jarrahzadeh, Z., & Tabatabaei, O. (2014). , Z. and , O. (2014). *Gender-based Study of Learners' Reading Ability Through Dynamic Assessment (DA): Guthke's Lerntest approach in focus*. 2(7), pp. 47-53. 2(7), 47–53.
- Jarrahzadeh, Z., & Tabatabaei, O. (2014). Jarrahzadeh, Z. and Tabatabaei, O. (2014). *Promoting EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension Skills through Dynamic Assessment Using Guthke's Lerntest Approach*. 3(5), 32–39.
- Kozulin, A., & Garb, E. (2002). *Dynamic Assessment of EFL Text Comprehension*. , 23(1), pp. 112-127. 23(1), 112–127.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Introducing Sociocultural Theory*. In *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2004). *Dynamic Assessment: Bringing the Past into the Future*. *Language Teaching* 42. 42, 355–368.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2010). *Dynamic Assessment in the Classroom: Vygotskian Praxis for Second Language Development*. 15(1), 11–33.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2007). *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. In *Theories in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 201–224). Mahwah, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lidz, C. (1987). *Dynamic Assessment: An Interactional Approach for Evaluating Learning Potential*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Losardo, A., & Notari-Syverson, A. (2001). *Alternative Approaches to Assessing Young Children*. USA: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Lussier, C. M., & Swanson, H. L. (2005). *Dynamic Assessment: A Selective Synthesis of the Experimental Literature*. In *Learning Potential Assessment and Cognitive Training: Actual Research and Perspectives in Theory Building and Methodology* (pp. 65–87). New York: Elsevier.
- Mahdavi, M. (2014). *The Effect of Dynamic Assessment on Essay Writing Ability of Iranian EFL Learners: A Gender Related Study* (Thesis). Eastern Mediterranean University, North Cyprus.
- Mehri, E., & American, M. (2015). *Challenges to Dynamic Assessment in Second Language Learning*. 5(7), 1458–1466.
- Murphy, R. (2011). *Dynamic Assessment: Intelligence, and Measurement*. UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Musta'in, M., & Handrianto, C. (2020). *Peranan Pengurusan Sekolah Berasrama Islam Nurul Hakim untuk Membangunkan Sumber Manusia Masyarakat Sekitar*. 3(9), 114–123.
- Nazari, B. (2012). *Teach-to-Test Instruction of Dynamic Assessment: A Critical Review*. 5(4), 56–68.

- Nengsih, Y. K., Hendrianto, C., Pernantah, P. S., & Tannoubi, A. (2022). *The Implementation of Interactive Learning Strategy to Formulating Learning Objectives in Package C Program*. 10(2), 311–317. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24036/spektrumpls.v10i2.117215>
- O'Malley, J. M., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners: Practical Approaches for Teachers*. Boston: Addison Wesley Publishing Company Incorporated.
- Pernantah, P. S., Rizatunnita, R., Kusnilawati, L., & Handrianto, C. (2022). *Implementasi Pembelajaran Tatap Muka (PTM) Terbatas Selama Masa Pandemi Covid-19 di SMAN 1 Kubu*. 22(1), 46–52. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24036/pedagogi.v22i1.1257>
- Poehner, Matthew E. (2007). *Beyond the Test: L2 Dynamic Assessment and the Transcendence of Mediated Learning*. 91(3), 323–340.
- Poehner, M.E. (2008). *Dynamic Assessment: A Vygotskian Approach to Understanding and Promoting Second Language Development*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Ramadhani, D., Kenedi, A. K., Helsa, Y., Handrianto, C., & Wardana, M. R. (2021). *Mapping Higher Order Thinking Skills of Prospective Primary School Teachers in Facing Society 5.0*. 8(2), 178–190. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24235/al.ibtida.snj.v8i2.8794>
- Rita, Y., & Handrianto, C. (2021). *Innovation of Digital Learning in Package C Program in Facing the New Normal Education*. 9(1), 20–28. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24036/kolokium-pls.v9i1.447>
- Sadeghi, K., & Khanahmadi, F. (2011). *Dynamic assessment of L2 grammar of Iranian EFL learners: The role of mediated learning experience*. 3(2), 931–935.
- Salamah, U., Rumadan, I., Handrianto, C., & Alfurqan, A. (2022). *The Role of Mediation Agencies in Divorce Cases as an Effort to Provide Protection against Women and Children*. 14(1), 45–56. doi: <https://doi.org/10.28918/muwazah.v14i1.5338>
- Sarte, N. M. R., Santiago, B. T., Dagdag, J. D., & Handrianto, C. (2021). *Welcome Back: The Return of College Dropouts to School*. 8(2), 140–149. doi: <https://doi.org/10.36706/jppm.v8i2.15386>
- Shabani, K. (2011). *Assessment of L2 Learners' Reading Comprehension Processes: A Vygotskian Perspective*. 32, 321–328.
- Shrestha, P., & Coffin, C. (2012). *Dynamic Assessment, Tutor Mediation and Academic Writing Development*. 17(1), 55–70.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2002). *Dynamic Testing: The Nature and Measurement of Learning Potential*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swanson, H. L., & Howard, C. B. (2005). *Children with Reading Disabilities: Does Dynamic Assessment Help in the Classification?* 28, 17–34.
- Tabatabaei, S., & Bakhtiarvand, M. (2014). *Application of Dynamic Assessment in Second and Foreign Language Teaching*. 4(3).
- Tiara, A. D., Rahman, M. A., & Handrianto, C. (2021). *The Students' Perception about Use of Duolingo Application for Improving English Vocabulary*. 4(4), 690–701. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5775915>
- Tzuriel, D. (2001). *Dynamic Assessment of Young Children*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Nurhafisah, M. Arinal Rahman, Shahid Rasool & Izzah Supeni, *A Result and Discussion of the Dynamic Assessment Approach in Language Teaching: A Literature Review Study*

- Utami, D., Prihantoro, P., Apriani, E., Hidayah, J., & Handrianto, C. (2021). , *D. M. A., Prihantoro, P., Apriani, E., Hidayah, J., & Handrianto, C. (2021). Empowering ICT potentials in English language teaching. , 10(2), 42-48. 10(2), 42-48. doi: <https://doi.org/10.30630/polingua.v10i2.180>*
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes* (ed. By M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Superman). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wiedl, K. H. (2003). *Dynamic Testing: A Comprehensive Model and Current Fields of Application. 3(2), 93-119. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1891/194589503787383055>*
- Xiaoxiao, L., & Yan, L. (2010). *A Case Study of Dynamic Assessment in EFL Process Writing. 33(1).*
- Zhang, Y. H. (2010). *Zhang, Y. H. (2010). Constructing dynamic assessment mode in college English writing class. 1. 1, 46-50.*