Fostering Students' Reading Comprehension through Dynamic Assessment

Widiyanti Rahayu
Universitas PGRI Semarang
widiyantirahayu051@gmail.com

Entika Fani Prastikawati
Universitas PGRI Semarang
entikafani@upgris.ac.id

Wiyaka
Universitas PGRI Semarang
wiyaka@upgris.ac.id

Maria Yosephin Widarti Lestari
Universitas PGRI Semarang
mariayosephin@upgris.ac.id

Abstract

This study emphasizes the implementation of dynamic assessment in reading comprehension in the English classroom of the tenth grade in senior high school. To reach this goal a mixed method as a design was used by the writers by applying a quasi-experimental research design and followed by a qualitative research design. There were two groups; the experimental class and the control class. The total amount of students who participated in this study was sixty students. In collecting the data, the writers used a reading comprehension test and an open questionnaire. After the data was collected the writers analyze the quantitative data using SPSS 21 such as; mean score and N-Gain. Meanwhile, the thematic analysis was carried out to analyze the open questionnaire. The findings of the studies should that the students reading comprehension in the experimental class are at a better level rather than the students in the control class. Moreover, according to the N-Gain measurement, the students reading comprehension in the experimental class show higher improvement when exposed to dynamic assessment.

Keywords: Assessment, Dynamic Assessment, Reading Comprehension

INTRODUCTION

Assessment is a process that uses to improve students' quality after evaluation. The assessment is based on the evaluation result (Srinivas, 2018). Furthermore, assessment is a process of collecting information to improve students in the classroom. The assessment also focuses on EFL students and their improvement in the classroom. In ELT, the assessment is also a teaching standard; the teacher evaluates students' work and improves their ability to get better results (Srinivas, 2018). Therefore, assessment is an essential process in ELT in the classroom.

Furthermore, assessment is a formal work used to get students' information about their ability and response to some material.

Assessment is a teacher's tool to know students' abilities. Assessment designates the

best manner to help students increase their ability (Julian G. Elliott, at all 2018). Assessment is an important tool that uses in the teaching and learning process. To measure students' ability and to know the level of students. After knowing the ability and level of students, the teacher knows how to teach and increase students' ability. From these, teachers also know students' positions or levels in the classroom. Teachers can plot and give treatment based on assessment results to perform to the best of students' ability in the classroom. There is a type of assessment which is emerged from sociocultural theory. This assessment is a dynamic assessment (DA).

Dynamic assessment (DA) is an assessment that has emerged from sociocultural theory. Vygotsky's theory is the zone of proximal development (ZPD). Zona of proximal development (ZPD) is used to develop and find solutions for solving the problem under adult guidance (Zaretsky, 2021). Further, ZPD is a potential concept used to implement the idea in psychology as a practice. ZPD is an approach that is a diagnostic understanding of the students, and it is promoted by offering a specific treatment or mediation in the classroom during the assessment procedure; it can help students to move and find the solution for problem-solving (Vygotsky, 1978; Lantolf & Poehner, 2008). Dynamic assessment is an assessment that focuses on a practice or implementation process. Therefore, dynamic assessment (DA) suits the zona of proximal development (ZPD) approach. The dynamic assessment applies to the existing static assessment for the foster learning and implementing processes (Naeini & Duvall, 2012).

On the other hand, dynamic assessment (DA) focuses on what the students do, and the mediation students need in the classroom. In addition, the work of dynamic assessment (DA) in the classroom shows how students can solve their problems in the classroom (Naeini & Duvall, 2012). Further, dynamic assessment is a term that refers to the active learning process, thinking process, and solving problem process. Dynamic assessment

processes refer to modifying an individual's cognition (Kazemi et al., 2020).

Cognitive is an approach that gets from the thinking process. The processes get the knowledge and manipulate the ability from remembering, analyzing, understanding, evaluating, etc. Furthermore, these processes are a kind of cognitive assessment. The cognitive assessment aims to identify the ability and susceptibility used to evaluate a consequence related to getting information for students' priority (Nicholas, 2020). The cognitive focus is on training and teaching to improve intention (Peng & Nicholas, 2020).

Furthermore, the kind of improvement of cognitive is verbal knowledge. Verbal knowledge such as vocabulary and comprehension. For that reason, reading comprehension relates to cognitive ability. Reading comprehension is a process and instruction about a practical understanding of reading skills. Further, when students read incomprehension, they are also studying cognitive ability. Students read some text more effectively because students understand the text quickly. Using processes of instruction, students get information, think, and solve the problem of some text. From these processes, students get benefits, students can better understand the text, and students also can develop the infrastructure of processes in another text.

Based on the facts above, this study carries out the following question, "How is the students' reading comprehension achievement that is exposed by dynamic assessment compared to those exposed by conventional assessment?"

METHODOLOGY

The writers used a quasi-experimental research design in this study by applying a pretest and posttest. This study has two groups; a control group and an experimental group. An

experimental group is a group that receives a treatment using dynamic assessment. A control group is a group that does not receive treatment by using dynamic assessment. It means a control group receives the conventional assessment.

The subjects of this study were students of SMA N 16 Semarang. The specific subject was tenth grade in SMA 16 Semarang in the academic year 2021/2022. This study needed two classes they were the experiment class and the control class. Two classes were selected by the writers X IPS 1 as the experiment class and X IPS 2 as the control class. The X IPS 1 was an experimental class that received treatment using dynamic assessment. The X IPS 2 was a class that did not receive treatment using dynamic assessment.

The instrument of the study was assessing, monitoring, and recording data device (Creswell, 2012). In addition, the instrument of the study was a tool used to collect data. In this study, the writers used the reading test as an instrument. A reading test was an instrument to know students' ability in

Class		Number of Students
X IPS 1	X IPS 2	
18	15	30
12	15	30

reading comprehension.

Table 1. Sample of the Research

In this case, the reading test consists of two reading tests in the pretest and a reading test in the posttest.

1. Reading Test
   a) Reading test in the pretest

The reading test in the pretest was a test for two groups; the control group and the experimental group. In the pretest, the writers gave students questions in multiple reading test choices. This test was used as a diagnostic test or to know the basic skill of students in reading. The reading test in the pretest was calculated to measure students' reading skills.

   b) Reading test in the posttest.

The reading test in the post-test was a test for two groups; the control group and the experimental group. In the posttest, the writers gave questions in multiple choices of reading tests. This test was used to know students' improvement after getting the treatment by using dynamic assessment in reading comprehension. The posttest scores will be compared with the pretest scores. For that reason, to find out the result of the study, the data from the data analysis.

After collecting data, the writers analyzed the students' test results for reading comprehension skills. The writers analyzed two groups: the control group and the experiment group. The writers used a quantitative coding technique and qualitative thematic analysis. The quantitative is used for analyzing students' reading tests, while the qualitative is used for analyzing students' perceptions about dynamic assessment. In this research, there were several steps to analyze data as follows:

1. The writers classified the students' reading comprehension levels into high, average, and low according to Habsyi's (2022) criteria and the scale of KKM as a standard of completeness of assessment. The writers divided into three groups based on the intake aspect, which is based on the assessment given before.

Table 2. Criteria and Scale of KKM

Criteria and Scale of KKM			
Analysis aspect	Criteria and Scale		
Complexity	High < 65	Average 65-79	Low 80-100

Power Support	High 80-)0	Average 65-79	Low < 65
Intake	High 80-100	Average 65-79	Low < 65

2. The writers analyzed the reading test in pretest and reading test in post-test using SPSS 21. The writers analyzed data pretest and posttest of two groups; the experiment and control groups. The writers analyzed the data to obtain the mean of pretest and posttest scores. These mean scores were then classified into some criteria. The score categories were adopted from Yunista Desy et al., (2021).

Table 3. Score Categories

Score Categories			
Interval Level	Score's Categories	Integrity	Predicate
86-100%	A	4	Excellent
76-85%	B	3	Good
60-75%	C	2	Average
55-59%	D	1	Poor
5 < -54%	E	0	Bad

3. The writers analyzed the significant differences between students exposed to dynamic assessment and those exposed to conventional assessment. The writers used an N-Gain measurement and the SPSS 21 for analyzing the data.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. **Reading Comprehension Achievement of Students who are Exposed by Conventional Assessment.**

In teaching the control class, they are exposed to conventional assessment. The dynamic assessment was not used in the control class. In the control class, the students were taught by implementing the conventional assessment. In the control class, the writers gave the reading test in a pretest.

The conventional assessment means that in the control class, there was no difference in the task, and the students were given the same task. Also, there was no different treatment in the control class. Before the teaching and learning process of implementing conventional assessment, the students in the control class were tested using a reading test in the pretest.

The reading test in the pretest that was given in the control class was the same as the reading test in the pretest in the experimental class. The scores of the pretest of the control class were shown in table 4.

Table 4. Student's Pre-Test Score in Control Class

Students' Code	Students' Pre-Test Score	Score's Categories
Mean score	64.47	C Average

Table 4 described the pretest scores in the control class that used the conventional assessment. Table 4.1 shows the value of 64.47 and the score in the C level. The average reading comprehension skill level in the English class after using conventional assessment.

After giving the reading test, the writers taught some material in the control class five times. The theme of material that gave to students in the control class was the narrative text about the legend of someplace and fairy tales. In the first meeting in the control class, the writers gave the pretest. In the second meeting, the writers taught about the definition, range-wide of text, and purpose or goal of narrative text. The writers explained the material in detail that used PowerPoint as a medium. In the third meeting, the writers taught the structure of the narrative text and the language features of the narrative text. In the fourth meeting, the writers gave some exercises or conventional assessments that contained narrative text material. In the last

meeting, the writers gave the reading test in the posttest for the students in the control class. The posttest was given to check students' reading comprehension achievement or to check students' understanding of the material. The student's scores on the post-test were shown in table 5.

Table 5. Student's Post-Test Score in Control Class

Students' Code	Students' Post-Test Score	Score's Categories	
Mean score	71.9	C	Average

Table 5 showed the average post-test scores in the control class that used the conventional assessment, and there were no significant differences in the result of the test. Table5 shows the value of 71.9 and the score in level C or average level. From both two tables, there was no significant improvement at different levels. Table 4 which showed the pretest score, and table 5 which showed the post-test, were the same in the C or average level.

2. Reading Comprehension Achievement of Students Who are Exposed by Dynamic Assessment.

The teaching in the experimental class, the students were exposed to dynamic assessment. This class used dynamic assessment treatment in the teaching-learning processes. The difference between the control and experiment classes was a category level of student achievement. The writers gave the reading test in the pre-test in the experiment class. The reading test in the pre-test was the same as that was given in the control class. The reading test in the pre-test was used to measure the students' level achievements. In the experiment, the class was divided into three groups. The writers divided thirty students into three groups based on the reading test in the pre-test. The writers divided thirty students into three groups based on the pre-test scores. The scores of students in the experiment class are shown in table 6.

Table 6. Student's Pre-Test Score in Experimental Class

Students' Code	Students' Pre-Test Score	Score's Categories	
Mean score	69.3	C	Average

Based on table 6, there were three categories of students' levels. Thirteen students were in the high-level category. In the average-level category, there were eight students. In the low-level category, there were nine students. Table 6 showed the average scores of the pre-test in the experimental class. Table 6 shows the value of 69.3 and the score in level C or average level.

After giving the reading test in the pre-test, the writers taught the material about the narrative text. The writers taught in the experiment class six times. In the first meeting, the writers gave a reading test in the pre-test for the experimental class. In the second meeting, the writers explained the definition of dynamic assessment and the rules of teaching-learning processes in the experimental class. In the third meeting, the writers taught the material about the definition, range-wide, purpose of the text, language features, and structures of narrative text. The writers explained the material of the narrative text and used PowerPoint as a medium. In the next meeting, the writers gave the example of narrative text. In this meeting, the writers and students analyzed the text together. In the fifth meeting, the writers divided thirty students into three groups. The names of the three groups were low, medium, and high. The groups were based on students' level of pre-test scores. The writers gave different tasks based on the group. In this meeting, the writers gave treatment of the experimental class using dynamic assessment. The writers guided the students in the process of task practice. After providing treatment using dynamic assessment, in the last meeting, the writers gave the reading test in the post-test in the experiment class. The test in the post-test was used to know students' achievements in the experiment class. The scores of

students in the experiment class were shown in table 7 below.

Table 7 showed the scores test in the post-test of students in the experimental class. Table 7 above also described the mean score of the reading test in the post-test.

Table 7 Student's Post-Test Score in Experimental Class

Students' Code	Students' Post-Test Score	Score's Categories	
Mean score	80.8	B	Good

3. The Difference in Reading Achievement between Students Exposed by Conventional Assessment and those Exposed by Dynamic Assessment.

To know the significant effect of implementing dynamic assessment in reading comprehension in experimental class and control class, the measurement of N-Gain was used. Table 4.5 shows the result of the N-Gain measurement of two classes.

Table 8 Enhancement Description of Control Class and Experimental Class

Enhancement Description of Control Class and Experimental Class Descriptive Statistics					SD
Measurement	N	Min	Max	Mean	
N-Gain Control	30	-2.00	1.00	.2165	.6159
N-Gain Experiment	30	.68	1.00	.8152	.08778
Valid N	30				

According to the N-Gain measurement, the mean score of the control class in the value amount of 0.217 with the standard deviation (SD) 0f 0.616, while the mean score of the experiment class in the value amount of 0.816 with the standard deviation (SD) 0.878. This table shows that the mean score of the experiment class exposed by dynamic assessment in reading comprehension is higher than the mean score of the control class.

After the measurement of N-Gain, a significant difference between scores of pre-test and scores of post-test. Both of control class and experiment class were tested using Mann Whitney. The descriptive statistic of significant difference shows in table 9 as below.

Table 9 Descriptive Statistics for Significant Difference

Hypo-thesis	Mea-sure-ment	Mean	SD	Value Z-Test	Sig. Value	Result
There is a significant difference between conven-tional assess-ment in control class and dynamic assess-ment in experi-	Mann Whitney	$\bar{x}$ Control = 0.2165	.6159	-6.011	0.000	Hypo-thesis accep-ted
		$\bar{x}$ Experiment = 0.8152	.08778			

ment
class

Based on N-Gain, using Mann Whitney on the SPSS showed that Asymp. Significant value (2-tailed) score is 0.000 while based on criteria, 5% significant value shows that the score is less than 5% (0.000 < 0.05). So, H0 was rejected and H1 was accepted. It could be summarized that there was a significant difference between the control class who are exposed to the conventional assessment and the experiment class who are exposed to the dynamic assessment.

DISCUSSIOND

This study focuses on implementing and describing the students' perceptions about dynamic assessment in reading comprehension in the English classroom of the tenth grade in SMA N 16 Semarang. The purpose of this study is to compare students' ability in reading comprehension between the control class exposed to conventional assessment and the experiment class exposed to dynamic assessment. Furthermore, this study also finds out significant differences between the experiment class and the control class. The findings can be concluded that dynamic assessment effectively supported EFL reading comprehension in the experimental class.

Based on the first finding, there was no significant improvement in the control class who are exposed to conventional assessment. The result scores of the pre-test and post-test did not show an improvement or different significance. It is proved that students did not act or respond in the classroom. In the teaching-learning process in the control class, students are more passive than students in the experiment class. In the control class who are exposed to conventional assessments just focus on the teacher-centered learning process. In this era, a student-centered is used in the teaching-learning process in the classroom. Furthermore, In the teaching-learning process, communication is an important thing between teacher and students. In the control class, students did not active. They ignore the important factor in communication such as interaction and communication between students and the teacher in the class. This is in line with what (Mcgorry, 2012) explained that interpersonal skills or communication skills are an important factor in the class. In addition, Vergara et al., (2022) mention that the traditional assessment focuses on measuring students' abilities and ignores the important factor of communication in the classroom. This reflects what happens in the control class, it is not interactive and passive during the teaching and learning processes.

The other factor in the control class who are exposed to conventional assessment received the same task. There was no new type or different level in the task. Meanwhile, students have different abilities in the classroom. Some students have a high level and students have a low level. To add, students who have a high-level ability can do the task while students who have a low-level ability can not do the task easily. It correlates with (Miller, 2018; Hung et al., 2015), students' abilities are also crucial in the teaching-learning processes, especially in assessment. Further, students who have the high-level ability are more persistent to study and do the assessment than students who have low-level ability. To add, students who have a high level of ability are dominant and can assess reading test easily than the students who have a low level of ability. For that reason, students in the control class are difficult to work on the assessment when they receive the same task in the classroom. Moreover, the score in the control class does not improve or has a different significance.

From the fact above, the lag factors from the control class who are exposed to traditional assessment in reading comprehension are passive and receive the same task. To add, when students are passive in the teaching-learning the reading comprehension makes the content of the text not transferred well. Furthermore, when the students receive the same task also makes them difficult to do the task. For that reason, the score of the control class who are exposed to conventional assessment has a low score rather than the experimental class.

In the second finding, there is a significant improvement in the experimental class who are exposed to dynamic assessment. It is proved by the pre-test and post-test scores. There is an improvement significant in the pre-test and the post-test scores. The dynamic assessment was effective and supportive in the classroom, especially in studying English in reading comprehension. Teaching-learning process in the experimental class is more effective and active, especially in students' performance and participation. In the experimental class, students are active and participate in the teaching-learning process, especially in the assessment process. As Naeni & Duvall (2012) stated, dynamic assessment boosts students' performance, and dynamic assessment also built a positive atmosphere in the class. For that reason, the experimental class who have been exposed to dynamic assessment has an improvement rather than the control class.

Moreover, dynamic assessment could maxim of students' potential. In the experimental class, students received tasks suitable to the student's level. They can understand the content of the text easily. In the experimental class who are exposed to dynamic assessment, the teacher told them to identify the text. Students do not just find and choose the correct answer, but they identify, understand, and solve the problem. Kazemi et al., (2020) stated, that the dynamic assessment does not just produce the correct answer, but students must understand the content of the text and solve the problem of the question. The dynamic assessment focuses on students' potential level of development, and students' performance (Yang &

Qian, 2017; Poehner & Lantolf, 2005). Furthermore, the dynamic assessment also gives new insight into assessment, especially information about students' abilities and future potential of the student (Kao Y, 2021). For that reason, dynamic assessment can prove that students' continuous learning and show the effectiveness of teachers to evaluate and revise the teaching in response. Meanwhile, in the control class, the teacher just focuses on students' scores rather than the process of students' potential development in the class. For that reason, students in the experimental class have high scores than students in the control class.

Based on the certitude above, both dynamic assessment and reading comprehension have an effective relation because learning English using dynamic assessment can raise students' abilities, especially in reading comprehension. In addition, the student's ability in reading comprehension can raise because in experimental classes students are classified into a group based on their level. Therefore, students do the assessment suitable to their ability and they are more focused on their work. It makes the score of the experimental class higher than the score of the control class.

The third finding, there is a significant difference between the control class and the experimental class. It is proved by the score of both classes. The score of the experimental class is higher than the score of the control class. Based on Caffrey E (2006), in the teaching-learning process of dynamic assessment in the class, the teacher measures students from aspect responsiveness and students' performance in the class. Furthermore, in the experimental class who are exposed to dynamic assessment, the students are required to be active in the class. For that reason, in this study, the writers calculate students' ability in reading comprehension through the reading test that has been given to students. Two assessments were used in both classes in the assessment process, they are conventional assessment and dynamic assessment. In the conventional assessment, the teacher just focuses on the result and value of the students. As (Alsaadi, 2021; Cacchion, 2015) stated, conventional assessment just focuses on the result and the value

of the test. For that reason, the conventional assessment is less effective in reading comprehension because in this assessment students are not receiving a clear description from the teacher.

In addition, students in the control class who are exposed to the conventional assessment are more passive in the class. On the other hand, in the experiment class, the teacher focuses on the process of teaching-learning, especially in reading comprehension. In addition, the teacher and students work together on the same program of subject matter. For that reason, (Kao Y, 2020; Kazemi et al., 2020; Alsaadi H, 2020) stated, that dynamic assessment is implemented in the pedagogic method to support students in the teaching-learning process, especially in the assessment of reading comprehension. Moreover, pedagogic means the process of the teacher guiding, supporting, and helping students to solve the question in the reading test. For that reason, students in the experimental class are more active and confidently asked questions when they had a hard situation. Therefore, the process of the teaching-learning process, especially the assessment of reading comprehension can construct a positive effect on the experimental class. Moreover, the score of the experimental class is high rather than control class. It is proved by the result of the pre-test and post-test of the experimental class that has exposed the dynamic assessment. The mean score for the pre-test in the experimental class is 69,3 and the mean score for the post-test is 80,8 while the score of standard deviation (SD) of the experimental class is 0,878. The lowest score in the experimental class is 38 and the highest score is 86.

Meanwhile, the mean score for the pre-test in the control class that uses the conventional assessment is 64,47, and the mean score for the post-test is 71,9 with a score of standard deviation (SD) of the control class being 0,878. In the control class that uses conventional assessment, the lowest score is 40 and the highest score is 76. Based on the data above, the experimental class is higher than the control class. It means there is a significant difference between both classes.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, this study has presented significant evidence that dynamic assessment cultivates students' reading comprehension when it is compared to conventional assessment. The pedagogical significance of dynamic assessment is not limited to assisting students in generating the right response, but rather in developing the insights that will form the basis of their future performances. Accordingly, DA is an organized, growth-focused framework for EFL instruction. Many opportunities for growth have opened up as a result of DA's integration of education and evaluation. Because of its two-way character, DA interaction fits in perfectly with conventional procedures in EFL and ESL courses. In contrast to static evaluations, dynamic evaluations aim to improve student learning and motivation by using teacher-provided mediations according to Vygotsky's most important idea of ZPD. Ultimately, it may be argued that dynamic assessment helps teachers build more effective courses by providing appropriate data regarding the origin, progression, and potential capacity of learners. Due to its limited sample size, lack of control over confounding variables, and quantitative character, the current study can only be seen as a baby step toward dynamic assessment's full application in reading comprehension classes. Despite these caveats, it is possible to draw conclusions that the results of this study give important information on the improvement of Indonesian senior high students' reading comprehension and their motivation to read. This study's results lent credence to Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (ZPD) and the concept of development in general. The shifts from the ZPD to the zone of actual development were tracked by comparing the participants' performance on a pre- and post-test.

REFERENCES

Alsaadi, H. M. A. (2021). Dynamic assessment in language learning; An overview and the impact of using social media. *English Language Teaching*, *14*(8), 73. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n8p73

Atencio, D. J. (2003). *The emerging volitional self: A dynamic assessment of the mediating role of social and private dialogue in the development of self-direction and task motivation*.

Caffrey, E. (2006). *A comparison of dynamic assessment and progress monitoring in the prediction of reading achievement for students in kindergarten and first grade.*

Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Research design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach second edition*.

Habsyi, R., Saleh, R. R. M., & Nur, I. M. (2022). Pengembangan E-LKPD berbasis guided dicovery learning untuk meningkatkan kemampuan berpikir kritis siswa. *Jurnal Riset HOTSPendidikan Matematika*, 2. https://doi.org/10.51574/kognitif.v2i1.385

Kao, Y. T. (2020). A comparison study of dynamic assessment and nondynamic assessment on EFL Chinese learners' speaking performance: Transfer of Learning: 動態評量與非動態評量對於英語學習者口語表現與學習遷移之比較研究. *English Teaching and Learning*, *44*(3), 255–275. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-019-00042-1

Kazemi, A., Bagheri, M. S., & Rassaei, E. (2020). Dynamic assessment in English classrooms: Fostering learners' reading comprehension and motivation. *Cogent Psychology*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2020.1788912

Mcgorry, S. Y. (2012). *No significant difference in service learning online*.

Media and Information Literacy in Higher Education. (2017). *Zone of proximal development*.

Miller, T. (2018). Developing numeracy skills using interactive technology in a play-based learning environment. *International Journal of STEM Education*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-018-0135-2

Naeini, J., & Duvall, E. (2012). Dynamic assessment and the impact on English language learners' reading comprehension performance. *Language Testing in Asia*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/10.1186/2229-0443-2-2-22

Poehner, M. E., & Wang, Z. (2020). Dynamic assessment and second language development. *Language Teaching*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444820000555

Srinivas Rao, P. (2018). Parupalli Srinivas Rao evaluation and perspective. In *Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL) A Peer Reviewed (Refereed) International Journal Impact Factor* (Vol. 6).

Vergara Cabarcas, L. K., Castellon Barrios, D. J., López Caraballo, J. L., Vásquez Rossi, C. A., & Becker Arroyo, E. A. (2022). Dynamic assessment approach in language teaching: A Review. *Zona Próxima*, *30*, 82–99. https://doi.org/10.14482/zp.30.371.3

Yunista Desy, Shanty Isnaini, & Elfitra Legi. (2021). Kemahiran menceritakan kembali teks eksplanasi siswa kelas VII sekolah menengah pertama negeri 16 Bintan tahun pelajaran 2020/2021. *Students Online Jurnal*.

Zaretsky, V. K. (2021). One more time on the zone of proximal development. *Cultural-Historical Psychology*, *17*(2), 37–49. https://doi.org/10.17759/chp.2021170204