Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies, Vol.3, No.1, 2024: 70-89
https://jals.aliabad.iau.ir
ISSN: 2820-9974

Augmenting Iranian Students' Autonomy and Reading Comprehension Through Implementation of Dynamic Assessment

Seyyed Hossein Sanaeifar[1], Mehrshad Ahmadian*[1], Amir Marzban[1]

Department of English, Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr Branch, Qaemshahr, Iran.

Email: s.h.sanaeifar@qaemiau.ac.ir

Email: a.marzban@qaemiau.ac.ir

*Corresponding Author's Email: mehrshad.ahmadian@qaemiau.ac.ir

Received: 11-02-2023, Accepted: 19-06-2023

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the accountability of implementing dynamic assessment (DA) on Iranian high school students' autonomy and reading comprehension development. To this end, 60 Iranian male students from two public vocational high schools in Guilan, Sowme'eh Sara, participated in this study. To gather the required data, two instruments were used: an autonomy questionnaire and a reading comprehension test. To conduct the study, the participants were divided into two groups: an experimental group (N=30) and a control group (N=30). Before the academic term, the pre-tests (autonomy and reading) were administered. Then, during the academic term, the experimental group was exposed to a sandwich format dynamic assessment which consists of three phases: pre-test, mediation, and post-test. The control group was exposed to conventional teaching practice. After ending the academic term, the post-tests (autonomy and reading) were administered again. The driven data through pre-and post-tests of this study were analyzed through SPSS software. The study's results indicated that implementing DA had a statistically significant effect on Iranian high school students' autonomy and reading skill development. This study has some implications for EFL teachers, students, and language syllabus designers.

KEYWORDS: Assessment; Autonomy; Dynamic Assessment; Reading Comprehension

INTRODUCTION

Originating from constructivist psychology, dynamic assessment (DA), conceptualized as a mediational practice, aims to integrate assessment and learning in a unified manner magnifying learners' current capabilities toward a higher level of performance (Shabani, 2012). DA challenges traditional views on the separation of teaching and assessment and suggests that these should be regarded as a unified and fully integrated activity. Such integration results from embedded intervention and mediation in the process and procedure of assessment (Lidz & Gindis, 2003). In the DA process, the focus of attention is not on learners' current level of performance. Instead, it is designed to continuously track learners' performance energized by mediational interventions expanding their potential achievements (Haywood & Lidz, 2007; Ukrainetz et al., 2000).

Furthermore, the recent paradigm shifts in education from teacher-centeredness to students-centeredness alter the focus of attention to the concept of autonomous learning, which views learning as a process that should be executed by the learners as crucial role players. Thus, learners are supposed to take their learning responsibilities in their entire learning process. With this perspective, teachers' roles changed from the transmitters of knowledge to the facilitators of the learning process (Zhong, 2010). In the same vein, DA assumes a similar position for learners in the learning process in which learners are required to level up their learning performance with the mediation from their teachers, peers, or adults. Thus, bridging these two concepts is an exciting attempt to investigate.

Recently, the issue of autonomous learning has flourished widely in the Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) field (Shimo, 2003). Maliqi (2019) believes that learners' autonomy is a cornerstone of the successful learning process having awareness about learning responsibility is a critical factor for learners to be autonomous. She also argues that the modern problem in educational settings is the passiveness of the learners in the learning process, which requires solving through expanding learners' autonomy. In this way, when the learner feels a responsibility for their learning actions, behaviors, and attempts, the chance of being successful in the process of learning in the future will increase.

In the field of language teaching and learning, autonomous learning plays a vital role because the ultimate goal of teaching is to allow learners to keep moving forward in their learning journey independently in their educational contexts and real-life settings. Being an autonomous learner allows learners to follow their pre-designed and self-constructed objectives toward more successful learning. In the Iranian EFL context, especially in the high school setting, the dominance of traditional types of language testing and assessment brings plenty of difficulties and problems in students' learning process. The process of gradation and marking students' performances in the Iranian high school context concentrates on administrating summative assessments at the end of their educational terms. Typically, these summative assessments are followed by formative assessments along the academic terms. These two types of assessments are regarded as the static model of assessment, which is product-oriented rather than process-oriented.

Such assessments can potentially bring fearsome emotional conditions, i.e., test anxiety and fear of exam failure. As there is no help or mediation from other persons in these assessments, they see themselves lonely in their mission of tackling high-demanded final examinations. These psychological blocking factors make them unable to show their actual and complete potential for learning. Poehner (2008) mentions this problem and believes that students are frustrated with the conventional assessment process because there is an anxiety-provoking element that makes them worry about the assessment results.

Considering the Iranian EFL context in high-school settings, there is widespread dissatisfaction with the autonomous learning condition. For many students, there are not enough opportunities for independent learning and self-development. Also, the chance to transfer in-class learning to out-of-class day-to-day learning is negligible. In Iranian high school settings, there are no rigorous attempts to instruct students for autonomous learning. The applied practice and teaching methodologies in language classrooms are not satisfactory enough and are ineffective in equipping students to take on their learning responsibilities.

Regarding the context of this study, the researchers found that students have many problems regarding class and final exams. Since a part of the final score of the English language course (4 points) is allocated to the speaking skill test, which was performed during a face-to-face interview, the researchers noticed during the speaking tests that students did not show a considerable desire to participate in the speaking test. They do not show acceptable WTC and often suffer from test anxiety. On the other hand, despite the constructive and positive effects of the DA approach on learning and test performance (Chen et al., 2022; Glaspey et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2023; Tang et al., 2023), the lack of coherent research on the effect of DA on the development of WTC among public school students in the context of Iranian language education is apparent. Therefore, the researchers decided to investigate the effect of practicing DA on the level of WTC among high school students.

This study was an attempt to investigate the accountability of DA on students' WTC, whether inside or outside of the class. Grounded on the Sociocultural Theory premise, this study aimed to shed light on the social dimension of learning in the case of Iranian high school students through the implementation of DA practice. Considering the English language courses in the Iranian scholastic context, despite some existing claims, practically, there is an

individualistic perspective on learning in the educational system (Goodrich, 2020; Moradian et al., 2022). Such a view does not provide an opportunity for students to emerge as autonomous learners in the educational context of Iran (Zarrabi & Brown, 2017). Therefore, it is necessary to establish a sociocultural view of the learning process in the recent educational system of Iran. Having a socialistic perspective on learning led the researchers to base the rationale of the current study on the concept of mediated testing through implementing DA practice on Iranian students' WTC development.

Considering the importance of assessment in the learning process and the issue of consequential validity in the language testing field, and the lack of coherent knowledge and understanding of autonomous learning in the territory of Iranian public schools, it seems to conduct a study centered on autonomous learning and a new type of assessment, i.e., DA in the learning of reading skill as a critical skill in learning English is to be logical and necessary. This importance will be more remarkable considering that this was done for the first time in the context of Iranian public schools because it can open a new window to existing knowledge in this regard.

Based on the problems mentioned earlier, the researchers aimed to examine the effectiveness of integrating instruction and assessment, i.e., implementing DA to promote students' autonomy and reading comprehension development. Considering the literature around the Iranian EFL context, it was the first attempt to explore the accountability of DA on students' autonomy and reading skill development in a scholastic context. As such, the following research questions were formulated in this study:

RQ_1: Does implementing dynamic assessment have any statistically significant effect on Iranian high school students' autonomy?

RQ_2: Does implementing dynamic assessment have any statistically significant effect on Iranian high school students' English reading skill?

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Poehner and Lantolf (2005) define DA as a deep and systematic procedure of assessment that aims to check students' development and lead them towards better learning performance, i.e., the next potential development through the provision of mediation. Mediation is a process of instructional intervention initiated by a more knowledgeable person (teacher, parent, peer, adult) aiming to provide required help (tips, prompts, hints) for acquiring the next level of potentiality for students. Students' performance on each level provides the basis for the instructor's further assessment and the type and amount of mediational help. Furthermore, Dorfler et al. (2009) view DA as a process of insightful evaluation of learners' current level of proficiency, seeking a chance to develop this level of performance into the next higher level. The unique feature of DA is its sensitivity to individual differences due to the mediation that adjusts based on an individual's response to the assessment practice. This mediation is continuously provided by the teacher to lead students toward their next potential level of performance.

DA practice is not only a process of assessment in a new form (Sanaeifar & Seifi Divcolaii, 2019) but also a new perspective on the nature of the assessment. In this perspective, the assessment process should follow the entire teaching/learning instructional period, not as an assessment in a traditional view but as an instruction itself. It means that assessment is an indispensable part of instruction giving the teacher insight into student's ongoing development (Vafaee, 2011). According to Poehner and Lantolf (2005), teachers' mediation is tuned based on students' performance on circular attempts during the learning process to accustom the instruction towards better learning achievement. Having predictive capability, DA gives the teacher a chance to predict students' next level of potential development (Poehner, 2008). DA combines the learning process with the evaluation process by relying on the social dimension of learning through the provision of the teacher's constructive mediation to lead the students to achieve higher levels of learning goals (Poehner & Lantolf, 2023).

The salient feature of DA is the progressive capability of its process. In this process, the teacher instructs the students to master their learning skills with an eye on their future potential for development. The mediation is presented during the assessment to provide the necessary information and help students to maximize their current performance to reach their next level of proficiency (Kirchenbaum, 1998). For Lidz (1987), DA generates mediated

interaction between teachers and their students. In other words, in the DA process, the assessment is contextualized into a learning event using mediation during the assessment procedure (Baek & Kim, 2003; Hill & Sabet, 2009). Here, teachers must be facilitators of the learning process, and students should actively follow their teacher's recommendations. According to recent studies, mediation, which is considered an essential element of dynamic evaluation, if implemented correctly and effectively, can have constructive effects, including accelerating the negotiation of meaning among students and improving their academic performance and achievement (Kao, 2022; Liang & Sang, 2023; Poehner & Yu, 2022). According to Teferi et al. (2023), by providing interactive interventions (mediation) based on the DA process, the learning attitude and cooperative motivation of learners has increased noticeably and prepared them for more efforts in the learning process.

By creating a friendly and supportive atmosphere in the classroom, DA can increase students' trust in their teacher because the provision of mediation satisfies students' immediate learning needs (Alsaadi, 2021). Therefore, they trust the teacher's instruction and guidance. The more they trust the teacher's instruction, the more motivation and enthusiasm they apply to follow the teacher's advice (Davin et al., 2017; Jia et al., 2022). Eventually, through repetition of mediational intervention, this sense of trust can even lead to a significant increase in students' self-confidence (Davin, 2016; Poehner & Wang, 2020). According to Dixon et al. (2023), DA can improve the initiative and creativity of learners in acquiring learning skills and make their hidden talents flourish. DA targets potential learning development providing learners with mental security and sufficient motivation to advance learning independently by reducing learning and assessment anxiety (Sherkuziyeva et al., 2023).

Rooted in constructivism, learning autonomy is an emerging concept in TEFL. The constructivist view of learning assumes that learners continuously attempt to construct their meaning in the learning process. This dynamic reconstruction of meaning (Little, 1991) occures when learners become skillful enough to build their own learning experience based on their learning needs and requirements. In this process, the role of learners' autonomy is considered as a critical element that equips learners to practice reconstructing their meaning. This self-generated learning experience enables the learner to master the reconstruction of meaning, and, as a result, their mastery over learning objectives increases considerably (Benson & Voller, 1997). Having similar idea, Benson (2001) asserted that learner active and effective engagement in the learning process is a fundamental element of learning autonomy. Learners have to learn how to construct their own meaning by concentrating on educational needs.

According to Dickinson (1992), learner autonomy is a situation where the learner tries to be responsible for the learning outcomes by engaging in decision-making tasks to achieve a higher level of performance. In other words, autonomous learning concerns learners' rights and potentiality to play determining role in the learning process (Little, 2022). This idea aligns what Benson (2001) argues about learning autonomy as a context-sensitivity that depends on learners' independent performance in various learning contexts and situations. Thus, learning autonomy concerns not only classroom settings but also all out-of-classroom contexts. Recent studies have shown that students' autonomy establishes when they practice systematic and strategic instruction that requires them to accept the consequences of their learning and achievements and adjust their learning activities based on independent decisions from the teacher. Such a practice should enhance continuously by increasing the efficiency of students' learning performance during the teaching-learning process (Boonma & Swatevacharkul, 2020; Qi, 2022; Rahman et al., 2022; Tuan, 2021).

For Schunk (2005), autonomous learners can initiate the learning process, monitor their development, and evaluate learning achievements independently. Similarly, Crome et al. (2009) believe that autonomous learning is a situation in which learners act and think critically, monitor and manage their learning process independently, and measure their learning strengths and weaknesses to construct their unique understanding. In this way, learning autonomy is not an innate ability for learners; instead, it is something teachable and transmittable that learners can acquire this ability like other learning skills. The main idea of student autonomy is rooted in the concept of reconstruction of meaning and knowledge by learners in the learning process so that the autonomous student first receives concepts and knowledge from the teacher, then reconstructs and rearranges it by relying on his own discernment and implements it in learning events (Shi & Han, 2019; Tsai, 2021).

Studies revealed that teacher autonomy is a determining factor for the development of learner autonomy, which means learners are unable to show a considerable level of autonomy without having autonomous teachers. Being autonomous lets teachers manage the teaching process more effectively and help learners to experience and practice

autonomy under the guidance of their teachers (Benson, 2000; McGrath, 2000; Thavenius, 1999). Thus, teachers need to develop both their own state of autonomy and a strategic methodology to train autonomous learners, and they are required to play a facilitating role in managing the process of autonomous practice (Santrock, 2006; Nakata, 2011). To train an autonomous learner, teachers must be autonomous themselves and play the role of a learning facilitator by presenting the possible choices and their possible consequences to the students to encourage them to achieve better learning outcomes (Gülnihal & Cem, 2019). Teachers can guide students toward autonomous learning by developing students' self-regulation ability. A self-regulated learner can reach the best learning decision by examining possible solutions and their effects, relying on critical thinking and problem-solving abilities (Hermagustiana & Anggriyani, 2020).

Moreover, by practicing meaningful activities in the learning process, teachers can encourage learners to be more responsible and execute different aspects of their learning independently (van Lier, 2004; Cotteral, 2000, Lengkanawati, 2016). Autonomous learning, as Zou (2011) claims, is an individualistic and step-by-step process of self-reliance following teacher-learner shared control over learning events. Autonomous learners can recognize the learning track, built-up the learning goals, execute sufficient strategies, monitor the learning progress, and assess the learning achievements practically (Dickinson, 1993). In other words, autonomous learners will become learners who possess strategic, emotional, logical, practical, executive, motivational, and pedagogical competencies and have a flexible, creative, and adventurous attitude toward acquiring the required knowledge and skill (Candy, 1991).

As a cornerstone of language skills, reading skill is influential in developing language learners' learning performance. Through reading skill, language learners are able to attain the required information and knowledge from written materials and facilitate the acquisition of other skills (Elleman & Oslund, 2019). To perform the reading skill, students must combine their constructed meaning from the given text with their schematic knowledge to comprehend it. Thus, Grabe and Stoller (2011) conceptualized the reading process as an interactive action between students and the text in which students try to extract meaning through a mixture of bottom-up (linguistic knowledge) and top-down processing (schematic knowledge).

In recent years, mastery of autonomous reading skill has been widely considered by researchers in TEFL and TESL fields (De Naeghel et al., 2016; Huang, 2019; Walsh, 2021). Having autonomous reading skill, learners can take control of reading by relying on autonomous learning strategies and solve their immediate learning problems actively and efficiently (Cheetham et al., 2017). An autonomous reader has significant growth in skills such as adjusting reading speed, choosing the level of reading accuracy, and assessing the needs and self-evaluation of activities related to learning reading skills (Shang & Chen, 2018).

RELATED STUDIES

Sun et al. (2023) studied the effect of implementing the DA approach on learners' second language development. In this study, the researchers taught the four learning skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening through an active DA-regulated intervention to encourage the learning of Chinese as a second language. The presentation of DA in the experimental group included the provision of hints, prompts, tips, and reconstruction of desired concepts in continuously during the training course. The statistical analysis of the study data showed that the learners' learning achievement and skills improved significantly.

Chen et al. (2022) investigated the effect of technology-assisted DA practice on learners' speaking skill development and speaking anxiety reduction in an EFL context. The researchers found that technology-assisted DA lets the learners develop their speaking skills. Also, the data analysis showed a significant decrease in speaking anxiety among the learners. In addition, the participants of this study believed that the DA approach was a constructive educational method and had a positive effect on their learning development.

Jia et al. (2022) studied the effect of DA mediation on EFL learners learning development. In this study, the researchers instructed the learners by providing DA-based mediation. The researchers tried to move from implicit to explicit guidance by creating sufficient freedom of action for the learners according to their unique educational needs. Data analysis of this research showed that after receiving the DA mediation, the learners felt visibly more satisfied with the learning process, and the quality of their learning performance improved significantly.

Alsaadi (2021) conducted a study to investigate the effect of integrating social media and the DA approach on learners' learning achievement. Relying on sociocultural theory and the concept of ZPD, the researcher systematically reviewed the existing literature, and the study showed that the use of technology-enhanced DA has significant effects on the development of learners' learning skills. Also, it revealed that DA has the potential to improve learners' learning performance and achievements.

In the Iranian EFL context, Sanaeifar and Seifi Divcolaii (2019) investigated the effect of implementing cumulative group dynamic assessment (GDA) and concurrent GDA on students' self-management of learning tasks. In this study, a new approach to DA, i.e., GDA, was interesting to the researchers. In GDA, the same techniques and process of DA are followed, but instead of providing individual intervention, the focus is on group-oriented intervention. In this study, learners were subjected to DA as a group during the learning process. The study revealed that cumulative and concurrent GDA enhanced students' self-management on learning tasks significantly. But the cumulative GDA group outperformed the concurrent GDA group.

In another Iranian study, Sanaeifar and Nafarzadeh Nafari (2018) conducted a study to investigate the effects of DA on reading comprehension on intermediate EFL learners' test anxiety. The researchers utilized the sandwich format of DA in their study. In this study, the researchers focused on reducing the students' reading test anxiety by providing DA techniques in the sandwich format. The researchers examined the reading skill magnitude and, subsequently reading comprehension level among EFL learners. A wide range of elements related to the DA procedure were used in this study. The data analysis of the study revealed that implementing DA practice in reading courses meaningfully reduced learners' test anxiety magnitude.

In addition, Ebadi and Saeedian (2016) investigated the effect of the DA approach through the provision of mediation on Iranian EFL university students' reading comprehension. The researchers provided contingent and flexible mediation during the treatment phase. In this study, the focus was on reading skill, and during the process of teaching reading comprehension, DA was used continuously and interactively. Various techniques of DA were performed during class activities, and students received necessary feedback when required. The results of the study indicated that DA mediational interventions promoted Iranian EFL university students' reading comprehension levels. Also, the students showed a positive attitude toward receiving the DA mediation.

In an ESL context, Poehner et al. (2015) investigated the effectiveness of online mediation on learners' reading and listening comprehension development. Both transactionist and interventionist approaches to mediation were presented as a treatment for the study. In this study, the researchers tried to integrate the teaching and assessment process by relying on DA techniques through the provision of the teacher's interactive mediation. The only difference was the type and sequence of presentation of mediation in the class. For one of the groups, the mediation was predetermined, and for the other group, it proceeded situationally. The analysis of data revealed that both approaches of mediation had a statistically significant effect on the promotion of learners' reading and listening comprehension magnitudes.

Today, one of the leading educational goals in the field of ELT is to establish autonomous and independent learning among students, both in the classroom and in their real-life situations (Cruz, J. L. (2023; Tran, 2020; Wiranti & Widiyati, 2023). On the other hand, recently, DA has been considered an effective alternative to the existing static assessment approaches (Pratolo & Zahruni, 2020; Yang & Qian, 2023), which can have constructive effects on the learning achievements of learners (Ebadi & Bashir, 2021; Ritonga et al., 2022). Since the review of the existing literature does not show any organized and coherent research on using DA and its effect on the autonomy of students in scholastic contexts, conducting such a study can propose an effective solution for educational issues such as students' overreliance on teachers and the shortcomings of the static and formative testing approaches. However, to the best of the current researchers' knowledge, no other study examined the effectiveness of implementing DA to promote students' autonomy and reading comprehension development in the Iranian high school environments. As such, the following research did its best to fill the existing gap in the literature.

Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies, Vol.3, No.1, 2024: 70-89
https://jals.aliabad.iau.ir
ISSN: 2820-9974

METHODOLOGY

PARTICIPANTS

In this study, convenience sampling was employed by the researchers. Sixty Iranian male students in grade 10th studying Vision 1 from Tolouei and Abbaspour public vocational high schools in Sowme'eh Sara, Guilan, took part in this study. All students were originally Iranian, and their first language was Persian. All the participants participated voluntarily in this study. To do this, the researchers provided the consent form for participants and got permission from the students. Also, the researchers ensured the confidentiality of the research information and emphasized that the obtained data was only accessible for research purposes anonymously. To provide the participants with a sense of trust, the researchers signed a research partnership agreement with all participants, emphasizing the anonymity of their information. All participants in this research studied the English language for three years in their secondary school.

INSTRUMENTS

Learner's Autonomy Questionnaire: This questionnaire was developed by Zhang and Li (2004) to measure students' level of autonomy. It is comprised of 32 items and has five parts (evaluation of English teacher's aims and requirements, evaluation of establishing studying goals and plans, evaluation of the learning strategy's implementation, evaluation of ability to monitor the usage of learning strategies and evaluation of English learning process) in a Likert scale format. As the researcher wanted to measure students' autonomy in its different aspects and the questionnaire underlying construct seems suitable for this study, it was used as well. The questionnaire was administered in its original form as pre and post-tests of the study before and after the instructional phase, respectively. Regarding reliability, the researchers piloted the questionnaire and calculated the reliability index through the Cronbach Alpha formula, which was about 0.8. The piloting phase of this research was conducted on a similar sample of participants who were high school 10th-grade students of Bijan Haghiri High School, Sowme'eh Sara, Guilan. The piloting sample was all male (N=32) and aged between 16 and 17. The researchers asked them to answer the questionnaire, and the results were recorded by the researchers to calculate the reliability of the research instruments. To measure the test's content validity, some experts in the field of TEFL were approached to comment on the items. Also, some studies in TEFL and TESL fields reported the standard validity of this questionnaire (Lin & Reinders, 2019; Macaskill & Taylor, 2010; Nguyen, 2012; Orakci & Gelisli, 2017).

Reading Comprehension Test: The reading test is taken from The TOEFL Junior Tests to indicate learners' reading comprehension ability. The participants were supposed to read each passage and check the correct answer to each item. The reading test had 20 multiple-choice items in three parts. The first part was about an announcement (items 1-4) and the second part was about a story (items 5-11), and the third part was about a passage (items 12-20). This test was used as pre and post-tests of the study before and after the instructional phase, respectively. Regarding the matter of reliability, the researchers piloted the test. As mentioned earlier, the piloting stage of this research was conducted on a similar sample of participants who were high school 10th-grade students of Bijan Haghiri High School, Sowme'eh Sara, Guilan. The piloting sample was all male (N=32) and aged between 16 and 17. The researchers asked them to answer the test, and the results were recorded by the researchers to calculate the reliability of the research instruments. In this study, the reliability index through the Cronbach Alpha formula was about 0.90. It means that the test was reliable enough to consider a standard test. To measure the test's content validity, some experts in the field of TEFL were approached to comment on the items. Based on the comments of the panel of experts, the test's items were refined and modified.

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

The participants were randomly divided into two groups: an experimental group (N=30) and a control group (N=30). Before starting the new academic term, the pre-tests, i.e., the student's autonomy questionnaire and the reading comprehension test, were administered to them. It is worth mentioning that for ease and plausibility of application in the classroom regarding students' level of language proficiency and classroom time management, the sandwich format DA was used for the experimental group during the academic term in this study. The sandwich format of DA, which was used in this study, consisted of three phases: pre-test, mediation, and post-test. As for the first phase, learners were asked to finish pre-test tests, tasks, or activities. Afterward, in the second phase (i.e., between the pre-

test and the post-test), they were exposed to mediation (i.e., instruction that was either pre-planned or tailored to the learners' needs based on their performance during the pre-test) by the teacher (mediator). Finally, they moved on to the next phase and completed post-test tests, tasks, or activities. The performance on the post-test was compared to that of the pre-test to determine how much development or progress a learner made as a result of mediation. As for assessment style, the researchers applied an interactionist approach of DA in this study. In the interaction with students, the researcher did his best to help students expand their current ability to perform independently. The researcher encouraged students to actively take part in the relevant features of the language by offering mediation of a set of prompts. In the present study, the researchers used multi-stage tests to implement DA. The teacher asked them to pass the test in the first stage, then after rating the papers, the observed problems and mistakes were discussed by the teacher with all the students. The teacher mediated and interacted with them, providing the necessary tips and hints to understand the problems. The students were again asked to take the previous test in the second stage. At this stage, the teacher monitored them individually and gave them the necessary mediation through constructive tips, hints, or prompts. The teacher tried to reach an agreement with the student to answer the questions correctly and reflect the result of this interaction on the paper. In the third stage, the teacher asked them to answer the question individually without providing help. Finally, the last stage's scores were considered the test result. The control group, on the other hand, was exposed to conventional teaching practice. It means that they did not receive dynamic assessment practice. Having finished the academic term, the post-tests, i.e., the student's autonomy questionnaire and reading comprehension test, were administered again. The collected data through pre and post-tests of this study were analyzed using SPSS software to answer research questions.

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In the present study, a quasi-experimental research design was used. Due to the existence of quantitative data and numerical and statistical analyses, this study has a quantitative perspective to research with an experimental design with a pre-test, then a treatment, and then a post-test format. Since the random selection of the research sample was not possible for the researchers, and a simple sampling method (available sampling) was undertaken in this study, the design type was assumed to be a quasi-experimental one. Due to the feasibility of the research and the high generalizability potential of the experimental research design, the researchers used a quasi-experimental design for this study.

RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

ANALYSIS OF THE FIRST RESEARCH QUESTION

The first research question of this study was as follows:

RQ_1: Does implementing dynamic assessment have any statistically significant effect on Iranian high school students' autonomy?

To answer the first research question, the descriptive statistics for the control and experimental groups' autonomy pre-tests scores are presented in the following table.

TABLE 1

The Descriptive Statistics for Autonomy Pre-Test Scores

	N	Range	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Variance
Control Group	30	80	34	114	67.40	22.627	511.972
Experimental Group	30	81	39	120	77.77	23.260	541.013
Valid N (listwise)	30						

According to Table 1, the means of the control and experimental groups' pre-tests scores are 67.40 and 77.77, respectively. Here, the mean for the experimental group is more than the control group (77.77 > 67.40), but it needs to check whether this difference is significant or not. To do so, the normality of datasets was explored at first. In

Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies, Vol.3, No.1, 2024: 70-89
https://jals.aliabad.iau.ir
ISSN: 2820-9974

order to check the normality of the pre-test scores, the Shapiro-Wilk test was run by the researcher. The normality statistics for the pre-test scores are presented in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2

The Normality Statistics for the Autonomy Pre-Test Scores

	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Control Group	.951	30	.174
Experimental Group	.964	30	.383

Based on the outcome of Table 2, the sig. values of the pre-test scores are 0.174 and 0.383. Here, both values are more than the critical value, i.e., 0.05 (0.174 > 0.05 and 0.383 > 0.05). It means that the scores are normally distributed. Since the pre-test scores are normally distributed, the researchers were allowed to run a parametric test to present inferential statistics for the comparison of means. Since two sets of scores belonged to two different groups, the researchers ran Independent Sample T-Test for the comparison of the means. In Table 4 below, the inferential statistics for the autonomy pre-test scores are presented. Before presenting inferential statistics, it needs to check the homogeneity of variances through the Levene test in order to find which row of the sig. value should be taken into account (Table 3):

TABLE 3

Levene Test's Statistics for the Autonomy Pre-Test Scores

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.001	1	58	.977

As can be seen in Table 4, the sig. value for the Levene test is 0.977, more than the critical value, i.e., 0.05 (0.977 > 0.05). It means that the difference between the variances of two sets of scores is not significant. In other words, two variances are supposed to be equal. Thus, the equality of the variances was assumed. However, the sig. value in the first row of the inferential statistics table is appropriate for interpreting the result. In Table 4, the inferential statistics for the autonomy post-test scores are presented.

TABLE 4

The Inferential Statistics for the Autonomy Pre-Test Scores

		t-test for Equality of Means						
		t	df	Sig.	MD	SED	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower	Upper
Autonomy Post-test	Equal variances assumed	-1.750	58	.085	-10.367	5.924	-22.226	1.492
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.750	57.956	.085	-10.367	5.924	-22.226	1.493

As the findings of Table 4 indicate, the sig. value is 0.085, which is more than the critical value, i.e., 0.05 (0.085 > 0.05). It means that the difference between the two means of pre-tests scores is not statistically significant. To continue the analysis of the first research question, next, the descriptive statistics for the control and experimental groups' autonomy post-test scores are presented in Table 5 below.

TABLE 5

The Descriptive Statistics for Autonomy Post-Test Scores

	N	Range	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Variance
Control Group	30	75	37	112	67.00	21.912	480.138
Experimental Group	30	76	49	125	85.40	22.132	489.834
Valid N (listwise)	30						

As can be seen in Table 5, the means of the control and experimental groups' post-test scores are 67.00 and 85.40, respectively. Here, the mean for the experimental group is more than the control group (85.40 > 67.00), but it needs to check whether this difference is significant. To do so, the exploration of the normality of datasets was required at first. In order to check the normality of the post-test scores, the Shapiro-Wilk test was run by the researchers. The normality statistics for the post-test scores are presented in Table 6 below.

TABLE 6

The Normality Statistics for the Autonomy Post-Test Scores

	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Control Group	.941	30	.094
Experimental Group	.954	30	.217

As can be seen in Table 6, the sig. values of the post-test scores are 0.094 and 0.217. Here, both sig. values are more than the critical value, i.e., 0.05 (0.094 > 0.05 and 0.217 > 0.05). It means that the scores are normally distributed. Since the post-test scores are normally distributed, the researchers ran a parametric test to present inferential statistics for the comparison of means. Since these two sets of scores belonged to two different groups, the researchers ran the Independent Sample T-test to compare the means. Before presenting inferential statistics, the homogeneity of variances had to be checked through the Levene test in order to find which row of the sig. value should be taken into account to verify the null hypothesis (Table 7):

TABLE 7

Levene Test's Statistics for the Autonomy Post-Test Scores

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.040	1	58	.842

As can be seen in Table 7, the sig. value for the Levene test is 0.842, and it is more than the critical value, i.e., 0.05 (0.842 > 0.05). It means that the difference between the variances of two sets of scores is not significant. In other words, two variances are supposed to be equal. Thus, the equality of the variances was assumed. However, the sig. value in the first row of the inferential statistics table is appropriate for interpreting the result. In Table 8, the inferential statistics for the autonomy post-test scores are presented.

TABLE 8

The Inferential Statistics for the Autonomy Post-Test Scores

	t-test for Equality of Means						
	t	df	Sig.	MD	SED	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper

Autonomy Post-test	Equal variances assumed	-3.236	58	.002	-18.400	5.686	-29.782	-7.018
	Equal variances not assumed	-3.236	57.994	.002	-18.400	5.686	-29.782	-7.018

According to the outcome of Table 8, the sig. value is 0.002, and it is less than the critical value, i.e., 0.05 (0.002 < 0.05). It means that the difference between the two means of post-test scores is statistically significant. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected as implementing DA had a statistically significant effect on Iranian high school students' autonomy.

ANALYSIS OF THE SECOND RESEARCH QUESTION

The second research question of this study was as follows:

RQ2: Does implementing dynamic assessment have any statistically significant effect on Iranian high school students' English reading skill?

To answer this question, first, the descriptive statistics for the control and experimental groups' reading comprehension pre-test scores are presented in the following table.

TABLE 9

The Descriptive Statistics for Reading Comprehension Pre-Test Scores

	N	Range	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Variance
Control Group	30	11	6	17	11.70	3.053	9.321
Experimental Group	30	12	6	18	11.40	2.908	8.455
Valid N (listwise)	30						

As can be seen in Table 9, the means of the control and experimental groups' pre-test scores are 11.70 and 11.40, respectively. Here, the mean for the experimental group is less than the control group (11.40 < 11.70), but it needs to check whether this difference is significant. To do so, the exploration of the normality of datasets was required at first. In order to check the normality of the pre-test scores, the Shapiro-Wilk test was run by the researchers. The normality statistics for the pre-test scores are presented in the following table.

TABLE 10

The Normality Statistics for the Reading Comprehension Pre-Test Scores

	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Control Group	.958	30	.283
Experimental Group	.961	30	.334

As the findings of Table 10 suggest, the sig. values of the pre-test scores are 0.283 and 0.334. Here, both values are more than the critical value, i.e., 0.05 (0.283 > 0.05 and 0.334 > 0.05). It means that the scores are normally distributed. Since the pre-test scores are normally distributed, the researchers ran a parametric test to present inferential statistics for the comparison of means. Since these two sets of scores belonged to two different groups, the researcher ran the Independent Sample T-test to compare the means. Before presenting inferential statistics, it needs to check the homogeneity of variances through the Levene test in order to find which row of the sig. value should be taken into account for the interpretation of the findings (Table 11):

TABLE 11

Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies, Vol.3, No.1, 2024: 70-89
https://jals.aliabad.iau.ir
ISSN: 2820-9974

Levene Test's Statistics for the Reading Comprehension Pre-Test Scores

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.156	1	58	.694

As can be seen in Table 12, the sig. value for the Levene test is 0.694, more than the critical value, i.e., 0.05 (0.694 > 0.05). It means that the difference between the variances of two sets of scores is not significant. In other words, two variances are supposed to be equal. Thus, the equality of the variances was assumed. However, the sig. value in the first row of the inferential statistics table is appropriate for the interpretation of the result. In Table 12, the inferential statistics for the reading comprehension pre-test scores are presented.

TABLE 12

The Inferential Statistics for the Reading Comprehension Pre-Test Scores

		t-test for Equality of Means						
		t	df	Sig.	MD	SED	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower	Upper
Reading Comprehension Pre-test	Equal variances assumed	.390	58	.698	.300	.770	-1.241	1.841
	Equal variances not assumed	.390	57.863	.698	.300	.770	-1.241	1.841

According to the outcome of Table 12, the sig. value is 0.698, more than the critical value, i.e., 0.05 (0.698 > 0.05). It means that the difference between the two means of pre-tests scores is not statistically significant. To continue the analysis of the first research question, next, the descriptive statistics for the control and experimental groups' reading comprehension post-test scores are presented in the following table.

TABLE 13

The Descriptive Statistics for Reading Comprehension Post-Test Scores

	N	Range	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Variance
Control Group	30	9	8	17	11.90	2.771	7.679
Experimental Group	30	11	8	19	13.90	2.881	8.300
Valid N (listwise)	30						

As Table 13 shows, the means of the control and experimental groups' post-test scores are 11.90 and 13.90, respectively. Here, the mean for the experimental group is more than the control group (13.90 > 11.90), but it needs to check whether this difference is significant. To do so, the exploration of the normality of datasets was required at first. In order to check the normality of the post-test scores, the Shapiro-Wilk test was run by the researchers. The normality statistics for the post-test scores are presented in the table below.

TABLE 14

The Normality Statistics for the Reading Comprehension Post-Test Scores

	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Control Group	.971	30	.577
Experimental Group	.933	30	.059

Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies, Vol.3, No.1, 2024: 70-89
https://jals.aliabad.iau.ir
ISSN: 2820-9974

As the findings of Table 14 indicate, the sig. values of the post-test scores are 0.577 and 0.059. Here, both values are more than the critical value, i.e., 0.05 (0.577 > 0.05 and 0.059 > 0.05). It means that the scores are normally distributed. Since the post-test scores are normally distributed, the researchers ran a parametric test to present inferential statistics for the comparison of means. Since these two sets of scores belonged to two different groups, the researcher ran the Independent Sample T-test for the comparison of the means. Before presenting inferential statistics, it needs to check the homogeneity of variances through the Levene test in order to find which row of the sig. value should be taken into account for interpreting the finding. The following table presents Levene test statistics.

TABLE 15

Levene Test's Statistics for the Reading Comprehension Post-Test Scores

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.034	1	58	.853

As can be seen in Table 15, the sig. value for the Levene test is 0.853, which is more than the critical value, i.e., 0.05 (0.853 > 0.05). It means that the difference between the variances of two sets of scores is not significant. In other words, two variances are supposed to be equal. Thus, the equality of the variances was assumed. However, the sig. value in the first row of the inferential statistics table is appropriate for the interpretation of the result. In Table 16, the inferential statistics for the reading comprehension pre-test scores are presented.

TABLE 16

The Inferential Statistics for the Reading Comprehension Post-test Scores

		t-test for Equality of Means						
		t	df	Sig.	MD	SED	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower	Upper
Reading Comprehension Pre-test	Equal variances assumed	-2.740	58	.008	-2.000	.730	-3.461	-.539
	Equal variances not assumed	-2.740	57.913	.008	-2.000	.730	-3.461	-.539

According to the outcome of Table 16, the sig. value is 0.008, less than the critical value, i.e., 0.05 (0.008 < 0.05). It means that the difference between the two means of post-test scores is statistically significant. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected as implementing DA had a statistically significant effect on Iranian high school students' English reading skill.

DISCUSSION

Initially, the data analysis in this study revealed that implementing DA had a statistically significant effect on Iranian high school students' autonomy and English reading skill, meaning exposure to DA practice meaningfully enhanced students' both levels of autonomy and reading skill.

Given the first finding of the current study, the high level of interaction between the teacher and the students provided a friendly and constructive atmosphere in the classroom, helping students to release their potential engagement and motivating them to take more responsibility for learning. In fact, the dialogic and interactional nature of DA practice closely links to the concept of autonomy. As Santrock (2006) believed, to have an

autonomous classroom, teachers should teach students as a facilitator of learning and not as a source of knowledge. To develop students' autonomy, the provision of mediation and enrichment of interaction in classroom practice is necessary. An effective interaction in the classroom can help students to transform their own constructed meaning and knowledge in a collaborative manner, which is helpful for students' autonomy development (Stroupe et al., 2016).

According to Benson and Voller (1997), an autonomous learner constructs his/her own meaning, which is unique to her/himself. Thus, teachers should emphasize students' active engagement in the construction of meaning while encouraging them to interact with each other for the negotiation of meaning. The cornerstone principle of DA is the allowance to construct student-specific meaning in teaching. DA process requires a teacher who interacts, intervenes, and guides students learning performance to shape and form their understandings. Thus, and as the outcome of the current study showed, if DA practice is implemented correctly, it has the potential to enhance students' autonomy.

In accordance with this finding, Furtak and Kunter (2012) concluded that motivational support from the teacher can enhance students' self-reliance and willingness to take on their learning responsibilities. DA process can provide a considerable amount of pedagogical and practical support for students in terms of mediation or continuous scaffolding. Students who receive DA practice find themselves in a supportive and friendly atmosphere that helps them to be more determined to achieve their learning goals. Thus, they become motivated to follow their own learning objective even independently. Such a student no longer considers him/herself as a passive receiver of knowledge from the teacher; instead, he/she constructs his/her meaning of the learning process and moves toward autonomous learning.

Considering the second finding of the study, as reading is an interactive process of extracting meaning from written texts (Grabe, 1991), learners need to perform their best to understand the meaning behind the text. One obvious strategy to do so is enhancing the ability to comprehend individually and independently. Thus, working on students' autonomy can facilitate their reading skill because the autonomous learner can construct the meaning more easily. As mentioned before, DA can enhance students' autonomy, and it has the potential to develop students' reading skill respectively. This idea aligns with Crome et al. (2009), who define autonomous learning as learners' ability to think, manage, evaluate, and perform the learning process independently in a realistic manner considering their own strengths and weaknesses.

According to (Khaghaninejad, 2015), DA is process-oriented and seeks to identify students' skills and learning potential. The provision of substantial assistance at the beginning of the learning process helps the students to improve their learning performance and efficacy. Thus, practicing DA in the classroom enables students to modify their performance. In this way, students consider themselves as better language learners who have a chance to learn to control their learning process. As such, along with skill development, it is a significant step toward autonomous learning for students. In addition, through DA practice, teachers are enabled to facilitate the learning process by providing mediational feedback. This pedagogical intervention is strong enough to recognize the learning difficulties and offers an excellent chance to solve these problems (Stevenson et al., 2016). Fewer learning difficulties and problems mean higher learning effectiveness, respectively.

However, developing students' autonomy is beneficial to learning skills, especially reading comprehension, as revealed in the current study. In addition, as reading comprehension is a cognitively demanding process, DA practice can facilitate it considerably. According to Grigorenko and Sternberg (1998), DA is designed to optimize students' cognitive functioning and enable them to develop their cognitive achievement through the provision of intervention by teachers.

Another crucial factor is the dialogic nature of the teacher's mediation. In the DA process, mediation consists of using active communication between teacher and student. It features a positive way for a student how to be able to express their opinions and points accurately and logically (Stringer, 2018). This dialogic interaction enables students to negotiate their meaning and exchange their understanding with teachers. Through the provision of mediated feedback, teachers can retune students' understanding and facilitate their learning process. This adjustment in learning can provide a constructive opportunity for reading skill development for the students.

According to Perry et al. (2007), to teach students how to be autonomous, teachers should be autonomous themselves and scaffold them to eliminate learning obstacles. Students need to train to learn how to regulate their learning process to achieve learning objectives. This opportunity is presented through the execution of the well-designed DA practice in the classroom, as the findings of the current study indicated.

As a final remark, it can be said that DA practice has some considerable and undeniable potentialities in the teaching and learning process. One critical potential is the power of DA to construct an autonomous identity for students. When the students become autonomous, they are ready to accept the responsibility to their learning actions and their consequences and move toward being better language learners.

CONCLUSION

DA flourished in response to the shortcomings of SA. This concept is grounded in Vygotsky's theory of mental development (Lantolf & Poehner, 2011). Emphasizing optimal learning performance based on the learner's potential abilities and not their current abilities (Haywood & Lidz, 2007), a salient feature of DA is the execution of the scaffolding process from teachers to support students' learning performance.

As the findings of this study confirmed, DA practice had an increasing effect on students' autonomy and reading skill development. When students find the reading activity and tasks more relaxing through practicing DA, their reading anxiety declines, and they can complete their reading mission more effectively. The researchers recommend language teachers consider DA practice as a practical teaching approach in their teaching contexts. To implement DA sufficiently, they should revise their ego and conceptualization of the nature of language assessment. A teacher who wants to practice DA in his/her teaching context needs to know the essence of teaching is not transferring some predesign knowledge to students. Teaching should concentrate on constant development in students' current level of understanding toward their next potential level.

It is worth noting that this study was limited to the scholastic context where the study was done in the Iranian EFL environment. Another limitation of this study was that the researcher had to work with male students in public high schools in Sowme'eh Sara, Guilan. Also, this study delimited the sandwich format of DA because of its plausibility and practicality characteristics at the high school level.

This study has practical applications for English language students and teachers in which, by experiencing the DA approach, they can move towards autonomous learning by altering the existing static approaches of testing and increasing the efficiency of the teaching-learning process. The results and findings of this research can be considered valuable and practical for teachers who are looking to teach reading skill and reading comprehension autonomously and with more freedom of action for learners. It can also be helpful for learners who are seeking for effective ways to learn reading skill and increase their comprehension ability tending to initiate their learning process. On the other hand, the results of the present study can inspire policymakers and education practitioners to find a solution to increase the quality of the English language teaching curriculum and syllabuses by increasing autonomy and improving educational achievements.

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), 73-82.

Baek, S., & Kim, K. (2003). The effect of dynamic assessment-based instruction on children's learning. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *4*(2), 189-198.

Benson, P. (2001). *Autonomy in language learning*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Benson, P., & Voller, P. (1997). *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. London: Longman.

Boonma, N., & Swatevacharkul, R. (2020). The effect of autonomous learning process on learner autonomy of English public speaking students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(1), 194-205.

Candy, P. C. (1991). *Self-direction for lifelong learning*. California: Jossey-Bass.

Cheetham, C., Elliott, M., Harper, A., & Ito, M. (2017). Accessibility and the promotion of autonomous EFL reading. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, *8*(1), 4-22.

Chen, C. H., Koong, C. S., & Liao, C. (2022). Influences of integrating dynamic assessment into a speech recognition learning design to support students' English-speaking skills, learning anxiety and cognitive load. *Educational Technology & Society*, *25*(1), 1-14.

Cotterall, S. (2000). Promoting learner autonomy through the curriculum: principles for designing language courses. *ELT Journal, 54*(2), 109-117.

Crome, K., Farrar, R., & O'Connor, P. (2009). What is autonomous learning? *Learning and Teaching in Philosophical and Religious Studies, 9*(1), 111-126.

Cruz, J. L. (2023). Promoting learner autonomy through tandem learning in a Japanese ESL context. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, *5*(1), 34-50.

Davin, K. J. (2016). Classroom dynamic assessment: A critical examination of constructs and practices. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*, 813-829.

Davin, K. J., Herazo, J. D., & Sagre, A. M. (2017). Learning to mediate: Teacher appropriation of dynamic assessment. *Language Teaching Research, 21*(5), 632-651.

De Naeghel, J., Van Keer, H., Vansteenkiste, M., Haerens, L., & Aelterman, N. (2016). Promoting elementary school students' autonomous reading motivation: Effects of a teacher professional development workshop. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *109*(3), 232-252.

Dickinson, L. (1992). *Learner autonomy: Learner training for language learning*. Dublin: Authentik.

Dickinson, L. (1993). Talking shop; aspects of autonomous learning: An interview with Leslie Dickinson. *ELT Journal, 47*(4), 330-336.

Dixon, C., Oxley, E., Gellert, A. S., & Nash, H. (2023). Dynamic assessment as a predictor of reading development: A systematic review. *Reading and Writing*, *36*(3), 673-698.

Dorfler, T., Golke, S., & Artlet, C. (2009). Dynamic assessment and its potential for the assessment of reading competence. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 35*, 77-82.

Ebadi, S., & Bashir, S. (2021). An exploration into EFL learners' writing skills via mobile-based dynamic assessment. *Education and Information Technologies*, *26*, 1995-2016.

Ebadi, S., & Saeedian, A. (2016). Exploring transcendence in EFL learners' reading comprehension through computerized dynamic assessment. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 4*(1), 27-45.

Elleman, A. M., & Oslund, E. L. (2019). Reading comprehension research: Implications for practice and policy. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *6*(1), 3-11.

Furtak, E. M., & Kunter, M. (2012). Effects of autonomy-supportive teaching on student learning and motivation. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 80*(3), 284-316.

Glaspey, A. M., Wilson, J. J., Reeder, J. D., Tseng, W. C., & MacLeod, A. A. (2022). Moving beyond single word acquisition of speech sounds to connected speech development with dynamic assessment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *65*(2), 508-524.

Goodrich, N. H. (2020). English in Iran. *World Englishes*, *39*(3), 482-499.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. (2011). *Teaching and researching reading*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Longman.

Grigorenko, E. L., & Sternberg, R. J. (1998). Dynamic testing. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*(1), 75-111.

Gülnihal, Ş. E., & Cem, B. (2019). Does autonomy really matter in language learning? *Journal of Language and Education, 5*(4), 98-111.

Haywood, H. C., & Lidz, C. S. (2007). *Dynamic assessment in practice: Clinical and educational applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hermagustiana, I., & Anggriyani, D. (2020). Language learner autonomy: The beliefs of English language students. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, *6*(2), 133-142.

Hill, K., & Sabet, M. (2009). Dynamic speaking assessment. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(3), 537-545.

Huang, Y. (2019). The application of autonomous reading in English reading classroom. *Journal of Simulation, 7*, 1-3.

Jia, L., Cai, J., & Wang, J. (2022). Promoting learning potential among students of L2 Chinese through dynamic assessment. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 20*, 66-87.

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

Khaghaninejad, M. S. (2015). *Dynamic assessment: From theory to practice*. Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Kirschenbaum, R. J. (1998). Dynamic assessment and its use with underserved gifted and talented populations. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 42*(3), 140-147.

Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. (2011). Dynamic assessment in the classroom: Vygotskian praxis for L2 development. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(11), 11-33.

Lengkanawati, N. S. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about learner autonomy and its implementation in Indonesian EFL settings. In: R. Barnard & J. Li (Eds.), *Language learner autonomy: Teachers' beliefs and practices in Asian contexts* (pp. 134-149). Phnom Penh: IDP Education.

Liang, Y., Li, Y., & Sang, Z. (2023). A study on peer mediation in dynamic assessment of translation revision competence. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *20*(1), 108-126.

Lidz, C. S. (1987). *Dynamic assessment: An interactional approach to evaluating learning potential*. New York: Guilford Press.

Lidz, C.S., & B. Gindis. (2003). Dynamic assessment of the evolving cognitive functions in children. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 99-116). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lin, L., & Reinders, H. (2019). Students' and teachers' readiness for autonomy: Beliefs and practices in developing autonomy in the Chinese context. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *20*, 69-89.

Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.

Little, D. (2022). Language learner autonomy: Rethinking language teaching. *Language Teaching, 55*(1), 64-73.

Macaskill, A., & Taylor, E. (2010). The development of a brief measure of learner autonomy in university students. *Studies in Higher Education*, *35*(3), 351-359.

Maliqi, F. (2019). Issues on learner autonomy: Teachers' effort and responsibility towards it. *Pristina College, 8*(1), 31-50.

McGrath, I. (2000). Teacher autonomy. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath, & T. Lamb (Eds.), *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions* (pp. 100-110). Harlow: Longman.

Moradian, M. R., Ramezanzadeh, A., & Khazaie, S. (2022). A critical examination of western and Islamic orientations to English language education in Iran: A call for dialogue across various perspectives in a non-native context. *Two Quarterly Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning University of Tabriz*, *14*(29), 118-132.

Nakata, Y. (2011). Teachers' readiness for promoting learner autonomy: A study of Japanese EFL school teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(5), 900-910.

Nguyen, L. T. C. (2012). Learner autonomy in language learning: How to measure it rigorously. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, *18*(1), 52-67.

Orakci, S., & Gelisli, Y. (2017). Learner autonomy scale: A scale development study. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *5*(4), 25-35.

Perry, N. E., Hutchinson, L., & Tauberger, C. (2007). Talking about teaching self-regulated learning: Scaffolding student teachers' development and use of practices that promote self-regulated learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *47*, 97-108.

Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting L2 development*. New York: Springer.

Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2005). Dynamic assessment in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, *9*, 233-265.

Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2023). Advancing L2 dynamic assessment: Innovations in Chinese contexts. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *20*(1), 1-19.

Poehner, M. E., & Wang, Z. (2020). Dynamic assessment and second language development. *Language Teaching, 54*, 472-490.

Poehner, M. E., & Yu, L. (2022). Dynamic assessment of L2 writing: Exploring the potential of rubrics as mediation in diagnosing learner emerging abilities. *TESOL Quarterly*, *56*(4), 1191-1217.

Poehner, M. E., Zhang, J., & Lu, X. (2015). Computerized dynamic assessment (C-DA): Diagnosing L2 development according to learner responsiveness to mediation. *Language Testing*, *32*(3), 337-357.

Pratolo, B. W., & Zahruni, N. A. (2020). Dynamic assessment effect on speaking performance of Indonesian EFL learners. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *9*(3), 778-790.

Qi, H. (2022). A revised survey on autonomy awareness of foreign language learners in China. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, *12*(1), 44-55.

Rahman, E., Yunus, M., Hashim, H., & Rahman, N. K. (2022). Learner autonomy between students and teachers at a defence university: Perception vs. expectation. *Sustainability*, *14*(10), 60-86.

Ritonga, M., Farhangi, F., Ajanil, B., & Farid Khafaga, A. (2022). Interventionist vs. interactionist models of dynamic assessment (DA) in the EFL classroom: Impacts on speaking accuracy and fluency (SAF), foreign language classroom anxiety (FLCA), and foreign language learning motivation (FLLM). *Language Testing in Asia*, *12*(1), 1-21.

Sanaeifar, S. H., & Nafarzadeh Nafari, F. (2018). The effects of formative and dynamic assessments of reading comprehensions on intermediate EFL learners' test anxiety. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *8*(5), 533-540.

Sanaeifar, S. H., & Seifi Divcolaii, M. (2019). Actualizing language learners' potentials through mediation: cumulative vs concurrent group dynamic assessment and students' self-management of learning tasks. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 9*(7), 802-809.

Santrock, J. W. (2006). *Educational psychology*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Schunk, D. H. (2005) Self-regulated learning: The educational legacy of Paul R. Pintrich. *Educational Psychologist, 40*, 85-94.

Shabani, K. (2012). Dynamic assessment of L2 learners' reading comprehension processes: A Vygotskian perspective. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 32*, 321-328.

Shang, H. F., & Chen, Y. Y. (2018). The impact of online autonomous learning on EFL students' reading skills. *International Journal on E-Learning*, *17*(2), 227-249.

Sherkuziyeva, N., Imamutdinovna Gabidullina, F., Ahmed Abdel-Al Ibrahim, K., & Bayat, S. (2023). The comparative effect of computerized dynamic assessment and rater mediated assessment on EFL learners' oral proficiency, writing performance, and test anxiety. *Language Testing in Asia*, *13*(1), 1-24.

Shi, W., & Han, L. (2019). Promoting learner autonomy through cooperative learning. *English Language Teaching*, *12*(8), 30-36.

Shimo, E. (2003). Learners' perceptions of portfolio assessment and autonomous learning. In A. Barfield & M. Nix (Eds.), *Teacher and learner autonomy in Japan, Autonomy you ask!* (pp. 175-186). Tokyo: Japan Association for Language Teaching Learner Development Special Interest Group.

Stevenson, C. E., Heiser, W. J., & Resing, W. C. M. (2016). Dynamic testing: Assessing cognitive potential of children with culturally diverse backgrounds. *Learning and Individual Differences, 47*, 27-36.

Stroupe, R., Rundle, C., & Tomita, K. (2016). Developing autonomous learners in Japan: Working with teachers through professional development. In R. Barnard & J. Li (Eds.), *Language learner autonomy: Teachers' beliefs and practices in Asian contexts* (pp. 43-61). Phnom Penh: IDP Education.

Stringer, P. (2018). Dynamic assessment in educational settings: is potential ever realised? *Educational Review, 70*, 18-30.

Sun, Z., Xu, P., & Wang, J. (2023). Dynamic assessment of the learning potential of Chinese as a second language. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *20*(1), 127-142.

Tang, Y., & Ma, X. (2023). An interventionist dynamic assessment approach to college English writing in China. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *20*(1), 44-65.

Teferi, H., & Ahmed Abdel-Al Ibrahim, K. (2023). Cultivating EFL learners' productive skills by employing dynamic and non-dynamic assessments: Attitude in focus. *Language Testing in Asia*, *13*(1), 1-21.

Thavenius, C. (1999) Teacher autonomy for learner autonomy. In S. Cotterall & D. Crabbe (Eds.), *Learner autonomy in language learning: Defining the field and effecting change* (pp. 159-163). Frankfurt and Main: Peter Lang.

Tran, T. Q. (2020). EFL students' attitudes towards learner autonomy in English vocabulary learning. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, *3*(2), 86-94.

Tsai, Y. R. (2021). Promotion of learner autonomy within the framework of a flipped EFL instructional model: Perception and perspectives. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *34*(7), 979-1011.

Tuan, D. M. (2021). Learner autonomy in English language learning: Vietnamese EFL students' perceptions and practices. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 307-317.

Ukrainetz, T. W., Harpell, S., Walsh, C., & Colye, C. (2000). A preliminary investigation of dynamic assessment with native American kindergartners. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools*, *31*(2), 142-154.

Vafaee, P. (2011). Dynamic assessment: A dialectical integration of assessment and instruction. *TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), 63-66.

van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective*. New York: Kluwer academic publishers.

Walsh, N. (2021). A study into the benefits of autonomous reading of a novel in an advanced English as a foreign language classroom. *The Journal of Literature in Language Teaching*, *10*(1), 2-14.

Wiranti, S., & Widiyati, E. (2023). Exploring the factors and levels of students' autonomy in language learning. *International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching*, *7*(1), 8-21.

Yang, Y., & Qian, D. D. (2023). Enhancing EFL learners' reading proficiency through dynamic assessment. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *20*(1), 20-43.

Zarrabi, F., & Brown, J. R. (2017). English language teaching and learning analysis in Iran. *International Journal of Educational and Pedagogical Sciences, 9*(10), 3485-3493.

Zhong, Q. (2010). The effect of Chinese EFL learners' beliefs on their autonomous learning. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 1*(3), 212-225.

Zou, X. (2011). What happens in different contexts and how to do learner autonomy better? *Teacher Development, 15*(4), 421-433.