



Research Article

Effects of Dynamic Assessment on Students' Self-Assessment and Writing Performances in EFL Classes: Arjo Secondary School in Focus

Zerihun Buli*, Zeleke Teshome, Rufael Disasa

Department of English Language and Literature, Wollega University, Ethiopia

Article Information

Received: 02 April 2022

Revised version received: 22 May 2022

Accepted: 24 May 2022

Published: 28 May 2022

Cite this article as:

Z. Buli et al. (2022) *Int. J. Grad. Res. Rev.* Vol 8(1-2): 19-28.

*Corresponding author

Zerihun Buli,

Department of English Language and Literature, Wollega University, Ethiopia.

Email: Zerihunfb@gmail.com

Peer reviewed under authority of IJGRR

© 2022 International Journal of Graduate Research and Review

OPEN ACCESS



Abstract

This study was aimed at assessing effects of dynamic assessment on students' self-assessment and their writing performances with particular reference to Arjo Secondary School, Ethiopia. The researcher has employed quasi-experimental pre-test-post-test non-equivalent control group design to secure data from the research participants. Random sampling technique was utilized to select 97 grade 11 students for the study. The participants constituted 49 from control group and 48 from experimental group. Pre-test, post-test and self-rating questionnaire were used to generate data from participants of the study. Consequently, mean, Independent-Samples t-test and Paired Samples t-test were employed to compute quantitative data. The results of the study revealed that there was statistically significant difference between the experimental group and the control group as the sig value is less than 0.05 ($p < .05$). Experimental group students demonstrated significant improvements in writing performances whereas the control group students did not improve their writing performances significantly. Besides, the study indicated that experimental group students' mean score was found to be better than control group students in self-assessment after intervention. The study implied that dynamic assessment was helpful for enabling students to rate their writing performances genuinely. Thus, it can be concluded that dynamic assessment was effective for enhancing students' writing performances. Thus, it is recommended that teachers are expected to employ dynamic assessment in EFL writing classes thereby students' writing performances would be significantly improved.

Keywords: Dynamic assessment; self-assessment; writing performance.

This is an open access article & it is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Introduction

Various theoretical and methodological orientations have furnished the history of assessing writing performances of students which is directly the reflections of how writing was taught in EFL classes at that time. In the early years of teaching English as a foreign language, assessing writing performances of students was influenced by behaviourism in which students are viewed as passive reactors in writing and they needed to write accurately to the teacher's stimulus

(Zhang, 2018). Students' performances in writing are measured in light of the imitation of input provided by the teacher. Succinctly, writing assessment takes the form of sentence drills, fill-ins, substitutions, transformation and completion. Furthermore, students are supposed to produce written compositions replica of the model with acceptable grammar thereby teachers focused on products of students' written work (Drid, 2018). In this regard, teachers assess



students' writing performances to ensure whether they have mastered the linguistic knowledge to produce grammatically accurate texts following a certain structure.

Scholars have started to rethink their assumptions about writing assessment and consider it as yielding significant results concerning both the processes of teaching and learning writing. Hence, they proposed alternative assessments which are carried out continuously over a period of time rather than restricted to the end of a course or a semester. The alternative assessments encompass a wide range of techniques, and the chief ones include portfolio, peer-assessment, self-assessment, etc. They are in place as a reaction to the long-established one-shot method of assessing writing performances of students. Such assessment techniques were quite conducive in offering learners opportunities to control their own learning and alleviate the burden of assessment from the teacher (Farrokh & Rahmani, 2017; Lenski & Verbruggen, 2010).

Indeed, traditional concepts of assessing writing performances of students describe instruction and assessment as dichotomous. Accordingly, researchers introduced dynamic assessment that attempts to link instruction and assessment together. DA is a comprehensive learning-oriented assessment that identifies the individuals' actual cognitive abilities and targets their scope of abilities when various mediational levels are offered as they struggle with difficult writing tasks. Most importantly, DA constitutes a valuable part of the assessment repertoire which gives insights into useful information about both present and potential performance that is not readily gained with other assessment forms (Haywood & Lidz, 2007). The implementation of DA follows three steps in which students are given mediation between pre-test and post-test stages throughout the assessment administration. Teachers conduct a test with students, observe the results and make some modifications to their teaching and adapt assessment tasks based on the new information obtained. Then, teachers administer a post-test to determine if intervention brings reasonable changes (Lantolf & Poehner, 2007; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2002).

Socio-cultural theory is the underlying foundation of dynamic assessment which is the theoretical constructs of this study (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Mauludin & Ardianti, 2007). According to this theory, knowledge is constructed socially through interactions and shared by individuals. It describes learning and development as being embedded in social events and occurring as students interact with other people. The study conducted by (Miao & Lv, 2013) indicated that dynamic assessment can improve writing performances with regard to accuracy, complexity and fluency in ESL classes. Furthermore, other studies have shown that DA appears to have the promising effects in improving the writing performances of students at different

education levels (e.g. Aghaebrahimian, *et al.*, 2014; Shrestha & Coffin, 2012; Xiaoxiao & Yan, 2010).

Most of the local findings show Ethiopian secondary school students' English language performances in general and their writing performances in particular are deteriorating. A large number of secondary school students are not good at producing good, coherent and well-organized paragraph. They experience scarcity of ideas, grammar, vocabulary and organization when they are engaged in writing tasks. They are incapable of producing reasonably effective written products such as reports, personal descriptions, letter writing, assignments and term papers (Mesfin, 2013). Furthermore, the study conducted by Solomon (2004) shows that most students at secondary school level do not produce written texts which meet the required standard as their teachers' endeavor of exposing students to writing practice is minimal. As a result of this, schools, training institutions, colleges and universities are drastically under criticisms from the public for failing to address the alarming decline of students' performances at various education levels.

Correspondingly, assessment of EFL writing has emerged as one of the heated themes of language teaching and has intrigued substantial research on its various theoretical and practical aspects (Drid, 2018). It is assumed that the students' academic failure in general and writing performances in particular is associated with assessment. Ineffective assessment practice that focuses on the outcomes of learning would hamper students from attaining the reasonable performances in writing.

To the researcher's knowledge, it seems that DA has not sufficiently been exploited in local contexts. Few attempts have been made locally to address writing assessment related issues. For instance, Zelalem and Boersma (2018) conducted a research on EFL instructors' beliefs and practices of formative assessment in teaching writing. The finding showed a positive, moderate and significant correlation between instructors' beliefs and their practices. This research is a good attempt in indicating the link between teaching and assessment in enhancing students' writing performances through process writing. However, Zelalem and Boersma's research was conducted at university level and it is quite different from the present study which was conducted at high school level where students' writing performances was even worse than university level. Besides, it dealt with instructors' beliefs and their practices about formative assessment which utilized descriptive survey; nonetheless, this study is different from the above study in that it employed quasi-experimental design.

Besides, their study did not consider self-assessment which can be attained by the implementation of DA. Thus, the researcher embarks on filling students' writing gap through



implementing dynamic assessment which moves writing assessment into a new territory in responsive to students' writing performances.

Objective of the Study

The specific objectives of the study are:

1. To examine whether students who are assessed in dynamic assessment method demonstrate better writing performances than those who are assessed in a conventional method.
2. To look into whether students who experience dynamic assessment make a reliable self-assessment than students who do not experience dynamic assessment.

The implementation of DA is fundamental in writing classes to yield meaningful improvements in students' writing performances. It is highly useful for teachers in generating ideas for the implementation of DA for students who are experiencing difficulties in writing. The study also benefits students as it gives opportunity for them to be actively engaged in carrying out self-assessment of their own writing under the close supervision of classroom teacher.

Materials and Methods

This study attempted to assess effects of dynamic assessment on students' self-assessment and writing performances in EFL classes at Arjo Secondary School. The paradigm governing the present study comes from pragmatism which allows mixed methods that negotiate numbers and words to be operated together to answer the research questions. It is considered to be "the philosophical partner" of the mixed research approach. The researcher employed non-randomized quasi-experimental design with already existing intact groups. Each classroom was considered an intact group, given that it was difficult to divide each classroom to randomly assign each student to an experimental or control group. In order to have a greater chance of determining whether a causal connection exists between DA and writing performances, this design was deemed necessary. Hence, the research participants were grouped into experimental group who received intervention in dynamic assessment and control group students who received no intervention and they were assessed writing in a conventional manner.

Sampling Techniques

This study targeted grade 11 students who attended their education at Arjo Secondary School in 2013 E.C. In this school, there were about 426 students (258 males & 168 females) which were assigned into 8 classes. Two sections of grade 11 students were randomly selected and assigned as experimental group and control group. The experimental class had 48 students (Male=26 & Female=22) whereas the

control class had 49 students (Male=27 & Female=22). Consequently, the study involved 97 grade 11 students in both groups. Grade 11 students were selected as participants of the study because they are found at the level where they are expected to establish a good foundation for university education which demands good command of writing in English courses as well as in other academic writing.

Instruments of Data Collection

For the present study, the researcher has employed pre-test and post-test, self-rating questionnaire (pre-intervention and post-intervention questionnaire), self-rating rubric scale and individual interview as a data gathering instruments. These research instruments were thought to be plausible and desirable to guide the researcher in achieving the objectives of the study.

Tests

Pre-test

The purpose of the pre-test administration is to provide a baseline data of students' actual performance before the experiment. The pre-test was administered for both experimental and control group students. It is used to check the similarity level of both groups of students. Accordingly, the topic entitled, 'The Advantages of School Uniform' was chosen and some outlines were provided and students are required to elicit more supporting details to write a unified paragraph. Besides, students were given different topics of free writing. Consequently, they opted and selected a topic on the basis of their own interest and wrote a paragraph. The result of the test was scored by two independent raters to produce consistent results. Raters took brief orientation about scoring rubrics before marking and they employed analytical scoring scheme. The pre-test was scored out of 30%.

Post-test

By the end of the treatment, post-test was prepared and administered for both experimental and control groups. The purpose of the post-test was to see the extent to which dynamic assessment brought the desired effects on students' writing performances. The post-test had the same format with that of pre-test; however, the same test was not presented again to avoid practice effect. The questions for post-test involved guided writing and free writing as that of pre-test in the same allocated time. Hence, the topic 'How to reduce the transmission of Covid-19 Pandemic' was given as outline and students were supposed to extend the outlines further to write a unified paragraph having topic sentence and conclusion. Besides, students were given different topics to select a topic of their choice. Then, they wrote a paragraph based on instruction given. The rubric used for scoring pre-test can be used for post-test, too which followed analytical method of scoring.



Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Pre- and post-self-assessment questionnaire was administered in this study to explore the general level of participants' writing self-assessment and the change of self-assessment in writing instruction due to the intervention of dynamic assessment. The self-assessment items were adapted from Hetthong and Teo (2013), Bing (2016) and Roohani & Shafiee (2019). A five-point Likert Scale ranging from 5 to 1 (strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree) was used. The items were responded in such a way that students are required to encircle the choices under the appropriate rating scales provided. The questionnaire has got 3 parts as pre-writing, during writing and after writing. The items were administered two times. Firstly, it was administered at the beginning of the intervention to see the extent to which students are experiencing self-assessment in writing. Secondly, the administration of self-assessment was run after intervention. The self-assessment items were administered to both experimental and control groups. The self-assessment questionnaire was translated into respondents' native language, Afan Oromo to avoid misunderstanding. No adequate and full-scale theory of translation exist, however, the basic principles and procedures are kept.

Interview

To enrich and strengthen the data obtained from the other data collecting instruments, the researcher generated 8 interview questions. Five students were randomly chosen from experimental classes to take part in the individual interview which was held in students' mother tongue to ease understanding. Semi-structured interview was prepared to allow respondents maximum opportunity to share their views and feelings of doing self-assessment, the potential contributions of DA for improving students' writing performance, etc. Semi-structured interview was used as it allows adjusting wording of questions, the level of language used and the interviewer makes clarifications, and adds or deletes probes between subsequent participants.

To this effect, 8 (eight) questions were designed in order to counter check and probe further information related to the topic. The interview was facilitated by the researcher himself to clarify things amid the interview session. The interview was held with the permission of the respondents at their conveniences. The average duration allocated for each interview was about 20 minutes. The interview was audio taped and later it was transcribed and translated to English during analysis session. Although there are no universal transcription formats/protocols that would be

adequate to transcribe interviews, the researcher used denaturalized transcription that prioritizes the verbal content and focused on the omission of idiosyncratic elements. The researcher has carried out the transcriptions almost immediately after the interviews. Once the researcher had received the transcripts from the audio recording, he listened to the interview recording while reading through the transcripts. Each transcript was checked individually for verification purposes.

Procedures of Data Collection

At the outset, research participants were given pre-test which served as baseline data. Moreover, pre-intervention questionnaire was administered to both groups of participants to trace their self-assessment in writing. During the data collection, students were given orientation about the purpose of the study and how to fill in the self-assessment questionnaire. The questionnaire was translated into Afan Oromo to ease respondents' understanding about the items. Then, the intervention was offered to experimental group whereas, the control group students did not receive any mediated learning experience and the teacher taught in a conventional way.

The intervention period lasted 9 weeks starting from February 1, 2022 to April 30, 2022 (February, March & April). The intervention time has gone during school periods as part of the regular schedule once in every week. After series of appropriate intervention, participants were provided with post-test in order to assess whether students have acquainted with the right instruction. After the provision of post-test, the students filled in the post-intervention self-assessment questionnaire. Finally, the interview was held with selected participants to get insights into their experience of dynamic assessment and their expectation of self-assessment in writing classes.

Methods of Data Analysis

Principally, the SPSS software was utilized for analyzing a quantitative data generated through pre-test, post-test and questionnaire. Accordingly, Independent-Samples t-test was utilized in order to compute the mean scores pre-test and post-test of both control and experimental groups. Besides, Paired Sample t-test was used to see the significant difference in pre-test and post-test of control group. Moreover, descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation was run to compute the mean scores of experimental and control group students' pre-intervention and post-intervention self-assessment practices. Besides, the data obtained through individual interview was analyzed qualitatively.



Results and Discussion

Table 1: Background Information about research participants

Groups	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
Control	27	22	49
Experimental	26	22	48
Total	53	44	97

Table 1 displays the participants of the main study who were selected from grade 11 students at Arjo Secondary school. The control group has 49 students with 27 males and 22 females whereas the experimental group constitutes 48 students with 26 males and 22 females. The data was collected from 53 males and 44 females with 97 participants.

The researcher has checked assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances before the data analysis process has begun. Accordingly, the assumption of normality was checked by skewness and kurtosis and Shapiro-Wilk ($p > .05$). Tests of homogeneity of variance was also checked using Levene’s Test of Equality of Error of Variances whether the variances in scores are the same for each of the groups.

Table 2. Independent Samples t-test for Pre-test Scores for both groups

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	t-test for equality of means		
					t-value	Df	Sig. (2-tailed) wawiled
Control	49	13.24	2.602	.03	.062	95	.265
Experimental	48	13.21	3.195				

To control variables before implementing dynamic assessment in EFL class, the scores of the writing pre-test was subjected to statistical treatment to find whether there was statistically significant difference between the control group and the experimental group in terms of the participants’ writing performances. Consequently, Independent Samples t-test was computed to compare the mean scores of the groups as shown in Table 2. Hence, the level of sig .265 with t-value (-0.62; Df =95) is greater than the expected value $p < .05$. Thus, there is no statistically significance difference between the results of the control and experimental groups prior to the intervention. Therefore, it can be claimed that both groups of respondents are homogenous and equal at the beginning of the administration of the intervention.

Table 3: Paired Samples t-test for control group

		Mean	SD	Correlation	t-value	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pre-test	49	13.24	.922	-.551	48	.584
	Post-test	49	13.33				

Paired Samples t-test was computed in order to examine control group students’ writing performances before and after intervention. These students did not receive any intervention throughout the intervention periods. Accordingly, the students’ pre-test accounted 13.24 whereas post-test mean score was accounted to be 13.33 with $SD=2.649$ (table 3). The result of post-test showed that students performed better than they did in pre-test. As the table depicts, however, there is no significant difference as sig value was found to be .584 ($p > .05$). Hence, it can be concluded that the conventional method of assessing writing did not yield the desired effects



in improving students' writing performances. This implied that teachers should devise another mode of assessing writing that is capable of improving students' writing performances.

Table 4: Pre-test and post-test score of experimental groups

		Mean	SD	correlation	t-value	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pre-test	48	13.21	.696	-14.589	47	.000
	Post-test	48	19.83				

In table 4, Paired Samples t-test was run to compare the pre-test and post-test scores of experimental group students. These students were taught through dynamic assessment and they received the intervention designed throughout for them. Table 4 indicated experimental group students' mean score in pre-test was reported to be 13.21 with SD=3.195. Then, the post-test was administered at the end of the intervention session. Hence, experimental group students' post-test mean score was reported to be 19.83 with SD=4.378. The result indicated that students performed better in post-test. Thus, there was statistically significant difference in scores $t(95) p=.000 < .05$ (two-tailed). It can be concluded that the incorporation of dynamic assessment in EFL writing classes was helpful in enhancing students' writing performances. This implied that teachers should implement dynamic assessment in their writing lesson presentations to make students successful in their writing.

Table 5. Independent Samples t-test for Post-test Scores for both groups

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	t-test for equality of means		
					t-value	Df	Sig. (2-tailed) wawiled)
Control	49	13.33	3.061	-6.50	-6.795	95	.000
Experimental	48	19.83	4.378				

To investigate the participants' writing performances after the intervention, Independent-Sample t-test was run to compare the writing performances of both groups in post-test. As can be seen from table 5, there was statistically a significant difference in scores for experimental group (M=19.83, SD=4.378) and control group (M=13.33, SD=3.061; $t(95) = -6.795, p=.000 < .05$). That is there was an increase in the scores of the students in the experimental group in post-test. Therefore, this study found out participants in dynamic assessment group showed significant improvements in their writing performances at the end of the 12-week intervention program. The obtained finding confirmed previous studies conducted by Ableeva (2010) and Poehner (2005).

Table 6. Results of the Pre- and Post-intervention Self-assessment

No	Items	Pre-intervention				Post-intervention			
		Control group		Experimental group		Control group		Experimental group	
		Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. dev	Mean	Std. Dev
1	Before writing items (10)	2.53	1.2097	2.62	1.245	3.57	1.285	3.97	.677
2	During writing items (13)	2.57	1.251	2.53	1.202	3.11	.529	3.88	.623
3	After writing items (15)	2.51	1.235	2.48	1.249	3.17	.579	4.01	.639
Cumulative mean score		2.54	1.2319	2.54	1.232	3.28	0.798	3.95	0.646

Table 6 showed that the pre-intervention mean score of control group participants at pre-writing stage was reported to be 2.53 (SD=1.2097) whereas their mean score increased to 3.57 (SD=1.285) in post intervention self-assessment. When the mean difference is calculated, there was a difference of 1.04. With respect to experimental group, their mean score in pre-intervention and post intervention was 2.62 (SD=1.285) and 3.97 (SD=.677) respectively. It showed an increment of 1.35 mean score which exceeded the mean value rated with control group participants. Regarding the second category of self-assessment-during writing, pre-intervention mean score of control group students' mean score is slightly better than the pre-writing phase. Accordingly, the mean value was reported to be 2.57 (SD=1.251) during pre-intervention and 3.11(SD=.529) during post intervention which showed improvements. Furthermore, the table further reported that experimental group students' mean score ranged from 2.53 (SD=1.202) to 3.88 (SD=0.623). Again the mean score showed an improvement of 1.35 which is a significant number. With regard to after writing phase, the mean score of pre-intervention of control group was 2.51 (SD=1.235) and that of post intervention was 3.17 (SD=.579) which is a substantial improvement.

Correspondingly, experimental group participants' mean score of pre-intervention and post intervention was 2.48 (SD=1.249) and 4.01 (.639) respectively. The cumulative mean score of experimental group and control group was similar before intervention which is 2.54 (1.2319). This means both control and experimental group participants' mean score did not deviate much from each other in the analysis undertaken in different stages of the self-assessment. Thus, it can be argued that students had equivalent level of self-assessment before the introduction of dynamic assessment. On the contrary, experimental group participants rated higher than control group in post intervention self-assessment. On the other hand, control group students also showed an improvement in mean score, but the value is two times lesser than the score rated with experimental group in post intervention.

Discussion of the Findings

The main objective of this study was to examine the effects of dynamic assessment on students' self-assessment and their writing performances with special reference to grade 11 students at Arjo Secondary School in 2013 E.C. To make sure that both control and experimental groups demonstrate equivalent level of performances in writing, pre-test was administered to both groups. The results run by Independent Sample t-test showed that both groups of respondents are homogenous at the beginning of the intervention because there was no statistically significant difference between them as the sig value is greater than 0.05. This means before

the treatment came into effect, both groups of students had nearly the same level writing performances. After the intervention, post-test was administered to both groups to examine the changes manifested as a result of the implementation of dynamic assessment. The findings obtained through statistical analysis from Independent-Samples t-test confirmed that there was statistically significant difference between control and an experimental group in post-test as the sig value is less than 0.05 ($p < .05$). The result indicated that the experimental group scored significantly higher than the control group in post-test. Table 4.4 further showed that the control group students' post-test mean score was 13.33 (SD=3.061) whereas that of experimental group was 19.83 (SD=4.378).

Therefore, significant improvement in mean scores of experimental group's post-tests demonstrated that dynamic assessment has potential effects in enabling students to write effective paragraphs. In other words, writing performances of students are highly influenced by the effectiveness of dynamic assessment that teachers employ in EFL classes. There are some plausible reasons for the accounts of this fact. First, the experimental group students have acquainted themselves over control group in writing performances. They got exposure to more practical writing tasks that are designed in meaningful ways. Furthermore, the teacher actively intervenes during the course of the assessment with the goal of making changes in the learner's current level of independent functioning. By practicing writing through DA on a regular basis, students are able to make steady improvements with regard to the quality and fluency of their writing.

The underlying reason for the students' meaningful and remarkable change in writing performances could be emanated from the provision of maximum number of opportunities for students to interact with the teacher and peer in different forms of mediation in their zone of proximal development through DA. This way, teachers can assess the true state of individuals' ability and capture their potentials in their ZPD. The power of interactions is so pivotal in letting student to reach the level of self-regulation. This means, after a series of mediation provided by the teacher, the students tended to demonstrate better performances in writing as the main assumptions within the DA procedures is mediation.

In order to gain qualitative insights into the opinion of the participants to DA and to triangulate the findings of statistical analysis, students who were selected from the experimental group were interviewed. They were asked if DA can improve their writing performances. All participants reflected to this interview question by providing their own arguments. Three respondents (out of 5) stated that they gained self-confidence and they realized



the progresses of their writing performance as a result of the implementation of DA. This response verifies the assumption that integrating instruction and assessment enhances students' writing performances. The qualitative result of the above interview that strengthens the quantitative finding can reiterate that DA can prepare students for fluent writing. This was done to seek further evidence and triangulate the data through various instruments. Thus, the data obtained supported each other in underscoring the significance of dynamic assessment for enhancing their writing performances.

The findings that emerged from this study are in congruent with the finding in Mahdavi (2014), Mauludin & Ardianti (2007), Rashidi & Nejad (2018), Xiaoxiao & Yan (2010) and many others. They came to realize that dynamic assessment substantially contributed in improving EFL students' writing performance. Furthermore, Shrestha and Coffin (2012) found that DA can contribute to the students' academic writing thereby they respond to the areas that need assistance. Their finding indicated that DA was more conducive and it facilitated students' writing performances than the utilization of conventional method. It is thus reasonable to conclude from both the statistical results and the opinions of the respondents that DA is a powerful tool for enhancing their writing performances

Apart from improving students' writing performances, the impact of dynamic assessment can be reflected to self-assessment too. Hence, in order to examine whether students who experience dynamic assessment demonstrate a reliable self-assessment in writing than students who do not expose to dynamic assessment, the researcher administered pre-intervention and post-intervention self-assessment questionnaire for both control and experimental group participants. Mean and standard deviation were employed to display the findings obtained from the research participants in the questionnaire. The questionnaire has got five-point Likert scale with 3 sections: pre-writing, during writing and after writing and it was filled in by 97 participants from both groups. From the descriptive statistics undertaken in the result part, it can be understood that both control and experimental group participants' mean score did not deviate much from each other in pre-writing, during writing and after writing of the self-assessment. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that participants demonstrated nearly equivalent level of self-assessment regarding their writing performances before the implementation of dynamic assessment.

After provision of dynamic assessment, both control and experimental group participants were required to complete post-intervention questionnaire to see the extent to which the intervention provided enabled them to rate their writing performances genuinely. From the analysis made so far, the result showed that experimental group students mean score

was found to be better than control group students at all stages of self-assessment. The finding gained revealed that dynamic assessment is noteworthy to let students to reflect reliable self-assessment in writing. A comparison between the two groups makes it clear that there was a difference between these two mean scores in favor of experimental group. As a result of dynamic assessment practice, improvement of self-assessment of experimental group was demonstrated. In other words, dynamic assessment can let students to display reliable self-assessment in writing. Through DA, students gain the kind of skills and expertise they require to assess their writing performances.

Furthermore, when students are engaged in self-assessment, they move towards self-initiation and independence and take responsibility for their own learning thereby they can discover their weak points and evaluate their writing performances. In order to corroborate the findings reported above from a qualitative perspective, individual interview was held with some selected students. In the interview, students were asked how the implementation of dynamic assessment enhances their self-assessment. They expressed the fact that they get the insights into how to better improve their works through their teacher's mediation. It is possible to infer from the finding of interview that DA is an effective method that encourages students to improve their writing performances through applying various stages of self-assessment of writing.

The finding from the present study strengthened the work of Mazloomi and Khabiri (2016) who argue that self-assessment substantially correlated with teacher's assessment through 8 weeks of treatment. Their finding further revealed the students' weaknesses and the areas which should be improved. The present study also supported the results of Alemi's (2015) study which investigated general English students' evaluation of their writing ability before and after taking a DA-based writing course. The findings were evidence of the consistent self-rating and teacher-scaffolding provided to students with insights into their writing ability which led to more accurate assessment of their writing ability. Students became more accurate in assessing their own writing through the implementation of dynamic assessment. This study further goes with the finding of previous works like Elgadal (2017) who showed that the DA made participants to be involved in self-assessment by making revisions of their written drafts.

Furthermore, introducing dynamic assessment into EFL writing may equip students with a practical and wide opportunity to be engaged in self-assessment of writing thereby they consistently rate their own writing performances. Furthermore, it helps students gain the kind of awareness they need to self-assess their writing performances. Consequently, introducing self-assessment



in the EFL classes may have direct implications on how easily students write a paragraph with the required level of quality.

Conclusion

Dynamic assessment is used as a valid and useful approach which could serve maximized writing performances. The findings of this study showed that teacher's mediation and students' active involvement in the assessment process is highly significant. Dynamic assessment establishes a solid basis for the integration of writing and assessment. Hence, it is reasonable to conclude from both the statistical results and the opinions of the respondents that dynamic assessment is effective and productive for enhancing students' writing performances of grade 11 students of Arjo Secondary School. The implementation of dynamic assessment produced remarkable changes on participants' writing performance significantly. Therefore, through the effective implementation of dynamic assessment, students are capable of producing a paragraph of the required quality.

A comparison between control and experimental groups made it clear that dynamic assessment helped experimental group participants to rate their writing performances reliably and genuinely. Experimental group students tended to demonstrate reliable self-assessment of their writing performances than students who did not expose to self-assessment. When dynamic assessment was properly implemented, students' self-assessment tended to reflect the real capability of students in writing performances. The time they write a paragraph, they apply self-assessment as one element of fostering the quality of their written products. Thus, DA can be used as a potential tool to maximize the accuracy of students' self-assessment in writing.

Thus, teachers are recommended:

- To apply dynamic assessment in order to improve the writing performances of students who are struggling to write effective paragraphs.
- To incorporate self-assessment into their writing lessons thereby students consistently and reliably rate their own writing performances.

Conflict of Interest

Authors have no conflict of interest.

References

- Ableeva R (2010) *Dynamic assessment of listening comprehension in L2 French*. PhD Dissertation. The Pennsylvania State University.
- Aghaebrahimian A Rahimirad, M. Ahmadi, A & Alamdari JK (2014) Dynamic assessment of writing skill in advanced EFL Iranian students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*: 98, 60-67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.389>.
- Alemi M (2015) The impact of dynamic assessment on Iranian EFL students' writing self-assessment. *TELL* 9 (1):145-169.
- Bing X (2016) A study of the effects of student self-assessment on the EFL writing of Chinese college students. *Journalism and Mass Communication*, 6 (2):91-107.
- Drid T (2018) The fundamentals of assessing EFL writing. *Psychological & Educational studies* 11(1): 292-305. EFL students' process writing development. AGE Open. DOI: 10.1177/215824401878464.
- Elgadal HA (2017) The effect of self-assessment on inexperienced EFL students' writing during revision. PhD Dissertation. The University of Birmingham.
- Farrokh P & Rahmani A (2017) Dynamic assessment of writing ability in transcendence tasks based on Vygotskian perspective. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*. DOI 10.1186/s40862-017-0033-z.
- Haywood HC & Lidz, CS (2007) *Dynamic assessment in practice: Clinical and educational applications*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hetthong R & Teo A (2013) Does writing self-efficacy correlate with and predict writing performance? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 2(1): 157-167.
- Lantolf JP & Poehner ME (2007) Dynamic assessment of L2 development: bringing the past into the future. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1 (2): 49-72.
- Lantolf JP & Thorne SL (2006) *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lenski S.D & Verbruggen F (2010) *Writing instruction and assessment for English language learners, K-8*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Mahdavi M (2014) *The effect of dynamic assessment on essay writing ability of Iranian EFL students: A gender related study*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Eastern Mediterranean University.
- Mauludin LA & Ardianti TM (2007) The role of dynamic assessment in EFL writing class. *Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching* 1(2): 82-93.
- Mazloomi S & Khabiri M (2016) Diagnostic assessment of writing through dynamic self-assessment. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 6 (6): 19-31.
- Mesfin A (2013) *An exploratory study on the implementation of the process approach to the teaching/learning of the course basic writing skills: The case of Hawassa University*. PhD Dissertation.
- Miao T. & Lv M (2013) Dynamic assessment in ESL writing classroom. *International Conference on Education Technology and Management Science*, 676-679.
- Poehner M E (2005) *Dynamic assessment of oral proficiency among advanced L2 learners of French*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Pennsylvania State University.



- Rashidi N & Nejad ZB (2018) An investigation into the effect of dynamic assessment on the
- Roohani A & Shafiee H.R (2019) Effectiveness of hybrid dynamic assessment in L2 learners' descriptive writing development. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning* 8(2): 67-79.
- Shrestha P & Coffin C (2012). Dynamic assessment, tutor mediation and academic writing development. *Assessing Writing*, 17(1): 55–70.
- Solomon A (2004) *The realisation of process approach to writing at the level of grade ten*. Unpublished MA Thesis AAU.
- Sternberg R J & Grigorenko EL (2002) *Dynamic testing: The nature and measurement of learning potential*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Xiaoxiao L & Yan L (2010) A case study of dynamic assessment in EFL process writing. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics* 33(1): 24-40.
- Zelalem B & Boersma EJ (2018) EFL instructors' beliefs and practices of formative assessment in teaching writing. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 9(1): 42-50.
- Zhang Y (2018) Exploring EFL students' self-efficacy in academic writing based on process-genre approach. *Canadian Centre of Science and Education* 11(6), 115-124.