

Impact of Written Corrective Feedback via Dynamic Assessment on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing: Micro and Macro Levels

Mohammad Reza Rafizade Tafti¹, Fariba Rahimi Esfahani^{2*}, Sajad Shafiee³

¹English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

^{2*}English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

³English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

Received: March 11, 2022

Accepted: August 18, 2022

Abstract

The current study aimed to assess the effects of written corrective feedback (WCF) on Iranian EFL learners' writing at the macro (i.e., rhetorical organization, task response, cohesion, and coherence) and micro levels (i.e., lexical resource, punctuation, grammatical range, and accuracy) with a dynamic assessment approach in focus. To this end, the Oxford Quick Placement Test was run on 150 male and female Iranian EFL learners, of whom 80 homogeneous intermediate learners were designated and allotted to an experimental group and a control group. The two groups received WCF in the sense that the teacher provided symbols such as WW for 'wrong word', SP for 'spelling', T for 'tense', WO for 'word order', etc. while marking their written productions. The difference was that the experimental group experienced a dynamic assessment of L2 writing during the term (in which the teacher taught and tested the learners in an ongoing fashion and provided prompts, hints, support, and encouragement every session), whereas the participants in the control group experienced a conventional class, devoid of an ongoing dynamic assessment component. At the culmination of the treatment, the collected data were statistically analyzed. The results exhibited that although the experimental group meaningfully outpaced the control group regarding the micro-levels of writing, no substantial difference was detected between the macro levels of writing in both groups. Thus, it was concluded that written corrective feedback and the dynamic assessment can significantly improve the writing of the students at micro-levels. This study has some implications for the teachers working on writing in ELT classes.

Keywords: Dynamic Assessment; Micro-Macro Levels; Static Assessment; Writing Accuracy; Written Corrective Feedback

INTRODUCTION

Learning is a process in which success comes by profiting from mistakes and errors which are identified and corrected (Ferris, 2006). Corrective feedback (CF) can be considered one of the most frequent strategies applied in the area of education and language education to deal with these errors (Bitchener, 2008). Different meanings are given to this term; Kepner (1991), for instance, defines corrective feedback as a method used to inform students

whether the response to instructions is right or wrong. Keh (1990) also defines it as "the input from the reader to the author which results in giving the author information to review" (p. 294). Lalande (1982) mentions that "feedback is a process exploited to notify the reader when the response to a command is right or wrong" (page 141). In general, CF is responsible for obtaining a formal or informal response to a person's performance from a teacher, or peers. Literature conducted in this area (Bitchener, 2008; Ghazi & Zamanian, 2016;

*Corresponding Author's Email:
rahimi_fariba@yahoo.com

Kolade, 2012; Lyster & Ranta, 2013) has shown that feedback is a multidimensional topic, especially when combined with other areas of research such as writing, grammar, etc. The method of giving corrective feedback to students may vary due to its multi-faceted material. Written feedback correction (WCF) can be considered one of the firmest ways to provide feedback to students (Hosseini, 2012).

In addition, assessment can be considered another important aspect of language learning. Assessment is conducted among students for two main purposes (Brown and Abeywickrama, 2010). First, it aims to make a summative assessment of student success. Second, it seeks to provide positive feedback on their progress and improve efficiency. Unlike static testing (ST), which is a standard testing technique for presenting objects to an evaluator test taker, Dynamic Assessment (DA) involves dynamic learning, without attempting to alter or improve the test writer's performance. This method aims at altering a person's mind working and identifying successful vicissitudes in learning and problem-solving methods in the test condition (Anton, 2009).

Furthermore, learning is one of the most important skills regardless of the importance of other skills. Writing seems to be the most sought-after skill for EFL practitioners as it requires both syntax and semantics (Shang, 2019). To be successful in this competitive world, effective writing skills predict academic success and are a rudimentary prerequisite for public life and participation in the worldwide economy (Graham and Perrin, 2007). At the micro-level, writing skills include acceptable lexical objects and syntactic structures (e.g., tenses, contracts, plurals), outlines, and directions. On the other hand, it is concerned with maintaining the communicative functions of the macro-level written texts of writing (Highland, 2004), which can be achieved through the organization of the text, participating in the coherence and coherence of all aspects of the work. It is important to identify how factors can improve the subtle and macro levels of writing.

The sad fact is that most of the students have limited writing experience even in their

mother tongue (Cohen, 2011). This challenge further aggravates, when the text is going to be written in a second or foreign language like English. Various research studies have been conducted on writing improvement (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Kolade, 2012; Raofii, Binandeh, & Rahmani, 2017; Shang, 2019), yet the ones carried out in this realm were mostly concerned with the general construct of writing, and micro and macro subskills have largely gone unnoticed. As either of these subskills is concerned with a particular area of writing, they need to be explored separately. Likewise, assessment is a concept widely researched about various aspects of language acquisition; however, most of the present literature on SLA is concerned with static assessment (Jung & Kim, 2003; Lee, 2007; Vaseghi, Ramezani, & Gholami, 2012), while dynamic assessment has been rarely worked on, especially in the domain of written corrective feedback.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Writing skills are complex mental skills because learners have appropriate intellectual skills, cognitive strategies, spoken information, language rules, and appropriate motivation (Kagan & High, 2002). In addition, writing skills are a central part of communication. Improved writing skills let the author convey his memo and thoughts to a wider population more clearly and easily than in an interview or telephone conversation (Troyka, 2010).

Written Corrective Feedback (WCF)

In the second language learning progression, corrective feedback can be taken as a kind of input provided to students so that they can observe incorrect passages in their text, thus avoiding correction and repetition (Bichner and Notch, 2010). Issues of importance and attention were introduced to make this point accurate. According to Kersten (2016), creeper refers to the virtual significance of a component of a sign. As the problem gets bigger, EFL learners need to raise awareness about it. The hypothetical hypothesis here goes further. The attentive hypothesis is a theory of second

language learning that a learner cannot continue to develop their language abilities or understand linguistic features unless they consciously observe the input (Schmidt, 1990). The corrective opinion provides the basis for this conscious notice. Therefore, exploring the impact of feedback on language acquisition has always been an interesting issue for researchers working in this field. Furthermore, the feedback provided plays a vital part in language learning development. Feedback from a blend of foundations offers students information about what is best and what has to be enhanced so that they can add feedback to their reviews and the final product of their writing. And can be used. Although agreement on research results is still pending, a huge number of research have scrutinized the impact of corrective feedback on student writing (Razzagifard and Razzagifard, 2011; Yeh and Low, 2009). Here, an evaluation of the related literature field is provided to show the theoretical and practical background of the study.

Assessment and language learning

Assessment plays an important part in educational development to inform and enhance the continuing learning process (Taras, 2005). According to Kırmız and Kömeç (2016), evaluation is considered an important part of any teaching and learning activity. By assessing and evaluating student performance, teaching decisions can be made and it can also help identify the strengths and weaknesses gained in relation to classroom teaching. In addition, it can provide students with specific feedback in support of their learning. However, each learning situation requires a specific type of assessment (Berry, 2010). Various tests should be used to assess student success. Testing and evaluation models are very important tools exploited to gauge the learning process. Therefore, it is important to choose the best evaluation method for the specific situation. Dynamic assessment is a type of collaborative assessment that integrates assessment and instruction. In this type of evaluation, the instructor, supervisor, or those with a high level of knowledge in the intended area will guide the examiner in the evaluation process, which

will improve learning through the application. Problem-solving strategy (Anton, 2009). This type of assessment is founded on Vygotsky's (1978) conceptual proximal developmental zone, which is demarcated as the alteration between a person's level of real progress that is specified independently by problem-solving and problem-solving under adults. Defined as the highest level of expected potential development. Guidance or collaboration with more competent colleagues (Kim & Quinn, 2013).

Studies on WCF

In this section, some experimental work on the effect of WCF on the writing accuracy of EFL practitioners are reviewed.

Rahimi (2009) explores the bearing of the WCF on the writing accuracy of Iranian EFL practitioners. Nominated participants were divided into two groups: the experimental group received unintended feedback and the control group received overall remarks and did not receive written corrective feedback. Both groups wrote four essays in one semester. Mistakes in the experimental group were highlighted and coded with syntactic groupings. At the end of the semester, learners were interviewed, the results of which exhibited that learners who did not receive a written corrective judgment on their grammatical structures were left unsatisfied and disillusioned. On the other hand, those who adopt a written corrective judgment will enhance their writing over time.

To discover the bearing of feedback on the online educational setting, Alvarez, Espasa, and Guash (2012) examined improvements in collaborative writing. The researchers analyzed the nature of teacher feedback during the assignment. 83 EFL learners participated in a two-week online class. Research has shown that learners work more creatively when they have feedback questions and recommendations given by teachers rather than obvious improvements.

Zarei and Rahnama (2013) conducted a study on 164 participants in four groups to investigate the effect of corrective feedback on writing accuracy. During the treatment process, each group received a specific type of

WCF. To assess the success of the participants, they were registered for a pre-test, questionnaire, and post-test. Research has shown that the direct improvement response group is better than other groups considering grammatical accuracy. Concerning the text accuracy of the articles, all treatment groups outpaced the control group.

In another attempt, Azizi, Behjat, and Sorahi (2014) explored the impact of a clear corrective opinion on the writing accuracy of Iranian EFL practitioners. Researchers have compared two types of explicit corrective feedback on students' writing performance: error code feedback and descriptive feedback. To achieve the goals, 69 women physicians were nominated to partake in this study. The results showed that clarity and mental correction feedback had a constructive effect on the writing advance of Iranian EFL learners.

Studies on DA

In this section, a summary of the most prominent work done on the impact of dynamic assessment on various aspects of language is provided.

Hill and Sabet (2009) worked on the outcome of a dynamic assessment of the speaking ability of EFL learners. The final findings of the research showed that dynamic assessment improves the speaking skills and knowledge of language learners. In addition, the researchers found that dynamic assessment could be considered an appropriate method to assess the development of speaking skills in EFL learners.

Zhang (2010) conducted an experimental study on the effect of dynamic assessment mode on L2 writing classes. The mentioned study worked on 45 EFL learners and provided guidance and graduate mediation to participants based on the developing requirements of the writing process learner. The results obtained demonstrated that both teachers and students were well-motivated using this evaluation method and that their writing scores significantly improved.

Nani and Duel (2012) conducted a study to investigate the improvement of university students' reading comprehension by using a dy-

amic assessment method during teaching and evaluation. To achieve the stated goal, ten university students were selected to partake in this study. The study includes a pre-test-post-trial design. The treatment phase consists of three sessions, each focusing on a specific reading comprehension sub-skill. Results indicate that static assessment as a general evaluation method in EFL classes impairs student performance. On the other hand, dynamic evaluation helps language teachers to more accurately determine students' levels of understanding and comprehension.

Aghebrahimian, Rahimirad, Ahmadik, and Khalilpur Alamdari (2014) examined the effect of dynamic assessment on writing progress in advanced Iranian EFL practitioners. To reach the goal of the study, twenty participants were randomly selected to participate in a two-month (eight sessions) writing course. All of the selected physicians received the same treatment, but half of them were assessed dynamically, while the rest were conventionally assessed. Participants' essays were scored by two different evaluators. The study results showed substantial growth in the experimental group participants' writing.

Rashidi and Bahdori Nejad (2018) conducted research to explore the bearing of dynamic assessment on the writing performance of Iranian EFL practitioners. To obtain the expected results, 17 students were divided into experimental and control groups. Then, a three-step dynamic evaluation process was applied to the experimental group and the control group was evaluated using conventional methods. The results showed that dynamic assessment meaningfully affected participants' scores and improved their writing ability. Furthermore, the results obtained by conducting interviews showed that dynamic assessment improves EFL attitude, confidence, and motivation of learners.

As noted in the reviewed literature, there are several studies on the impact of WCF on the writing ability of EFL learners. In addition, a great number of studies can be discovered on the effects of dynamic assessment. However, to the best of the authors' knowledge, no studies have been found on the effect of both WCF and

DA on the writing ability of EFL learners. Furthermore, most studies done in this area do not take into account various factors such as the subtlety and macro-level of the writing. Therefore, considering the role of evaluation processes, a current study has been done to examine the impact of WCF on the writing accuracy of Iranian EFL practitioners at the micro and macro level.

Research Questions

Based on the errors found in the literature, the current study was primarily concerned with the effect of the WCF on the writing accuracy of Iranian EFL practitioners at the macro / micro levels with a focus on a dynamic assessment approach. Thus, the following research questions were addressed for the stated purpose:

RQ1: Does written corrective feedback via a dynamic assessment approach have any statistically substantial impact on Iranian EFL learners' writing enhancement at the micro-level?

RQ2: Does written corrective feedback via a static assessment approach have any statistically substantial impact on Iranian EFL learners' writing enhancement at the micro-level?

RQ3: Does written corrective feedback via a dynamic assessment approach have any statistically substantial impact on Iranian EFL learners' writing enhancement at the macro level?

RQ4: Does written corrective feedback via a static assessment approach have any statistically substantial effect on Iranian EFL learners' writing enhancement at the macro level?

METHOD

Participants and Sampling

The current study was conducted with a semi-experimental design and measures the effects of WCF by DA on L2 learner writing at the micro/macro level using pre-test and post-test data. Candidates were selected through a convenient sampling process. Subsequently, the Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) was used to identify participants with similar skill

levels. Eighty Intermediate EFL practitioners were eventually selected as participants in the study. Participants' writing ability in this study was identified as a dependent variable and different response styles were taken as independent variables. All participants were L2 practitioners in Yazd and Persian was their first language. These students are engaged in learning English from the age of two to four and their age ranges from 18 to 25 years.

Tools and Materials

To conduct the intended study and obtain reliable results, three types of tests were used. First, OQPT was used to fix the skill level of the participants. The test was developed by the Oxford University Press in association with the Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate to determine the skill level of EFL learners. Depending on the test rubric, a score between 30 and 47 (out of 60) indicates an intermediate level of proficiency.

In addition, pre-tests and post-tests were developed to assess participants' performance on written tasks. In both cases, the written test consists of subjects selected from students' textbooks to assess their writing ability. Students were anticipated to write a paragraph on the required subjects. Lessons on various topics of qualified text such as vocabulary, grammar, coherence, and coherence are examined at the micro and macro levels. Besides the assessment tools, during the treatment, participants in the written response groups scored on the erroneous parts and the traditional style of writing in their correct form; However, since the instructions are mainly provided through social networks, feedback is provided to the learners using some written instructions posted on the internet.

One thing to consider is that all tests must be approved taking into account their validity and reliability before applying to the study. Therefore, the above tests in this regard have been carefully studied. First, the tests must be verified. Therefore, a test study was done on 10 intermediate learners to find out the potential problems of the exams. Then, the tests were modified to maintain the desired pattern. After that, the researchers approached some

trainers and colleagues to test both pre-test and post-test. After some modification, the tests are approved and can be applied in the study. In addition, inter-rater credibility was obtained by computing the Pearson correlation between the scores assigned by the two evaluators for student writing ($r = .85$).

Procedure

The current study was steered in a language institute according to a specific timetable provided by the Institute. The first researcher described the information needed for the study, testing, and treatment. Next, OQPT was conducted for all the students studying at the Intermediate level of the Institute, to select the desired participants from the candidates. Then, the nominated participants were assigned to two groups to be exposed to the intended treatments. At the beginning of the session, participants in both groups received a preliminary test to gauge writing skills at the macro and micro levels. In line with the English curriculum for EFL students studying at the Institute, they were asked to write two paragraphs on two popular topics: the advantages and disadvantages of social media for children and the effects of global warming on food. Subsequently, participants in both groups underwent the treatments they desired. Both groups received written correctional feedback on their writing errors in the sense that teachers marked their written presentations (e.g., WW for misspellings, SP for spelling, T for period, WO for word order, etc.). Due to the nature of the classes being conducted virtually, WCF was given to students through social networks. In all these cases the teacher plays the role of the leader who controls the duties and makes the final adjustments. In addition, one of these two groups is assessed by static assessment methods, while the other group is subjected to dynamic assessment. In fact, during each session in the DA group, students received treatment and evaluation; Whenever these students have problems with assignments, teachers give them clues and prompt them to see if they can overcome the problem; If they still need help, the teacher will ask for peer support and feedback or teacher assistance. The teacher praises the students for overcoming

a problem or completing a task. This type of evaluation and feedback is provided on the subtle and macro aspects of L2 writing. However, learners in the static assessment group were not subjected to the DA but provided a summative assessment of their work. In other words, when they receive a revised draft, their problems are directly resolved and corrected.

At the culmination of the semester, the participants in both groups were asked to sit the post-test of writing. Again, they were supposed to write two paragraphs on two topics: air pollution effects on human life and the most favorite city in the world. The written texts were checked regarding different aspects of a qualified text such as vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, and coherence. After that the papers were corrected by the instructor and the researchers and based on the participants' mastery of micro and macro skills of writing, two scores were recorded for each student. Finally, the obtained scores were prepared to be analyzed via statistical operations.

RESULTS

To conduct the intended analyses, SPSS 21 statistical software was used. The performances of both groups in pre-tests at micro and macro levels of writing were likened. The findings revealed that no substantial alteration was observed between the performances of both at the micro-level: static group ($M = 9.87$, $SD = 2.07$) and dynamic group ($M = 9.82$, $SD = 2.04$), $t(78) = 0.108$, $p = 0.914$ (two-tailed) and at the macro level: static group ($M = 10.55$, $SD = 2.98$) and dynamic group ($M = 10.97$, $SD = 3.53$), $t(78) = 0.581$, $p = 0.563$ (two-tailed). Therefore, both groups were found to be homogenous and at the same level considering the micro and macro levels of writing.

Considering the research questions, at first, the effect of written corrective feedback via a dynamic assessment approach on Iranian EFL learners' writing improvement at the micro-level was explored. To compare the improvement of writing performance in the participants, paired-samples t-tests were run. Table 1 deals with the results on the effect of WCF via a dynamic assessment approach on the micro-level of writing

Table 1
Comparing the Effect of DA via WCF at the Micro Level

Experimental Group	Paired Differences					<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
pre-test micro - post-test micro	-5.22	3.26	.51	-6.26	-4.18	-10.13	39	.000

According to Table 1, there was a noteworthy improvement from pre-test ($M = 9.82$, $SD = 2.04$) to post-test ($M = 15.05$, $SD = 2.75$), $t(39) = 10.13$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed) in dynamic assessment group at micro levels of writing.

Then, the effect of written corrective feedback via a static assessment approach on Iranian EFL learners' writing improvement at the micro-level was examined. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Comparing the Effect of Static WCF at the Micro Level

Control Group	Paired Differences					<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
pre-test micro - post-test micro	-3.15	4.69	.74	-4.65	-1.64	-4.24	39	.000

The statistical results demonstrated in Table 2 revealed that there was a important improvement from pre-test ($M = 9.87$, $SD = 2.07$) to post-test ($M = 13.02$, $SD = 3.95$), $t(39) = 4.24$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed) in static assessment group at the micro level of writing. After that, the effects of written corrective

feedback via a dynamic assessment approach on Iranian EFL learners' writing improvement at the macro level were explored. To identify the effect, the macro-level pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group were likened, as is demonstrated in Table 3 below.

Table 3
Comparing the Effect of DA via WCF at the Macro Level

Experimental Group	Paired Differences					<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
pre-test macro - post-test macro	-2.70	4.88	.77	-4.26	-1.13	-3.49	39	.001

The results represented in Table 3 showed that there was a noteworthy improvement from pre-test ($M = 10.97$, $SD = 3.53$) to post-test ($M = 13.67$, $SD = 3.54$), $t(39) = 3.49$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed). Finally, the effect of written

corrective feedback via a static assessment approach on Iranian EFL learners' writing improvement at the macro level was investigated. Table 4 provides the statistical results obtained in this regard.

Table 4
Comparing the Effect of Static WCF at the Macro Level

Control Group	Paired Differences					<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
pre-test macro – post-test macro	-1.90	4.45	.70	-3.32	-.47	-2.69	39	.010

As the statistical results in Table 4 revealed, there was a significant improvement at the macro levels of writing from pre-test ($M = 10.55$, $SD = 2.98$) to post-test ($M = 12.45$, $SD = 3.72$), $t(39) = 2.69$, $p < .000$ (two-tailed) in the control group. Now, the performances of

both groups on the post-test at micro levels were equated to see whether there was any important alteration between the ultimate effect of each treatment or not. Table 5 provides the results obtained by running an independent samples t-test.

Table 5
Comparing the Effects of WCF via Dynamic and Static Assessment on the Micro Level

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		<i>t</i> -test for Equality of Means						
	<i>F</i>	Sig.	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	7.06	.01	-2.65	78	.010	-2.02	.76	-3.54	-.50
Equal variances not assumed			-2.65	69.59	.010	-2.02	.76	-3.54	-.50

A comparison of post-test scores at the micro-levels revealed a substantial difference between the performance of the dynamic and static assessment groups, $t(78) = 2.65$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed). Therefore, students in the dynamic group performed better than

students in the static group, taking into account the micro-levels of writing. The same analysis was repeated to capture the possible difference between the performance of both groups at macro levels of writing. Table 6 shows the statistical results in this regard.

Table 6
Comparing the Effects of Dynamic and Static Assessment on the Macro Level

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		<i>t</i> -test for Equality of Means						
	<i>F</i>	Sig.	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.02	.88	-1.50	78	.136	-1.22	.81	-2.84	.39
Equal variances not assumed			-1.50	77.80	.136	-1.22	.81	-2.84	.39

The results presented in Table 6 show that despite achieving higher post-test scores at the gross levels of dynamic group rewriting, the post-test scores did not differ meaningfully between the two groups, $t(78) = 1.50$, $p = .136$ (two-tailed).

Therefore, no statistically substantial alteration was found between the performance of the two groups at the macro writing level.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

As mentioned earlier, the current study deals with the impact of written correctional opinion on Iranian EFL practitioners' writing accuracy with a macro / micro level dynamic assessment approach. To achieve the intended goal, four research questions were designed. The first two research questions are related to the impact of WCF on the use of dynamic and static evaluation methods at microscopic levels of writing. The results obtained showed that both groups had improvements from pre-test to post-test concerning the subtle levels of writing; however, those in the dynamic group accomplished better than those in the static group. Therefore, written corrective feedback can be confirmed to significantly improve the writing accuracy of Iranian EFL practitioners at the microscopic level, while feedback provided by a dynamic approach to vision may be more effective. The third and fourth research questions are related to the effects of WCF using dynamic and static evaluation methods at the macro level. At the microscopic level, similar improvements were observed between participants' pre-test and post-test scores in the dynamic and static groups. However, no substantial variance was seen between the gross-level post-test scores of the two groups. Therefore, even if the WCF is impressive, static or dynamic evaluation may not lead to significant differences, given the macro levels of the writing.

The results lead to the conclusion that written correction feedback raises learners' awareness of the subtle and macro levels of writing. This consciousness is consistent with the theoretical assumptions of cognitive language learning and the function of attention in second language learning (Robinson, 2001; Schmidt, 1995). Improvements in students' writ-

ing skills have largely been attributed to the role of attention, without which, for many conservative scholars and researchers, "learning anything is too little" (Robinson, 2001). Language learners observe the input as part of their cognitive process and when the exposure method is changed and improved to suit their needs, the language input becomes more perceptible and attentive to them. Qualifies. The development of students' written responses can be explained by attributing the role of intentional attention to the linguistic features required for the production of their written work. Furthermore, this focus initiated by WCF is also closely connected to the influence of instruction methods and learning materials. In addition, the impact of dynamic evaluation shows on the subtle levels of writing, in the evaluation process, teachers mostly focus on the subtle levels of writing; So, the students have improved in this regard. On the other hand, in the course of dynamic assessment teachers do not emphasize the coordination points too much and students may not improve significantly in this respect.

The findings of the current research can be compared with those of the ones conducted by other researchers working in this area. Rahimi (2009), Alvarez, Espasa, and Guasch (2012), Zarei and Rahnama (2013), and Azizi, Behjat, and Sorahi (2014) also conducted similar studies concerning the impact of WCF on the writing accuracy of EFL learners. The point worth noting is that all these studies dealt with writing accuracy as a general ability; however, the present study was concerned with both macro and micro levels of writing. Therefore, the findings here can give more detailed insight into the effect of WCF on different aspects of writing. The findings are also consistent with the findings of the studies by Zhang (2010), Aghaebrahimian, et al. (2014), and Rashidi and Bahadori Nejad (2018). In these studies, the dynamic assessment was taken as an effective way of assessment/instruction; while in the present research study, the dynamic assessment had a positive impact on micro levels of writing and no difference was observed between static and dynamic assessment considering the macro levels of writing

References

- Aghaebrahimian, A., Rahimirad, M., Ahmadi, A., & Khalilpour Alamdari, J. (2014). Dynamic assessment of writing skills in advanced EFL Iranian learners. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 60 – 67.
- Alvarez, I., Espasa, A., & Guasch, T. (2012). The value of feedback in improving collaborative writing assignments in an online learning environment. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(4), 387-400.
- Antón, M. (2009). Dynamic assessment of advanced second language learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(3), pp. 576-598.
- Azizi, M., Behjat, F., & Sorahi, M. (2014). Effect of metalinguistic teacher corrective feedback on writing performance of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2, 17-25.
- Berry, R. A. (2010). Preservice and early career teachers' attitudes toward inclusion, instructional accommodations, and fairness: Three profiles. *The Teacher Educator*, 45(2), 75-95.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 102-118.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with WCF. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207-217.
- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. White Plains.
- Cohen, A. (2011). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Cox, R. & Kersten, M. (2016). Mortality salience increases language style matching and well-being. *Self and Identity*. 15(4), 452–467.
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland and F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in Second language writing: Context and issues* (pp. 81-104). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ghazi, S., & Zamanian, M. (2016). The effect of asynchronous versus conventional corrective feedback on the correct use of prepositions in an EFL context. *International Journal of English and Education*, 5(2), 152-160.
- Graham, C. & Perin, K. (2007). The effects of parents' working conditions and family economic hardship on parenting behaviors and children's self-efficacy. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 60(4), 291-303.
- Hill, K., & Sabet, M. (2009). Dynamic speaking assessments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(3), 537–545.
- Hosseini, S. B. (2012). Asynchronous computer-mediated corrective feedback and the correct use of prepositions: Is it effective? *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 13(4), 95-111.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. London: The University of Michigan Press.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83-101.
- Jung, E-h, & Kim, S.-H. (2003). A study on the motivating factors and the strategy use by different levels of middle school students. *Foreign Languages Education*, 10(2), 227–250.
- Kagan, S., & High, J. (2002). *Kagan structures for English language learners*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publishing.
- Keh, C. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44, 294 -304.
- Kepner, C. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of writing skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(3), 305-313.
- Kim, J. S., & Quinn, D. M. (2013). The effects of summer reading on low-income children's literacy achievement from kindergarten to grade 8: A meta-analysis of classroom and home interventions. *Review of Educational Research*, 83, 386-431.

- Kırmızı, Ö., & Kömeç, F. (2016). An Investigation of Performance-Based Assessment at High Schools. *Üniversitepark Bülten*, 5(1-2), 53-65.
- Kolade, T. A. (2012). The influence of process approach on English as second language students' performances in essay writing. *English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 16-29.
- Lalande, J. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66 (2), 140-149.
- Lee, I. (2007). Feedback in Hong Kong secondary writing classrooms: Assessment for learning or assessment of learning? *Assessing Writing*, 12(3), 180-198.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (2013). Counterpoint piece: The case for variety in corrective feedback research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 167-184.
- Naeini, J., & Duvall, E. (2012). Dynamic assessment and the impact on English language learners' reading comprehension performance. *Language Testing in Asia*, 2(2), 22- 41.
- Rahimi, M. (2009). The role of teacher's corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy over time: Is learner's mother tongue relevant? *Reading and Writing*, 22 (2), 219-243.
- Raofi, S., Binandeh, M., & Rahmani, S. (2017). An investigation into writing strategies and writing proficiency of university students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(1), 191-198.
- Rashidi, N., & Bahadori Nejad, Z. (2018). An investigation into the effect of dynamic assessment on the EFL learners' process writing development. *Sage Open*, 8(2), 1-14.
- Razzagifard, P., & Razzagifard, V. (2011). Corrective feedback in a computer-mediated communicative context and the development of second language grammar. *Teaching English with Technology*, 11(2), 1-17.
- Robinson, P. (2001). Individual differences, cognitive abilities, aptitude complexes, and learning conditions in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 17(4), 368-392.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129-158.
- Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning*, 9, 1-63.
- Shang, H.F. (2019). Exploring online peer feedback and automated corrective feedback on EFL writing performance. *Journal of Interactive Learning Environments*. DOI: 10.1080/10494820.2019.1629601
- Taras, M. (2005). Assessment -summative and formative- Some theoretical reflections. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(4), 466-478.
- Troyka, L. Q. (2010). *Simon & Schuster Handbook for Writers*. Toronto: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Vaseghi, R., Ramezani, A. E., & Gholami, R. (2012). Language learning style preferences: A theoretical and empirical study. *Advances in Asian Social Science*, 2(2), 441-451.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Yeh, S. & Lo, J. (2009). Using online annotations to support error correction and corrective feedback. *Computers & Education*, 52, 882-892.
- Zarei, A. A., & Rahnama, M. (2013). The effect of written corrective feedback modes on EFL learners' grammatical and lexical writing accuracy: from perceptions to facts. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 1(3), 1-14.
- Zhang, Y. H. (2010). Constructing dynamic assessment mode in college English writing class. *Journal of PLA University of Foreign Languages*, 1, 46-50.

Biodata

Mohammad Reza Rafizade Tafti is a Ph.D. Candidate of TEFL at the Department of English, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran. Her Ph.D. dissertation on 'Impact of Consciousness-raising via Input Flooding vs. Vocabulary Enhancement on Reading Fluency of Iranian EFL Intermediate Learners' is in progress at the time being. She is interested in research on language teaching and learning skills.

Email: *mrrafizade@yahoo.com*

Dr. Fariba Rahimi Esfahani is Assistant Professor, Department of English, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran. He holds lectures in Syntax, Linguistic Typology, Issues in Persian Syntax, and Pragmatics. He has published a good number of articles on discourse, pragmatics, and syntax in local and international journals.

Email: *rahimi_fariba@yahoo.com*

Dr. Sajad Shafiee is an Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics at the Department of English, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran. He has published a good number of articles on testing and research issues in local and international journals. His research interests include testing, research, and materials development.

Email: *s.shafiee@iaushk.ac.ir*