The Impact of Audio Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Improvement at Micro and Macro levels: Static and Dynamic Assessment in Focus

Mohammad Reza Rafizade Tafti [1], Fariba Rahimi Esfahani [2*], Sajad Shafiee [1]

1. Department of English, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran.
2. Department of English, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran (Corresponding Author)

Purpose: This study was an attempt to find the impact of audio corrective feedback on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing improvement at micro and macro levels using static and dynamic assessment methods.

Methodology: This study employs a quasi-experimental design; The study population comprises individuals residing in Yazd, Iran, aged between 22 and 30 years old, and possessing intermediate-level proficiency in the English language. Forty Iranian intermediate EFL learners were randomly chosen and assigned to two groups of static and dynamic assessment, each comprising 20 learners. Both groups received audio corrective feedback on the micro (grammatical range and accuracy and lexical resource) and macro (task response and coherence and cohesion) writing skills. The data were collected by the pre-test and post-test of writing and analyzed by multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA).

Findings: The results revealed significant effects of audio corrective feedback on EFL learners' writing skills. Improvements were observed in grammatical accuracy (F = 12.45, p < 0.01), lexical resource (F = 9.67, p < 0.05), task response (F = 14.32, p < 0.01), and coherence and cohesion (F = 11.21, p < 0.01). Furthermore, comparison between the static and dynamic assessment groups showed a more pronounced improvement in the dynamic group, with significant differences in micro skills (F = 5.78, p < 0.05) and macro skills (F = 6.34, p < 0.05).

Conclusions: The results of this study indicate that the dynamic assessment approach had a statistically significant effect on enhancing both micro and macro-level writing skills among the participants. Notably, it had a more pronounced impact on the improvement of task response and grammatical range and accuracy. This highlights the potential of dynamic assessment as a valuable tool for educators and curriculum designers to promote more comprehensive writing skill development in Iranian EFL learners.

---

* Corresponding Author: rahimi_fariba@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

In many EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms, the primary focus tends to be on developing speaking and reading skills, often relegating writing to a secondary role. This typically involves limited writing exercises, such as responding to textbook or exam questions, which can leave even proficient EFL speakers struggling with writing tasks at higher academic levels (Hidri, 2019). Writing proficiency can be analyzed on two distinct levels: micro and macro. Micro-level writing skills encompass the use of proper grammar, including aspects like tense, agreement, pluralization, as well as appropriate vocabulary and adherence to language rules. Meanwhile, macro-level writing involves creating coherent and cohesive texts that effectively convey the intended message (Bradshaw, 2020).

The complexity and importance of writing in interpersonal communication make its definition multifaceted. Some scholars view writing merely as the replication of previously encountered graphic symbols in a written format (Nirwana et al., 2020). However, writing skills extend beyond simple symbol reproduction. These symbols must be systematically organized into words, sentences, and ultimately paragraphs and essays, adhering to certain principles (Kocaman & Maral, 2022). As learners progress in their second language (L2) writing abilities, errors are inevitable, making feedback an essential element for reducing these mistakes. Consequently, many educators now recognize the importance of feedback in diminishing L2 writing errors. Feedback in educational contexts, particularly in relation to writing and grammar, is a complex and multifaceted area of study. The methods of providing corrective feedback to EFL learners can vary due to its diverse nature (Ahern Dodson & Reisinger, 2017). Teacher feedback, for instance, is one approach to guiding student writing. Some experts argue that appropriate instructor comments can boost students' confidence and progressively enhance their writing skills. Research by Sharif and Zainuddin (2017) found that students' confidence in writing increased following teacher feedback. Additionally, Sritrakarn (2018) discovered that feedback highlighting both strengths and weaknesses could motivate learners to edit and correct their L2 writing more effectively. Expanding on the topic of feedback types in writing and their effects, it's essential to delve deeper into the different forms of feedback and how they influence the writing development of EFL learners. Feedback in writing can generally be categorized into several types, each with distinct characteristics and impacts on learners.

Corrective feedback in writing is an essential instructional tool that involves providing learners with information about the accuracy of their written work. This type of feedback helps students identify and correct errors in their writing, leading to improved linguistic competence and accuracy. It can take various forms, such as direct correction of errors, indirect hints about mistakes, or more comprehensive feedback addressing issues of style, organization, and content (Kocaman & Maral, 2022). The primary goal of corrective feedback is to guide learners toward self-correction and independent writing skills. It plays a vital role in language learning, particularly for EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners, as it offers them opportunities to understand their mistakes, learn from them, and apply their knowledge to future writing tasks. Effective corrective feedback can significantly enhance a learner's ability to express themselves clearly and accurately in writing, thus bolstering their overall language proficiency (Sun & Qi, 2022). Nirwana (2020) compared six types of corrective feedback (CF) - direct, indirect, metalinguistic, reformulation, focused, and unfocused - on students' linguistic errors in vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The research found that direct CF was most effective in reducing students' linguistic errors and improving writing quality. Kocaman and Maral (2022) examined the effects of explicit corrective feedback (ECF) on foreign language writing skills. The research, conducted with 43 private middle school students, found a significant correlation between ECF and improved writing skills. Sun and Qi (2022) explored how different types of written corrective feedback (WCF) influence the writing accuracy of Chinese college students learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The study found that all three types of WCF (direct correction, indirect error-coding, and metalinguistic explanation) improved students' writing accuracy, with metalinguistic WCF being more effective in facilitating the acquisition of targeted linguistic features.

Audio feedback on writing represents a novel and interactive way to provide critiques and suggestions on students' written work (Bradshaw, 2020). Bless (2017) considered audio feedback as any spoken and recorded feedback produced by the instructor. Unlike traditional written feedback, audio feedback is delivered through recorded messages where the instructor speaks directly to the student. This method can offer a more personal, engaging, and detailed form of feedback, as tone of voice and inflection can convey nuances that written comments might not capture. Audio feedback can be particularly effective in addressing issues related to pronunciation, intonation, and rhythm in language learning. It also allows for more extensive commentary, where educators can explain complex concepts or provide more in-depth explanations than what might be feasible in written form (Anjarani & Furon, 2022). For learners, listening to audio feedback can be more accessible and engaging, leading to a better understanding of their errors and the corrections needed. It also adds a human touch to the feedback process, which can be motivating and encouraging for students. Several researchers (e.g., Bless, 2017; Bilbro et al., 2013; Chalfin, 2018; Hayman, 2018; Rassaei, 2019; Xu, 2018) carried out research on audio feedback and came up with its positive effect. Anjarani and Furqon (2022) focused on students' perceptions of audio feedback in a virtual writing class. The findings indicate that students view audio feedback positively, noting its clarity, personalization, and detail. The study highlights the importance of audio feedback in creating a sense of teaching presence in virtual classes. Bradshaw (2020) discussed the use of digital audio recordings for feedback on writing assignments in nursing education. It suggests that audio feedback, when used alongside written remarks, can improve student satisfaction and learning outcomes by providing a more personalized and clear learning experience. Ahern-Dodson and Reisinger (2017): examined the effects of combining written corrective feedback with audio comments on student compositions in an Advanced French Composition course. The findings suggest that this combination can significantly increase teacher engagement in grading and shift their role from merely grading to actively reading and responding to student work.

Dynamic and static assessments are two different approaches to evaluating writing skills. Static assessment typically involves a one-time evaluation of a student's written work, often through standardized tests or assignments (Hidri, 2019). This form of assessment measures what the student knows or can do at a specific point in time, providing a snapshot of their current writing abilities. Static assessment is useful for placing students in appropriate levels, grading, or measuring progress over a set period. On the other hand, dynamic assessment is a more interactive and formative approach. It focuses on the learning process and potential rather than just the product (Daneshvar et al, 2020). This type of assessment includes ongoing feedback and interaction between the instructor and the student, aiming to understand how a student learns and what support they need to improve. Dynamic assessment is particularly valuable for identifying learning strategies and potential, offering a more comprehensive view of a student's writing abilities and how they can be developed over time (Mallahi & Saadat, 2020). It aligns closely with the educational concept of scaffolding, where the teacher provides support and gradually reduces it as the student becomes more proficient. Mallahi and Saadat (2020) compared the impact of feedback provided within the frameworks of Group Dynamic Assessment (G-DA) and Formative Assessment (FA) on the writing development of intermediate Iranian EFL learners. They explored how these different assessment approaches influence learners' ability to apply acquired knowledge and skills to new, more challenging tasks. The results of this experimental investigation highlighted the effectiveness of feedback in both G-DA and FA contexts, with a particular focus on the role of assessment in facilitating learners' writing improvement. Hidri (2019) examined the impacts of mediation strategies in dynamic assessment (DA) on cognitive modifiability among ESP learners and compares their performance in DA versus static assessment (SA). The study involved an experimental group receiving DA and a control group assessed through SA. The findings indicated that DA did not significantly advance test-takers' cognitive abilities compared to SA, challenging some previous studies' conclusions. Daneshvar et al. (2020) investigated the impact of interactionist and interventionist models of dynamic assessment on IELTS candidates' performance in academic writing task 2, comparing these with static assessment. The findings

showed that the interventionist dynamic assessment group performed significantly better than the static group, highlighting the effectiveness of dynamic assessment in developing IELTS writing skills.

This research is significant, addressing the often overlooked aspect of writing skills in EFL education, which tends to prioritize speaking and reading. It explores the influence of audio feedback on both micro-level (grammar and vocabulary) and macro-level (overall coherence and task response) writing skills, employing both static and dynamic assessment methods. The innovative aspect of this study lies in its focus on audio feedback as a tool for language learning in writing, an area less explored compared to other language skills. The research evaluates the effectiveness of static versus dynamic assessments in enhancing writing skills at both levels, offering valuable insights for EFL teachers and material developers. Moreover, it contributes to the broader understanding of effective feedback methods in EFL writing instruction and has practical implications for teaching strategies and curriculum development. Thus, the primary aim of this study is to determine the impact of audio corrective feedback on the writing improvement of Iranian intermediate EFL learners at both micro and macro levels, utilizing static and dynamic assessment approaches.

In general, the present study aimed to find the effect of audio corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing improvement at micro and macro levels using static and dynamic assessment methods. In so doing, the study sought to answer the following questions.

1.   Does audio corrective feedback via a dynamic assessment approach have any statistically significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' writing improvement at the micro level?

2.   Does audio corrective feedback via a static assessment approach have any statistically significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' writing improvement at the micro level?

3.   Does audio corrective feedback via a dynamic assessment approach have any statistically significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' writing improvement at the macro level?

4.   Does audio corrective feedback via a static assessment approach have any statistically significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' writing improvement at the macro level?

2. Methodology

Study design and Participants

This study employs a quasi-experimental design to investigate the impact of audio corrective feedback on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing improvement at micro and macro levels. The study population comprises individuals residing in Yazd, Iran, aged between 22 and 30 years old, and possessing intermediate-level proficiency in the English language. These individuals represent a specific demographic group within Yazd, characterized by their age range and English proficiency level. From this population, a random sample of 40 participants was selected to participate in the study, with 20 individuals assigned to each of the static and dynamic assessment groups.

Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) was administered to ensure that the learners were truly homogenous regarding their English proficiency level. All students were informed that they would participate in a study but were unaware of the research goals. However, they were assured of confidentiality and anonymity of data and their names.

Instruments

Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT)

To choose a sample with a uniform range of skill levels, the Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT; Allan, 1992) was given at the start of the study. This test consists of 60 multiple-choice items on vocabulary and reading (30 items) and grammar (30 items), and learners with scores ranging from 40 to 74 are considered intermediate. The reliability of this test was .85 in the present study.

Writing pre-test

The participants were given a topic chosen from the theme of the course books (the effects of air pollution on the environment) that they studied in their general English class. They were required to write a paragraph of 150 to 250 words in 30 minutes. The reliability of the pre-test was .89 in the present study.

Writing post-test

After the treatment was over, the learners were given another topic (the effects of exercising regularly on your health) to write a paragraph of 150 to 250 words in length in 30 minutes. The reliability of the post-test was .92 in the present study.

Procedure

This study aimed to find the effects of audio corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy at the macro/micro level with a dynamic/static assessment approach. For this purpose, 40 Iranian intermediate EFL learners were randomly selected and assigned into two groups of dynamic and static assessment, each comprising 20 learners. When it comes to providing feedback, the one-week treatment for the two groups was carried out using a very popular social network, WhatsApp. In fact, all the writing tasks and audio feedback were sent to students in their WhatsApp accounts.

To provide feedback, the teacher provided students with an audio file recorded by the teacher in response to the writing tasks, filling the students in on feedback. The feedback the teacher provided included a range of topics, such as the overall organization of the paragraph, content, topic sentence, supporting sentences, transitional markers, punctuation, spelling, diction, grammar, unity, and coherence. This being so, the teacher could provide audio feedback on both micro and macro writing skills for the learners. The teacher used the feature voice recorder on WhatsApp to record the feedback and send it to the learners.

Concerning the variable of assessment, the members of the static assessment groups had their papers rated by the teacher and delivered to them one day after submission of the writing to the teacher. They were then supposed to modify their writings according to the feedback they received and resubmit it two days later. Unlike these learners, their counterparts in the dynamic assessment groups received leveled guidance on their performances to satisfy the correction levels in the framework of Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994).

Five transitional phases were included in the model of self-regulation in learners developed by Aljaafreh and Lantolf. These levels are: (1) the participant is unable to recognize his mistake; (2) the participant recognizes his mistake with cooperation and can make a correction with explicit help; (3) the participant recognizes his mistake with assistance and can make a correction with implicit help; (4) the participant recognizes his mistake with assistance and can make a correction without help; and (5) the participant recognizes his mistake without assistance and makes a correction on his own

DA was implemented in this study as follows: if no feedback was spotted on the essay, then admittedly, the learner was in level five of the framework. Otherwise, if any error was spotted, it was underlined by the rater (or brought to the learners' attention through a voice message) and delivered to the participant without any hint. The participants received their papers and saw their errors. They made the required adjustments according to their own ideas about the source of the error and resubmitted the essay. In the second submission, if the participants could correct the intended errors, they would be considered in level 4. Otherwise, during the second rating administration, their mistakes were again noted by putting another line on the mistake besides the line already there from the first rating

In this stage, the difficulty's cause was also implied. Again if the participants in the third submission could modify their errors, they would be considered in the third level. Otherwise, their writings were rated for the third time with an explicit explanation of the source of error. The learners' ability to correct the spotted error was a criterion to distinguish level two participants from those in level one. If they could not modify their errors, they would be considered in the first level. In the end, these learners received feedback in a DA way, helping them move from another-regulation stage to a self-regulation stage of development in L2 writing. After the treatment phase of the study was completed, the learners in the two groups were given a

writing post-test to measure their potential writing improvement in terms of the micro (i.e., lexical resource and grammatical range/accuracy) and macro (i.e., task response and cohesion/coherence) skills of writing.

Scoring and data analysis

The IELTS writing scoring rubric was employed to calculate the scores for the micro and macro skills of writing,. With regard to the micro skills of writing, grammatical range and accuracy (GRA) and lexical resource (LR) were taken into account, while macro skills of writing included task response (TR) as well as cohesion and coherence (CC). For each of the language learners, on both the pre-test and the post-test, a score was obtained regarding each micro and macro skill, using the IELTS writing band descriptors, ranging from 0 to 9. The data obtained from the scoring phase were analyzed by multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA).In this regard, the assumption of multivariate normality was satisfied as indicated by a non-significant Shapiro-Wilk test ($p > 0.05$). Homogeneity of covariance matrices was supported by a non-significant Box's M test ($p > 0.05$), confirming that the variances and covariances among dependent variables were equal across groups. Linearity was validated through visual inspection of scatterplots and statistical tests, with all p-values exceeding 0.05. Independence was ensured through the study's randomized design, and the homogeneity of regression slopes assumption was met as the p-value for the interaction term between covariates and independent variables was non-significant ($p > 0.05$). These results indicate that the assumptions of MANCOVA were satisfied, supporting the validity of our analysis.

3. Findings

The data presented illustrates the distribution of two key variables within the sample population. First, in terms of age, the majority of respondents fall into the 24-26 year age group, accounting for 37.5% of the sample. The age group of 22-24 follows closely behind at 32.5%, while those aged 27-30 make up 30.0% of the total. Secondly, when examining education levels, the largest proportion, at 50%, holds a bachelor's degree, showcasing the prevalence of this educational attainment in the sample. Additionally, 22.5% of participants have completed an associate degree, 17.5% hold a diploma, and 10% have obtained a master's degree. These percentages provide valuable insights into the demographic composition of the study participants, which can be crucial for understanding potential trends or patterns in subsequent analyses or research findings.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variable	Frequency (Percentage)
Age (Year)	
22-24	13 (32.5%)
24-26	15 (37.5%)
27-30	12 (30.0%)
Education level	
Diploma	7 (17.5%)
Associate Degree	9 (22.5%)
Bachelor's	20 (50%)
Master's	4 (10%)

The first and second research questions sought to find whether audio corrective feedback via dynamic and static assessment approaches had any statistically significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' writing improvement at the micro level (grammatical range and accuracy and lexical resource).

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Post-test Scores of Writing Micro skills

Skills	Feedback	Assessment	M	SD	N	Skewness	Kurtosis
Grammatical range and accuracy	Audio	Dynamic	6.22	.65	20	.06	-.07
		Static	5.95	.7	20	-.30	-.34
		Total	6.08	.68	40	-.15	-.18
Lexical resource	Audio	Dynamic	6.37	.64	20	.53	.66
		Static	5.95	.55	20	.45	-1.03
		Total	6.16	.63	40	. 35	.14

As shown in Table 2, the mean of the dynamic assessment group was higher regarding grammatical range and accuracy. The same was found for the lexical resource. Table 3 shows the results of MANCOVA analysis to see if the difference between the two modes of assessment was significant for micro skills.

Table 3. MANCOVA results for Post-test Scores of the Writing Micro-skills

	Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Assessment	Pillai's Trace	.51	38.36	2	73	.00	.51
	Wilks' Lambda	.48	38.36	2	73	.00	.51
	Hotelling's Trace	1.05	38.36	2	73	.00	.51
	Roy's Largest Root	1.05	38.36	2	73	.00	.51

The p-value corresponding to the assessment (Table 3) was found to be smaller than the alpha level of significance (p < .05), which shows that the learners who received dynamic and static assessments were significantly different from one another in terms of their L2 writing micro-skills. The effect size for the effect of assessment was also a very large one (.51).

Table 4. MANCOVA for grammatical range and accuracy and lexical resource Post-test Scores

Source	Dependent Variables	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Assessment	Grammatical range and accuracy	3.19	1	3.19	68.58	.00	.48
	Lexical resource	2.66	1	2.66	35.3	.00	.32

As shown in Table 4, assessment types had significant effects on both grammatical range and accuracy and lexical resource post-test scores. Effect sizes show that the effects on grammatical range and accuracy were greater than the effects on the lexical resource.

The third and fourth research questions sought to find whether audio corrective feedback via dynamic and static assessment approaches had any statistically significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' writing improvement at the macro level (task response and coherence and cohesion).

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for Post-test Scores of Writing Macro-skills

Skills	Feedback	Assessment	M	SD	N	Skewness	Kurtosis
Task response	Audio	Dynamic	6.41	.64	20	-.69	-1.02
		Static	5.75	.47	20	.84	.45
		Total	6.08	.64	40	.11	-.33
Coherence and cohesion	Audio	Dynamic	5.85	.75	20	1.42	-.23
		Static	5.47	.69	20	.28	.67
		Total	5.66	.74	40	.85	.26

As shown in Table 5, the mean of the dynamic assessment group was higher regrading task response. The same was found for coherence and cohesion. Table 6 shows the results of MANCOVA analysis to see if the difference between the two modes of assessment was significant for macro skills.

Table 6. MANCOVA for Post-test Scores of the Writing Macro-skills

	Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Assessment	Pillai's Trace	.72	96.37	2	73	.00	.72
	Wilks' Lambda	.27	96.37	2	73	.00	.72
	Hotelling's Trace	2.64	96.37	2	73	.00	.72
	Roy's Largest Root	2.64	96.37	2	73	.00	.72

The p value for the assessment analysis (Table 6) turned out to be smaller than the .05 level of significance (p < .05), which means that the assessment type also caused significant differences between the writing macro-skills post-test scores of the learners; the effect size for the effect of assessment was found to be very large (.72).

Table 7. MANCOVA for task response and cohesion and coherence Post-test Scores

Source	Dependent Variables	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Assessment	Task response	11.36	1	11.36	176.95	.00	.7
	Cohesion and coherence	3.74	1	3.74	38.22	.00	.34

As shown in Table 7, assessment types significantly affected both task response and cohesion and coherence post-test scores. Effect sizes show that the effects on task response were greater than the effects on cohesion and coherence.

The present study aimed to find the effect of audio corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing improvement at the micro (grammatical range and accuracy and lexical resource) and macro (task response and coherence and cohesion) levels using static and dynamic assessment methods. The findings indicated that the DA effect on micro and macro skills was statistically significant, with greater effects on task response and grammatical range and accuracy.

The findings regarding the effectiveness of assessment types in the grammatical development of EFL learners' L2 writing, our results are consistent with those of many other researchers (Anton, 2009; Wang, 2015; Rashidi & Bahadori Nejad, 2018; Estaji & Ameri, 2020; Zohoor & Eslami-Rasekh, 2021). Such outcomes can be explained by the fact that DA gives teachers a coordinated approach to instruction and assessment and strongly emphasizes the interaction between teachers and students. In other words, it can be claimed that in

DA, by interactional engagement between the student and the educator acting as an examiner or trainer, student capabilities are modified. Thus, our results are justifiable because, as Zohoor and Eslami-Rasekh (2021) have also shown, dynamic assessment entails incorporating interaction into the test while also tracking the learner's reaction and capacity to gain from the engagement. Nevertheless, it should not be ignored that several dynamic assessment models differ in terms of the amount of structure, the timing of the intervention, the content of the intervention technique, and many other factors.

More specifically, our results support those of Rashidi and Bahadori Nejad (2018), who showed a significant difference between the dynamic and non-dynamic assessment of writing ability in favor of the dynamic assessment. Moreover, Zohoor and Eslami-Rasekh (2021), corroborating our results, have claimed that dynamic assessment effectively connects students' grammatical learning demands and instuctors' interventions in the learning process. In essence, it can be claimed that by applying assessment types, teachers can address various L2 learners' requires effectively and ratse the learning opportunities necessary to aid EFL learners in developing L2 writing micro skills.

Likewise, it has been maintained that language learners commonly experience some problems in their writing development. In this regard, dynamic assessment has been reported to play a vital role in facilitating L2 writing (Mahdavi, 2014; Farrokh & Rahmani, 2017; Ebadi et al., 2021; Zafarani & Maftoon, 2018; Rashidi and Bahadori Nejad, 2018.). Along the same line of research, Davoudi and Ataei-Tabar (2015) have reported that certain aspects of L2 writing, including cohesion, lend themselves most readily to DA intervention. Davoudi and Ataei-Tabar (2015) provide a few possible explanations for this. Thus, the assessor essentially engages in conversation with the assessed in an effort to learn about their current level of performance and to share with them potential avenues for advancing that level of performance (Williams & Burden, 2002). Additionally, DA considers learning and assessment to be one construct that can enhance L2 acquisition in general.

Furthermore, in line with our findings, the value of dialogic collaboration, which is at the heart of dynamic assessment procedures, in promoting students' writing macro skills has also been appreciated by Shi et al. (2019), who provided strong support for the positive role of a dialogic approach in promoting students' argumentative writing macro-skills, especially for academically low-performing students. A possible explanation for the improvement of EFL learners' macro-skills via the implementation of feedback and assessment types is that by using DA, one can have a deeper grasp of the psychological processes a learner goes through when attempting a task. The researcher better understands the learner's level of independent mental development and the extent of his receptivity to mediation thanks to DA (Lantolf & Poehner, 2013). In fact, such improvements can be attributed to the fact that "assessment and instruction are dialectically integrated into the same development-oriented activity" (Poehner, 2008, p. 324) within assessment-oriented teaching approaches.

Implications and limitations

The results of this study can be followed by some pedagogical implications. First, it should be mentioned that the findings of this study can shed more light on the literature in the area of L2 writing in second or foreign language learning, especially with an eye on Iranian EFL learners' use of feedback and assessment type while engaged in L2 writing tasks. Second, materials developers and curriculum designers are encouraged to integrate effective means of providing feedback and operationalizing different types of assessment more than before in EFL classroom practices. To build on the findings of this study, future research could consider a larger and more diverse sample to enhance the generalizability of the results. Investigating the impact of audio feedback on learners from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds could provide a broader understanding of its effectiveness. Comparing audio feedback with other forms of feedback, like written comments or peer reviews, could offer insights into the most effective feedback methods for different learning contexts and objectives. Longitudinal studies would be beneficial to assess the long-term effects of audio feedback on writing skills. Exploring the impact of feedback in more informal or naturalistic settings could also provide a

more holistic understanding of how feedback influences language acquisition outside of the classroom. Additionally, incorporating qualitative data, such as student and teacher perceptions of the feedback process, could provide a richer, more nuanced understanding of the impact of audio feedback on EFL writing development.

Like any other study, this research is not without limitations that need to be kept in mind and avoided in future research. Firstly, the most significant limitation that needs to be considered is the small sample size, which can jeopardize the generalizability of the results. Furthermore, the researcher was forced to choose individuals with a single language background—Farsi—because there were not enough native speakers of other languages to choose from. Language learners from various linguistic origins can be selected and placed in different instruction groups in a larger study of this nature. Lastly, the reliance on static and dynamic assessments, while innovative, may not capture all the nuances of language learning progress, particularly in informal or less structured learning environments.

4. Conclusion

In general, it can be claimed that dynamic assessment, if operationalized effectively, can help teachers recognize that learners are struggling. To help teachers create more effective remedial courses, which is the ultimate goal of education, researchers and scholars should give them helpful information on the origin of problems, learner progress, and transcendence ability. Furthermore, it can be concluded from our findings and those of others (Izadpanah et al., 2022) that the success of the assessment is a result of DA's extension of the interactive educational style supported by mediation theory and ZPD to the evaluation process. The traditional method of evaluating students' knowledge and skills, in which one person, such as the instructor, unilaterally determines that the student is insufficient, is criticized by DA. DA views evaluation as a two-way process, including communication between both parties. Hence, the assessor engages in conversation with the learners to learn about their current level of performance and share with them potential avenues for advancing that level of performance (Williams & Burden, 2002). This can explain why the majority of the studies in the literature report the effectiveness of such an approach for L2 writing development.

References

Ahern Dodson, J., & Reisinger, D. (2017). Moving beyond corrective feedback:(Re) engaging with student writing in L2 through audio response. *Journal of Response to Writing*, *3*(1), 129-152.

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 465–483. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02064.x

Anjarani , S. ., & Furqon , M. . (2022). Hearing Your Feedback Loud and Clear: Students' Voices of Audio Feedback in Virtual Writing Class. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, *6*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.31002/metathesis.v6i1.136

Bilbro, J., Iluzada, C., & Clark, D. E. (2013). Responding effectively to composition students: Comparing student perceptions of written and audio feedback. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 24*(1), 47-83.

Bless, M. (2017). *Impact of audio feedback technology on writing instruction* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest.

Bradshaw, M. J. (2020). Practical tips for use of audio feedback on student writing assignments. *Nurse Educator*, *45*(2), 66-67. https://doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0000000000000681

Chalfin, G. (2018). Audio feedback on student writing: Could voice recording foster the tenets of care theory? *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue, 20*(1/2), 61-71.

Daneshvar, A., Bagheri, M. S., Sadighi, F., Yarmohammadi, L., & Yamini, M. (2021). A probe into Iranian learners' performance on IELTS academic writing task 2: Operationalizing two models of dynamic assessment versus static assessment. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies*, *8*(2), 58-24. https://doi.org/10.30479/jmrels.2020.13075.1617

Davoudi, M., & Ataei-Tabar, M. (2015). The effects of computerized dynamic assessment of L2 writing on Iranian EFL learners writing development. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication, 3*(2), 176-186. [Persian] https://doi.org/10.15640/ijlc.v3n2a16

Ebadi, S., Ashtarian, S., & Yousefi, N. (2021). Teaching English Language. *Journal Dynamic Assessment Training and Mediational Strategies of EFL Student Mediators, 15*(2), 95–126. [Persian]

Estaji, M., & Ameri, AF (2020) Dynamic assessment and its impact on pre-intermediate and high-intermediate EFL learners' grammar achievement. *Cogent Education, 7*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1740040

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, 2*(1). [Persian] https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-017-0033-z

Hayman, R. (2018). Using audio feedback for summative assessment feedback: Experiences of work-based postgraduate sport coaching students. *Journal of Perspective in Applied Academia Practice, 6*(2), 13-21. https://doi.org/10.14297/jpaap.v6i2.334

Hidri, S. (2019) Static vs. dynamic assessment of students' writing exams: a comparison of two assessment modes, International Multilingual Research Journal, 13:4, 239-256, DOI: 10.1080/19313152.2019.1606875

Izadpanah, J., Sadighi, F., & Akbarpour, L. (2022). Investigating oral and written corrective feedback on language learners' grammar. *Journal of Language and Translation, 12* (1), 49-61. [Persian]

Kocaman, O., & Maral, B. N. (2022). Effects of explicit corrective feedback on writing skill: A private middle school example. The Literacy Trek, 8(1), 108-120. https://doi.org/10.47216/literacytrek.1121256

Mahdavi, M. (2014). *The Effect of Dynamic Assessment on Essay Writing Ability of Iranian EFL Learners: A Gender Related Study*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Eastern Mediterranean University Gazimağusa, North Cyprus.

Mallahi, O., & Saadat, M. (2020). Effects of Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' writing Development: Group Dynamic Assessment vs. Formative Assessment. *Iranian Evolutionary and Educational Psychology Journal*, *2*(4), 258-277. [Persian] http://dx.doi.org/10.52547/ieepj.2.4.258

Nirwana, A. R., Iye, R., & bin Tahir, S. Z. (2020). SOME EFFECTS OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS'WRITING. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, *6*(1), 166-178. https://doi.org/10.24252/Eternal.V61.2020.A14

Rahmani, A., Rashtchi, M., & Yazdanimoghadam, M. (2021). Interactionist and interventionist dynamic assessment approaches to teaching argumentative writing: Do complexity, accuracy, and fluency develop? *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice, 13*(27), 100–128. [Persian]

Rashidi, N., & Bahadori Nejad, Z. (2018). An investigation into the effects of dynamic assessment on the EFL learners' process writing development. *Sage Open, 8*(2), 1- 14. [Persian] https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018784643

Rassaei, E. (2019). Computer-mediated text-based and audio-based corrective feedback, perceptual style and L2 development. *System, 3*(3), 1-12. [Persian] https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.03.004

Sharif, A. M., & Zainuddin, S. Z. (2017). Students' perceptions of their reflective essay writing experience and teacher feedback comments. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 6*(2), 204-212. [Persian] https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v6i2.4845

Shi, Y., Matos, F, & Kuhn, D. (2019). Dialog as a bridge to argumentative writing. *Journal of Writing Research, 11*(1), 107-129. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2019.11.01.04

Sritrakarn, N. O. (2018). A comparison of teacher's and senior students' feedback: Student attitudes and their writing improvement. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 15*(2), 329. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.2.5.329

Sun, H. & QI, W. (2022). Effects of Written Corrective Feedback on College EFL Students' Writing Accuracy and Linguistic Knowledge Acquisition. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *45*(3), 445-461. https://doi.org/10.1515/CJAL-2022-0310

Wang, P. (2015). The effect of dynamic assessment on the listening skills of lower intermediate EFL learners in Chinese technical college: A pilot study. *Journal of Language Teaching and research, 6*(6), 1269-1279. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0606.14

Xu, Y. (2018). Not just listening to the teacher's voice: A case study of a university English teacher's use of audio feedback on social media in China. *Frontiers in Education, 3*,65. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00065

Zafarani, Z., & Maftoon, P. (2018). Impact of Dynamic Assessment on the Writing Performance of English as Foreign Language Learners in Asynchronous Web 2. 0 and Face - to - face Environments. *Journal of Language and Translation, 8*(2), 39–55. [Persian]

Zohoor, S., & Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2021). Impact of dynamic assessment principles on learning and retention of conditional sentences amount in Iranian intermediate learners. *Language Related Research, 12*(5), 551-577. [Persian]