

The Application of Dynamic Assessment: Is It Worth the Effort?

Elahe Fazlollahi

Allame Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran

Fahime Marefat

Allame Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran

Shahin Vaezi

Iran University of Science and Technology, Tehran, Iran

Abstract—The emergence of Dynamic Assessment (DA) has been motivated by the inadequacy of conventional static tests to provide accurate information about the individuals' learning ability. To explore the effectiveness of Dynamic Assessment and conventional methods of teaching and assessing in writing, 45 female students were studied. These individuals were randomly assigned into two groups. To understand students' problems and needs better, individuals in both groups were asked to write reflective reports which mainly focused on their writing process. Analyzing the mean scores of these groups revealed the superiority of Dynamic Assessment. The students' scores in each group were also compared prior to the implementation of the treatment and after that, using two paired t-tests. The results revealed that unlike the conventional group, those in Dynamic Assessment group had improved their writing skills significantly. Such results implicitly revealed that writing reflective reports by itself cannot have any effect on the writing abilities of individuals. Some criteria for writing, as mentioned by the individuals in their reflective reports, were categorized: grammar, content, using appropriate and effective vocabulary, organization, spelling and capitalization. Further findings and implications for future research are discussed in the paper.

Index Terms—Dynamic Assessment (DA), reflective report, writing

I. INTRODUCTION

As a basic communication skill and a means of measuring individuals' learning in second language, writing is one of the most important skills. Foreign language students are often anxious about writing, so teachers should encourage them to see the writing process as 'a means of learning' rather than 'demonstrating learning' (Hyland, 1990, p. 285).

Proponents of the process approach to writing believe that traditional assessment techniques are often incongruent with classroom writing practices (Lucas, 2007). The standardized written test given at the end of the school term is seen as particularly antithesis to the process approach to writing (Moya & O'Malley, 1994). So, writing experts have begun to explore new means. Dynamic assessment (henceforth, DA), as a new way of assessing in the field of testing, argues that important information about a person's abilities can be learned by offering assistance during the assessment itself. In fact, not only can DA provide a different picture of an individual's abilities, it can also help to develop those abilities. DA, hence, aims at the integration of assessment and instruction to promote learner development. Sternberg and Grigorenko (2002) consider DA as a paradigm shift towards a new philosophy of assessment that focuses on helping individuals to develop through intervention.

II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

A. Assessing Writing and Dynamic Assessment

According to Weigle (2002) "The ability to write effectively is becoming increasingly important in our global community" and as a result instruction in writing becomes more important "in both second- and foreign-language education" (p. 1). Weigle (2007) also considers assessment of student writing as an essential task for writing teachers. So, besides instruction, assessment has also gained the key role for writing teachers. In fact, teachers often feel that assessment is a central aspect of teaching that has the potential to be beneficial to both teacher and students. Ellis (2009) refers to the fact that what actually individuals are expected to do with the corrections provided for them is important. Students may simply be given back their corrected texts and then simply ignore the corrections or they may be required to pay close attention to those corrections. He believes only the second issue is effective since it makes the individuals more aware of their problems.

As Brown (2004, p. 218) notes, "the assessment of writing is no simple task". When we look back at writing assessment in the 20th century, we see a number of phenomena. These include the rise in the popularity of the so-called

'objective tests' that aimed at measuring writing ability through multiple-choice tests; the subsequent movement by writing teachers was an aim to measure writing ability through actual writing; and the next movement was towards portfolios, as a reaction to the 'one-shot' approach to essay testing. In fact, dissatisfaction towards previous approaches to writing appeared in different ways and as a result different ways of assessment and instruction were made. Testing specialists have called for a closer integration of assessment and instruction for a long time (Bachman & Cohen 1998; Lantolf & Poehner, 2007). DA is the emergence of new ways of thinking that result from an individual's engagement in activities where he or she is supported by interactions with others. It posits a qualitatively different way of thinking about assessment from how it was traditionally understood by classroom teachers and researchers (Poehner, 2008).

DA is grounded in the theory of mental development elaborated by the Russian psychologist, L. S. Vygotsky. Understanding the processes of development to help individuals overcome difficulties and to support their ongoing development is not possible through mere observation of solo performance. Instead, active collaboration with individuals simultaneously reveals the full range of their abilities and promotes their development. In educational contexts, this means that assessment – understanding learners' abilities – and instruction – supporting learner development – are integrated activities. This new pedagogical approach has come to be known as DA. Bitchener and Knoch (2008) believe that student motivation is more likely to be gained if teachers negotiate with their students about which features they will focus on, about the type of feedback that will be given and about what the students will be expected to do in response to the feedback. Based on Bitchener and Knoch's study negotiation with individuals on the type of feedback is considered as a positive point in promoting students' abilities. DA requires the examiner to mediate the examinee's performance during the assessment itself through the use of prompts, hints, and questions (Poehner, 2008). In this way, the focus of the assessment shifts from examinee's success or failure at completing a given task to an analysis of the amount and kinds of assistance they required. Matsumura and Hann (2004) have done a study on EFL writing classes. They found that it is the pivotal responsibility of the teacher to ensure effective learning by providing classroom feedback methods that are matched to students' feedback preferences.

Many studies of DA are done regarding at-risk students. Most of these studies revealed the effectiveness of this approach for these students. Schneider and Ganschow (2000), for example, suggest the potential usefulness of DA procedures in helping at-risk L2 learners, particularly those with problems arising from dyslexia. Kozulin and Garb (2002) have done a DA study on their participants' ESL reading comprehension skills. It should be noted that the goal of this mediation stage was not simply to improve learners' performance on the posttest, but to promote development.

Poehner (2009, p. 481) provided an eight-step scale for interventions based on which the teacher can mediate the learners:

1. Pause.
2. Repeat the whole phrase questioningly.
3. Repeat just the part of the sentence with the error.
4. Teacher asks, "What is wrong with that sentence?"
5. Teacher points out the incorrect word.
6. Teacher asks either/or question.
7. Teacher identifies the correct answer.
8. Teacher explains why.

B. Using Reflective Report in Dynamic Assessment (DA)

Education represents one of the primary contexts where DA has been applied (Haywood & Lidz, 2007). The researchers used different techniques in this regard. Carslon and Wiedl (1992) have developed various levels of standardized verbalization prompts designed in some cases to encourage learners to think aloud so that the researchers can better assess where the problems occur during task solution. The results of this study revealed that, the use of verbalization has been particularly successful with a variety of learners.

According to Tzuriel (2000) one of the goals in DA is to change learners' impulsive style to a reflective mode of responding, so throughout the present study it was tried to make individuals reflect on the process of their writing. Weigle (2002) believes many teachers like to have students include their reflections on the process they went through to create their final works. In many alternative ways of assessment like portfolios, this takes the form of a reflective essay, which introduces the reader to the contents of the students' writings and frequently provides insights into a student's self-assessment of his or her writing strategies and strengths and weaknesses in writing. Reflective essays have the advantage of giving students the opportunity to explain to their evaluators what they have learned and why they included certain pieces, which provide them with an opportunity to develop their self-awareness and to practice self-assessment. This practice encourages students to become more actively involved in and take responsibility for their own learning (Koegler, 2000; Rosier, 2002). Reflective report may include asking learners to present a report on how they did their writing. The learners may be asked to reflect on their performance and evaluate it or they may be asked comments on how they might improve their writing. The information which is provided for teacher in this way can help to recognize the problematic areas for each writer. It can also help to gain an insight on the mental processes of the learners.

This study explores the effectiveness of the application of DA to an L2 learning context. In this text, we are trying to find the answers to the following questions:

1. Is there any significant difference between conventional and DA methods of teaching and assessing in a narrative writing?
2. What are the areas of difficulty as reported by students in their reflective reports?

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

The participants in this study included 45 intermediate level female students who were studying in Farzane Sazan Institute in Sari. Their age ranged from 14 to 18. To check the proficiency level as well as the homogeneity of the two groups Nelson test was used by the researcher. These students were from two intact classes, with 23 individuals in the experimental group and 22 students in the comparison group. The experimental and comparison groups were randomly assigned by the researcher in this study. In the experimental group, one student was excluded because she was often absent throughout the treatment sessions.

B. Materials

The instruments used to collect data included:

- (1) A general proficiency test, Nelson 200 A, which comprised 50 multiple choice grammar and vocabulary items.
- (2) Narrative Prompts: About 100 narrative prompts were taken from the Internet by the researcher. According to Ummel-Ingram (2004) narration is more suitable to this proficiency level than other types of writing. The researcher selected eight topics for this study. Then two of these topics were randomly chosen; one as a pre-test and one as a post-test. The other six remaining topics were given to the students one by one every other session to be written at home. The students were asked to write about 150 to 200 words for each of the topics in about thirty minutes.
- (3) Reflective Report: Individuals in both groups were asked to provide their reflective reports based on their problems in writing process and what they had learned in the previous session. Reflective reports were gathered from individuals every session. On the whole, there were twelve reflective reports for each individual in this study. The researcher analyzed these reflective reports and tried to give individuals feedback based on them. The analysis of the reflective reports also aimed to find if there was any improvement in each person's writing based on writing these reports.
- (4) Rating scale: In order to score students' papers, Jacobs, Hartfleb, Hughey, and Wormuths' (1981) analytical scale was used. The important categories in this scale includes: content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics.

To ensure the reliability of the scores the students received based on the scale, two raters scored the students' papers on both pre-test and post-test. One of the raters was the researcher and the other an English Translation graduate student. The correlation coefficients between the raters for the pre-test was 0.89 and for the post-test was 0.94, using Pearson Product formula, were high enough (Hyland, 2003).

C. Procedures

Having collected the first writing of participants as the pre-test, the two groups went through different treatments of DA and conventional methods. To understand students' problems, feelings and needs better and to provide them with the best types of hints they needed, individuals in both groups were asked to write reflective reports which mainly focused on their writing process. After the treatment there was another topic to write about in the class and this was regarded as the post-test.

1. DA Group

The researcher in this group collected, corrected and selected two of the papers. To do this, she considered their reflective reports and the most obvious problems in most of the writing papers. One writing was selected as the best and one as the worst from among the written papers for the next session. The researcher typed them and brought a copy of them to class. She tried to cover the writing papers of each student at least once in the class.

After distributing the papers among the students, the researcher asked one person to read a sentence from the beginning or she herself did the task. And then asked students whether there was any problem regarding that sentence or not. To clarify how she made the treatment in this group, she recorded some parts of their speech throughout the treatment. Using the DA interventions classified by Poehner (2009), the researcher provided feedbacks throughout the treatment. This scale was ordered from the indirect types of feedback to the direct ones. When students could not correct themselves or when they couldn't get why they were wrong, the teacher felt the need to explain for the students the reasons behind each answer. To clarify the situation an example is provided below:

"I said who can called me at this time" this was a sentence in one of the writing papers. The teacher (T) asked one of the students (Ss) to read this sentence. (R and M refer to two of the students, Roya & Maryam).

R: I said who can called me at this time.

T: I said who can called me at this time?

T: PAUSE

T: I said who can called me at this time. Is it Ok?

Ss: no

Ss: can call

T: so, it is call, not called. Any other problem?

M: told

R: wondered

T: I wondered, I asked myself. I wondered who could call me at this time.

At first, the teacher repeated the sentence **questioningly** and when she didn't get any feedback from students, she repeated the whole sentence and asked students whether it was ok. The students seemed to find some problems in this sentence. So, they corrected the mistake themselves as "can call". This shows that their problem with using the simple form of the verbs after modal verbs like "can" is not deep. The teacher asked them of other possible problems. As you see, they identified the next problem without any help from the teacher. They suggested other words, one of them said "told" but immediately after that another one (R) suggested "wondered" and the teacher confirmed her. To make other students understand the point, she provided a meaning for "wondered" as you see above. There was also another problem here. The whole sentence is past, so students should use "can call me" in the past form. It seems that students didn't notice the problem, so the teacher herself corrected it while she was repeating the sentence. To make students aware of such correction, she brought some explanation for what she did, and told them it should be "could" because it happened in the past. She corrected the word herself because the students seemed not to notice the wrong form of the word and the researcher felt the need to explicitly correct it herself and bring the reason behind.

As you see, the teacher should not necessarily follow these steps one after the other obligatorily; the researcher may skip some steps based on the reactions of individuals in her class. But there is no change in the order. The writing papers of all individuals were read and discussed in the class the same way. The researcher kept a copy of each person's writing and reflective reports for herself in case of need for further investigation. Then she gave them back to make the students more aware of their own problems in writing based on what was discussed in the class.

The treatment with this group continued like this with all of the six topics. The researcher also discussed the problematic areas they mentioned in their reflective reports to ensure them that she paid attention to the reports.

2. Conventional Group

Individuals in this group were assigned to write about one topic at home and bring it for the next session. The teacher revised their papers, corrected their errors and gave them back in the following session. This was repeated for all sessions and the students wrote on all six topics and received feedback from the teacher on their writing papers. In providing feedback, their reflections in their reports were considered and some of their problems mentioned in their reports were also discussed in class.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section is divided into two parts. The first part offers quantitative data to answer the first research question.

The second part, the qualitative section, used the reflective reports provided by DA group together with their writing papers to see their feelings and how they progressed in their writing.

Section A: Quantitative Analysis

Part One. Descriptive Analysis of the Data and Results of the Pre-test

At first, the results of the descriptive analyses for the Nelson test and pre-test of writing are presented. The Nelson test was given to all the students in these two groups in the first session to ensure their homogeneity although they were considered as homogeneous based on the exams held in the institute at the end of each semester. The results of the descriptive analysis for the Nelson test are given in Table 1.

TABLE 1
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE NELSON TEST PRIOR TO THE TREATMENT

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Nelson test for DA	22	24	32	28.23	2.844
Nelson test for Conventional	22	24	32	27.59	2.443
Valid N(listwise)	22				

As can be seen in this table, the mean score for these two groups, DA and conventional groups are 28.23 and 27.59, which are very close to each other. The researcher presented this table here to show their homogeneity prior to the treatment. This is also obvious by looking at the amounts observed for skewness (0.10 and 0.20) and kurtosis (1.36 and 0.85) which do not exceed +2 or -2 (Bachman, 2004). This is also revealed in the data of their writing papers which was gathered from them as pre-test. To clarify the subject more, the results of descriptive statistics concerning their pre-tests are provided in Table 2 below:

TABLE 2
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF WRITING TEST BEFORE THE TREATMENT

	N	Minimum	maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
DA-pretest scores	22	63	83	70.95	5.79
Conventional-pretest scores	22	63	80	71.45	4.17
Valid N (listwise)	22				

As it is obvious in this table, the mean score for the pre-test of these two groups in DA and conventional groups are 70.95 and 71.45 which are very close. The scores obtained for Standard Deviation in DA and conventional groups are 5.79 and 4.17 which are near. The amounts observed for skewness (0.42 and 0.22) and kurtosis (0.7 and 0.02) do not exceed +2 and -2 (Bachman, 2004). So, these statistics can assure us of two homogeneous groups.

Although the number of students in each group was equal and so we had a balanced design, the equality of variances of the groups was assured by the help of Levene's Test. As it is obvious in the following table (Table 3), the observed amount for p (0.025) is more than the significant value of 0.05. This reveals that the two groups are equal in their variances and so the assumption of the equality of variances could be met for a parametric Independent Samples t-test.

TABLE 3
INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST RESULT FOR THE PRE-TEST

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pre-test Equal variances assumed	5.38	0.025	-0.22	40	0.82
Equal variances not assumed			-0.21	33.27	0.82

In Table 3 the Independent Samples t-test for the results of the pre-test is calculated. The *t* value found for the t-test of the pre-test with degrees of freedom of 40 for these two groups is 0.22 which is smaller than critical value of 2.02. This reveals that the null hypothesis of no difference among the two groups cannot be rejected. This can also be shown if we look at the observed amount of significance (0.82), which is more than the specified level of significance (0.05). It can be concluded that the two groups were not significantly different prior to the treatment.

Part 2. Results and Discussions for the Post-test

After giving the specified treatments to each of the two groups, the post-test was given to the students. The results of the descriptive statistics are given in Table 4.

TABLE 4
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE RESULTS OF THE WRITING TEST AFTER THE EXPERIMENT

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
DA post-test score	22	76	92	82.73	5.24
conventional post test score	22	63	86	75.05	5.90
Valid N (listwise)	22				

As it is obvious in Table 4 the mean scores for the DA and the conventional group (82.73 and 75.05) are not close anymore. It seems the two groups are not homogenous in their post-test, though the respective standard deviations for the groups (5.24 and 5.90) are still very close. Compared with the pre-test data, the mean score for DA group has increased more than that obtained from conventional group. Although the standard deviations for the two groups did not differ much from those in the pre-test, its value decreased in DA group and increased in conventional group. It shows that the variability among the students in DA reduced but its value increased for conventional group.

Quantitative Research Question 1:

The first research question addressed the effect of DA on improving writing skill of intermediate level students. To probe its corresponding null hypothesis, the researcher used an independent samples t-test to compare their mean scores after the treatment (Table 5).

TABLE 5
INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST RESULTS FOR THE POST-TEST

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pre-test Equal variances assumed	.01	.91	4.46	40	.00
Equal variances not assumed			4.48	39.98	.00

The findings, ($t(40) = 4.46, p < 0.01$), show the amount observed value for *t* with degrees of freedom of 40 is 4.46 which is more than the critical amount of 2.7 ($p < 0.01$). So the null hypothesis of no difference between the post-tests of DA and conventional groups is rejected.

There may be so many reasons involved which led to the effective instructions in the DA group compared with the conventional group. The individuals in DA may have progressed as a result of the predetermined steps in DA through which the teacher by considering their emotions and their difficulties in writing from their own points of view provided them with suitable feedback. This way they became more conscious about their problems and they tried to remove them.

The other point is that the teacher in DA tried to consider students' emotions and the problems observed by themselves in this regard. This way they felt better and they could express their ideas in a more relaxed way through their reflective reports. They also felt better because they could express anything they liked without their friends knowing anything about. It was even more obvious for shy students who talked less in class. This way they were more relaxed in expressing their feelings.

In order to see whether writing reflective reports have any effect on improving the individuals' writing ability in these two groups, two paired t-tests were conducted.

TABLE 6
PAIRED T-TEST FOR DA

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 DA	-11.773	4.639	.989	-13.829	-9.716	-11.904	21	.000

The *t* value found for DA with degrees of freedom of 21 is 11.9 which exceed the critical value of 2.83 ($p < 0.01$). Such result reveals that writing reflective reports in this group can increase their writing abilities (Table 6).

To see whether writing reflective reports by itself can improve students' writing skills in the conventional group, another paired t-test was done which compared the mean values for pre-test and post-test of conventional group (Table 7). The *t* obtained value with degrees of freedom of 21 is 2.72 which is lower than its critical value (2.83, $p < 0.01$). Such result implicitly reveals that writing reflective reports by itself is not significantly effective in improving the writing abilities of students.

TABLE 7
PAIRED T-TESTS FOR CONVENTIONAL GROUP

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 2 Conv	-3.591	6.185	1.319	-6.333	-.849	-2.723	21	.000

That may be because reflective reports are not effective by themselves and they should be used with some other effective methods like DA. It seems those individuals in conventional group who did not discuss their problems with the teacher in class were even less interested in writing reflective reports. Their reflective reports were shorter in the length and contained one or two sentences as if those in this group found no use in writing such reports. It seems that the individuals in DA could see more of the effect of reflective reports while those in conventional group were not aware of its use and that's why they just wrote one or two sentences to show their problems in writing.

Section B: Qualitative Analysis

In an attempt to show what actually happens as a result of this research, the following research question was posed: What are the areas of difficulty as reported by students in their reflective reports?

To answer this research question, the researcher asked students to cite their impressions and problems in writing freely in their reflective reports. The analysis of reflective reports was done just for DA group because the only group which showed progress was this group. It assumed that if students reflect on their own work while they write and also after getting the feedback from teacher in class, they will find their problematic areas in writing better. Based on subjects' reflective reports, some problematic criteria are listed here. The observed amounts for each of these criteria were calculated on the basis that these factors were mentioned at least once in individuals' reflective reports.

► Grammar

Focusing on students' reflective reports, it was revealed that almost 68.2 percent of students (15 out of 22) considered language use to be as the most important and problematic section in their writing. They expressed this in different words.

Some of them wrote in their reflective reports that:

- *It is a good idea to correct grammar mistakes.*
- *It is good at teaching grammar.*

Some others identified their problems in writing:

- *I have problem in the exchange of tense.*

► Content

Almost 63.6 percent of students (14 out of 22) considered topic as one of the important criterion in their reports.

- *Some subjects are not good and they are not exciting. So I can't write a lot.*

As you see in this sentence, the student related the topic to the length of her writing and considered it as one important factor.

It seems more advanced students paid more attention to content compared with others. In their reflective reports they asked questions regarding "how to start their writing" or "how to make the best effect on the reader from the beginning by providing a good introduction".

► Appropriate and Effective Vocabulary

It was also found that some students believed vocabulary and word selection are very important criteria in writing. 59.1 percent of students referred to vocabulary in most of their reflective reports.

- *I don't know many vocabularies. So, I can't speak or write very well.*
- *I forget words easily.*
- *I have problem in using the word. (when to use which word) I mean finding the best words.*

► **Organization**

About 27.3 percent of students regarded organization and connection of sentences as another effective factor in their writings.

► **Spelling and Capitalization**

Two other criteria referred to by students are spelling and capitalization as major factors in mechanics. Students, 22.7 percent, referred to these two in their reports.

- *When we should bring capital letters?*
- *I have problems with spelling the words.*

Students participating in DA group resorted to different criteria to define their problems in writing papers. These criteria were mainly related to the five mentioned criteria in Jacob, et al's (1981) category. It may be because of the fact that in the very first session the researcher explained these five factors and the extent they were important in their scores.

Careful observation of the data revealed that the subjects' level of language proficiency affected their selected criteria and the importance they gave to those criteria to a great extent. Although most of the students of the low and average proficiency levels were mainly obsessed with surface-level problems, those in higher levels realized that their writings should meet a wide variety of criteria, including content and organization, to be known as a good piece of writing.

Although short by themselves, reflective reports of DA were longer compared with those of conventional group. That may be because individuals in DA could see more of the effect of reflective reports while those in conventional group were not aware of its use and that's why they just wrote one or two sentences to show their problems in writing.

Overall, the findings of this very study demonstrated the effectiveness and positive value of DA in enhancing writing skills of intermediate level students. The results of this study confirmed those studies which investigated the effectiveness of DA in other skills. Kozulin and Garb (2002), for example, have done a DA study on their participants' ESL reading comprehension skills.

The result of this study also corroborated that by Poehner (2005) who has done his study on the effectiveness of applying a DA procedure to speaking. The results also confirm those of Poehner (2009) who found the effectiveness of Group-DA.

V. CONCLUSION

With regard to the highlighted importance of learning writing skill in English classes, the present study aimed at comparing two different methods of teaching and assessing writing namely, DA and conventional methods, to see if they had any effect on the students' writing proficiency. It was also an attempt to see whether the applied technique (reflective report) in these two groups had any effect on their writing proficiency. As can be seen from the results of the study, DA had priority over the other conventional method in the extent to which it helped students to improve their writing. It was also implicitly found that writing reflective report on itself cannot help individuals in improving their writing abilities. To investigate individuals' problems better, the researcher analyzed their reflective reports in DA. She found that the most important criteria from their own views were: grammar, content, vocabulary selection, organizing text, spelling and punctuation.

Based on the obtained results, DA can be applied in promoting various writing skills. Teachers should keep in mind not to treat texts as products; rather they should try to view students' writing as works in progress and provide appropriate feedback to facilitate successful revision by considering how much they need help from the teacher. So, teachers must be aware that revision alone does not guarantee positive changes in writing quality. Teachers should try to make the individuals more conscious of their problems in writing. The most important thing is that the teacher should consider every body's reaction and needs to provide them with the best type of feedback. Interested teachers can also use reflective reports to know their students' problems in writing better. This way, they can provide more appropriate feedbacks for their students. But, they should make sure that their students find some use in writing such reports. Finally, further research may address the effectiveness of DA in other skills. Finding the efficacy of Group-DA and computerized DA are also suggested as future avenues of research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bachman, L. F. & A. D. Cohen. (1998). *Interfaces between second language acquisition and language testing research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [2] Bitchener, J. & U. Knoch. (2009). The value of a focused approach to write corrective feedback. *ELT Journal* 63, 204-211.
- [3] Brown, H. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. White Plains, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- [4] Carlson, J. S. & K. H. Weidl. (1992). Principles of dynamic assessment: The application of a specific model. *Learning and Individual Difference* 4, 153-166.

- [5] Ellis, R. (2009). Direct corrective feedback provides learners with explicit guidance about how to correct their errors. *ELT Journal* 63, 97-107.
- [6] Haywood, H. C. & C. S. Lidz. (2007). *Dynamic assessment in practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Hyland, K. (1990). Providing productive feedback. *ELT Journal* 44, 279-285.
- [8] Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [9] Jacobs, H. L., V. F. Hartflel, J. B. Hughey & D. R. Wormuth (1981). ESL composition profile. Retrieved August 12, 2010 from <http://eli.tamu.edu/resources/profile.html>.
- [10] Koegler, S.M. (2000). *Self-reflective assessment through teacher portfolios: The experience of first-year teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York University.
- [11] Kozulin, A. & E. Garb. (2002). Dynamic assessment of EFL text comprehension of at risk students. *School Psychology International* 23, 112-127.
- [12] Lantolf, J.P. & M. E. Poehner. (2007). *Dynamic assessment in the foreign language classroom: A teacher's guide*. United States of America: CALPER Publications.
- [13] Lucas, R. I. G. (2007). A study on portfolio assessment as an effective student self-evaluation scheme. *The Asia Pacific-Education Researcher* 16, 23-32.
- [14] Matsumura, S. & G. Hann. (2004). A Computer Anxiety and Students' Preferred Feedback Methods in EFL Writing. *The Modern Language Journal* 88, 403-415.
- [15] Moya, S. & J. M. O'Malley. (1994). A portfolio assessment model for ESL. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students* 13, 13-36.
- [16] Poehner, M. E. (2005). *Dynamic assessment of oral proficiency among advanced L2 learners of French*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.
- [17] Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting L2 development*. USA: Springer.
- [18] Poehner, M. E. (2009). Group dynamic assessment: mediation for the L2 classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 43, 471-491.
- [19] Rosier, G. (2002). Using reflective reports to improve the case method. *The Journal of Management Development* 21, 589-597.
- [20] Schneider, E. & L. Ganschow. (2000). Dynamic assessment and instructional strategies for learners who struggle to learn a foreign language. *Dyslexia* 6, 72-82.
- [21] Sternberg, R. J. & E. L. Grigorenko. (2002). *Dynamic testing: The nature and measurement of learning potential*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [22] Tzuriel, D. (2000). Dynamic assessment of young children: Educational and intervention perspectives. *Educational Psychology Review* 12, 4, 385-435.
- [23] Ummel-Ingram, L. (2004). Narrative writing works magic in the ELD classroom. Retrieved July 12, 2010 from <http://www.nwp.org/cs/public/print/resource/1284>.
- [24] Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [25] Weigle, S. C. (2007). Teaching writing teachers about assessment. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 16, 194-209.

Elahe Fazlollahi got her M.A. from Allame Tabatabae'i University. She passed her BA at University of Tehran. Her research interest focuses on ESP, dynamic assessment, reading and writing.

Fahime Marefat is an Associate Professor in TEFL at Allame Tabatabae'i University. Her research interest focuses on Writing.

Shahin Vaezi is an Assistant Professor of TEFL at Iran University of Science and Technology. Her research interest focuses on psycholinguistics.