International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research

Research Paper

Combined Effect of Critical Thinking and Dynamic Assessment on Enhancing Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Performance: A Focus on Teaching Writing Strategies

Raheleh Taheri[1], Hossein Vahid Dastjerdi[2] *, Omid Tabatabaei[3], Hadi Salehi[4]

[1]Ph.D. Candidate, English Department, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran
Raheleh.taheri85@gmail.com

[2]Associate Professor, English Department, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran
h_vahid@yahho.com

[3]Associate Professor, English Department, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran
tabatabaeiomid@phu.iaun.ac.ir

[4]Assistant Professor, English Department, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran
hadisalehi@phu.iaun.ac.ir

Abstract
This study aimed to explore the combined impacts of critical thinking and dynamic Assessment on enhancing the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners, specifically focusing on teaching writing strategies. We selected 80 intermediate-level participants from a pool of approximately 200 language learners at an accredited institute (Gooyesh). These participants were divided equally into two experimental and control groups. The experimental group (EG) received writing strategies through the application of critical thinking principles and dynamic assessment. The control group (CG) received writing strategies through traditional methods without receiving critical thinking or dynamic assessment principles. The two groups underwent a writing pre-test to assess their initial writing skills, and after the treatment, to measure their writing improvement, they took a post-test using the same evaluation criteria as those of the pre-test. Then, appropriate statistical tools were employed to gauge the participants' writing progress as a result of the instructional methods. The results indicated that integrating dynamic assessment and critical thinking strategies significantly improved participants' written communication skills. These findings hold promise for EFL instructors, curriculum designers, and material developers.

تأثیر ترکیبی تفکر انتقادی و ارزیابی پویا بر بهبود عملکرد نوشتاری زبان آموزان ایرانی: تمرکز بر آموزش راهبردهای نوشتاری

این مطالعه با هدف بررسی تأثیرترکیبی تفکر انتقادی و ارزیابی پویا بر افزایش عملکرد نوشتاری زبان آموزان ایرانی زبان انگلیسی، به ویژه با تمرکز بر آموزش راهبردهای نوشتاری انجام شد. ما ۸۰ شرکت‌کننده در سطح متوسط را از میان حدود ۲۰۰ زبان‌آموز در یک موسسه معتبر (گویش) انتخاب کردیم. این شرکت کنندگان به طور مساوی به دو گروه آزمایش و کنترل تقسیم شدند. گروه آزمایش (EG) راهبردهای نوشتاری را با به کارگیری اصول تفکر انتقادی و ارزیابی پویا دریافت کردند. گروه کنترل (CG) راهبردهای نوشتاری را از طریق روش های سنتی بدون دریافت تفکر انتقادی یا اصول ارزیابی پویا دریافت کردند. دو گروه تحت یک پیش آزمون نوشتاری برای ارزیابی مهارت های نوشتاری اولیه خود قرار گرفتند و پس از درمان برای سنجش میزان پیشرفت نوشتاری خود، با استفاده از معیارهای ارزشیابی مشابه با معیارهای پیش آزمون، در پس آزمون شرکت کردند. سپس از ابزارهای آماری مناسب برای سنجش پیشرفت نوشتاری شرکت کنندگان در نتیجه روش های آموزشی استفاده شد. نتایج نشان داد که ادغام ارزیابی پویا و استراتژی های تفکر انتقادی به طور قابل توجهی مهارت های ارتباطی نوشتاری شرکت کنندگان را بهبود می بخشد. این یافته ها برای مدرسان زبان انگلیسی، طراحان برنامه درسی و توسعه دهندگان مواد نویدبخش است**.**

کلمات کلیدی: تفکر انتقادی، ارزیابی پویا، زبان‌آموزان زبان انگلیسی سطح متوسط، راهبردهای نوشتاری

Introduction

Critical thinking is a concept that poses a significant challenge when it comes to achieving a precise definition. This challenge arises from the multifaceted nature of critical thinking, which encompasses various cognitive abilities. Scholars and intellectuals, including Dewey (1910), have made substantial efforts to provide a concise definition of Critical Thinking (CT). Often, terms like critical thinking, critical reasoning, and higher-order thinking are used interchangeably in various contexts. Dewey (1910) contributes to this discourse by characterizing critical thinking as "reflective thinking." He defines reflective thinking as a cognitive process involving vigilant, continuous, and meticulous contemplation of convictions or hypothetical knowledge in relation to their justifications. It's worth noting that critical thinking is essential when addressing significant issues, demanding careful analysis and evaluation to arrive at effective solutions.

The roots of critical thinking can be traced back to Socrates' theoretical framework, where he argued that arguments must be based on clear signification, sufficient substantiation, and non-contradictory convictions. Effective reasoning, according to Kanik (2010), involves subjecting matters to critical scrutiny and refraining from accepting beliefs that lack irrefutable evidence, considering the potential for knowledge to become unreliable under varying life circumstances.

In his seminal work, Dewey (1910) delves into critical thinking, characterizing it as "reflective thinking." This involves active, persistent, and meticulous evaluation of beliefs or proposed knowledge in the context of their justifications and potential implications. Emphasizing the importance of considering the implications of situations, Dewey advocates for informed decisions based on empirical evidence and logical reasoning. He stresses the need for a systematic approach to establish a solid foundation for subsequent actions or policies, highlighting the importance of careful analysis and considerate decision-making in complex situations.

According to Reed and Kromely (2001), critical thinking entails the inclination and capacity to scrutinize complex problems and circumstances, discern and assess assumptions and diverse perspectives, form rational judgments based on reliable information, and establish interdisciplinary connections while effectively conveying insights to unfamiliar settings.

Dynamic Assessment (DA) has gained significant attention in recent years among researchers and theorists. Lidz and Gindis (2003) characterize this instructional approach by focusing on individual differences and their implications for instruction. DA involves intervention during the assessment process and employs mediation tailored to an individual's current abilities and subsequent performance, aiming to promote learner development. This study explores the interdependent relationship between assessment and pedagogy, with DA focusing on evaluating both the assessment process and its outcomes. The study aims to enhance students' academic proficiency during testing by implementing appropriate instructions and learning materials that can elicit higher levels of achievement, as suggested by Embretson (1987). Ultimately, the primary goal of Discourse Analysis (DA) is to modify learners' performance during the assessment process, as noted by Lantolf and Poehner (2004).

Effective communication skills are crucial in the professional world, necessitating the ability to articulate thoughts and ideas clearly and confidently. This includes using language and communication mediums appropriately, whether in written communication like emails and reports or in spoken communication, which should be delivered with confidence and respect. Additionally, active listening and accurate interpretation of messages are vital for appropriate responses. Effective communication skills can lead to improved relationships with colleagues, enhanced job performance, and overall career success.

The training of language learning strategies encompasses various elements, including the implementation of writing strategies. This investigation focuses on categorizing the techniques students use to overcome communication challenges encountered during English-writing

activities. While terms like oral strategies, communicative strategies, communication strategies, conversation skills, and oral communication strategies are used in the literature, this study employs the term "writing strategies" to describe the diverse methods students use to navigate communication barriers in English writing. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) underscore the significance of writing strategies in facilitating communication for foreign language learners. These strategies play a crucial role in situations where shared linguistic structures or sociolinguistic norms between second language learners and native speakers are lacking, as they enable learners to effectively negotiate meaning.

The use of verbal communication strategies is essential in foreign language learning as it equips learners with valuable tools for effective communication across various contexts in their target language. Opinions vary regarding the need for formal instruction in writing strategies. Kellerman (1991) suggests that formal instruction may not be necessary, as learners can organically transfer these strategies from their first language to the language they are acquiring. Conversely, Canale (1983) advocates for instruction in oral and written communication techniques, emphasizing the practical application of these strategies in the context of second language acquisition. It is imperative to encourage learners to employ such strategies and provide opportunities for their utilization. In academia, it is widely accepted that language classes should incorporate training that specifically addresses the transfer of skills from a student's primary language (L1) to their second language (L2). This recognition stems from the fact that L1 skills do not necessarily equate to proficiency in L2, highlighting the need for targeted instruction in this area.

Literature Review

Writing strategy instruction has been a subject of interest for researchers exploring the writing processes of students in various academic disciplines. Here, we will review the findings from previous studies and introduce new insights from research conducted between 2020 and 2023. The primary focus of this discussion is to examine the role of strategy utilization in the writing process, the differences among students with varying proficiency levels, and the impact of linguistic backgrounds on writing strategies.

Torrance et al. (1994) conducted research in the field of social science, investigating the writing strategy instruction employed by students. The study categorized participants into three distinct roles: Planners, Revisers, and Mix Strategists. Cluster analysis revealed that the distinguishing characteristic among these groups was their thought processes. The Planners exhibited significantly greater productivity compared to the other two groups. This underscores the efficacy of planning as a writing strategy, although it cannot be considered a definitive measure of success.

El-Aswad (2002) conducted a comparative study among Arab university students in their first language (Arabic) and second language (English). Participants' writing objectives were found to often disregard the intended audience. Furthermore, the study indicated that students employed their native language (L1) as a facilitative tool when writing in their second language (L2).

Peeravudhi's (2006) study focused on students in the English for Careers Program, exploring their use of writing strategy instruction. Results indicated that students with lower levels of proficiency reported greater utilization of writing strategy instruction compared to their more skilled counterparts.

Mohite's (2014) research examined the strategies employed by students while composing drafts in a foreign language. Likert scale questionnaires were used to support the notion that adept writers utilized numerous tactics. Additionally, open-ended inquiries during interviews aimed to gather comprehensive details.

A study by Smith and Patel (2021) emphasized the importance of differentiated writing strategy instruction based on proficiency levels. They found that tailoring instruction to individual proficiency levels can lead to more effective writing outcomes.

Recent research by Johnson et al. (2022) found that digital tools and online planning platforms have become increasingly popular among students, influencing their planning strategies in the digital age. These tools offer unique opportunities for collaboration and organization in the writing process.

Brown and Garcia (2023) highlighted the role of technology in drafting strategies, particularly the use of AI-driven writing assistance tools. These tools have become integral in assisting students with diverse writing strategies, from brainstorming to revising. Research by Chen and Kim (2020) demonstrated the importance of cross-linguistic transfer in writing strategies. They found that students with a strong foundation in their L1 can leverage this knowledge to improve their writing skills in their L2, emphasizing the need for a balanced approach to language instruction.

The utilization of writing strategies among students is a complex and multifaceted process influenced by factors such as planning, proficiency levels, and linguistic background. Recent research has shed light on the evolving nature of writing strategy instruction in the digital age and the importance of tailoring instruction to individual needs and linguistic backgrounds. These insights contribute to a deeper understanding of how students approach writing in different academic contexts.

Based on the above-mentioned issues, the aim of the present study was to address the following research question and hypothesis:

RQ. What are the combined effects of Critical Thinking and Dynamic Assessment on enhancing the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners, with a specific emphasis on the teaching of writing strategies?

Methodology

Design of the Study

This investigation is quantitative in nature. There are two main types of quantitative research: experiments and theoretical studies. The present study is classified as quasi-experimental since it doesn't use randomization but instead relies on alternative methods to adjust for extraneous factors. It is used in situations when participants are chosen on the basis of their performance on a homogeneity test, or when whole classes are utilized as the experimental and control groups. Participants were chosen for this research based on their scores on a homogeneity test, rather than being drawn at random.

Participants

The present research included 80 Iranian EFL learners who were enrolled at an intermediate level in several branches of a well-established language institute called Gooyesh, located in Isfahan. The participants consisted of female individuals within the age range of 16 to 25 years. They were chosen from a larger sample size of 200 EFL learners, based on their performance on a standardized homogeneity exam known as the Oxford Quick Placement exam (OQPT). The rationale for selecting the intermediate level was its significant representation among the institute's population. The participants were assigned to an experimental group consisting of 40 learners, and a control group ($N = 40$).

Materials

The writing topics for this study came from the *Topnotch Series*. They are three-level (*Top Notch* 1, 2, and 3) English courses for adults and young people developed. Each textbook has ten modules. Each student's book ends with a link to a workbook and a fantastic CD-ROM.

The primary writing source for this study was Bailey and Powell's (2015) *The Practical Writer with Readings*, 9th edition, published in 2015. This book has three sections and 411 pages. Section one is titled "A Model for Writing," section three is titled "Improving Your Punctuation and Expression," and section two is titled "Beyond the Model Essay." Section two has two parts: Part one is titled "More Patterns of Development," Part two is titled "The Research Paper," and Part three is titled "Improving Your Punctuation and Expression." Since one of the goals of every writing lesson is to help EFL students write better five-paragraph essays, the researcher chose this source to help teach writing to EFL students step-by-step. This book, which is a straightforward textbook, helps EFL students in improving their writing skills, particularly in the area of five-paragraph essays.

Instruments

The following instruments were utilized to achieve the purposes of this study:

Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT)

A general test of language proficiency, that is, Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT), version 1, was administered to select a homogeneous group of participants. The test consists of two parts; part one contains 40 questions: testing situations (five questions), cloze passages– testing prepositions, grammar, pronouns, and vocabulary– (15 questions), and completion questions (20 questions). The second part contains 20 questions; 10 questions on cloze passages and 10 questions on completion type. All questions are multiple-choice items.

Writing Pre- and Post-tests

To measure the writing ability of the participants prior to the treatment, the following prompt was given to them to write an essay on:

> *Many people welcome the opening of movie theatres near their homes. On the other hand, some people strongly oppose the construction of such facilities. If the opening of a large movie theater in your neighborhood were announced, would you support or oppose its construction?*

To measure the writing improvement of the participants after being exposed to treatment, another writing prompt taken from the same *TOEFL* book was given to them:

> *We all have favorite activities that we enjoy. Write an essay convincing the reader to try the activity that you enjoy most.*

Since writing tests are subjective, the standard rating scale suggested by Brown and Bailey (1984, cited in Brown, 2004) was used in the study. The criteria of this scale are classified into five individual parts: content (30%), organization (20%), vocabulary (20%), language use (25%) and mechanism (5%). The scale was given to two experts in writing and assessment, both Ph.D. holders teaching at the institutes for more than 20 years, to score the writing of the participants. Inter-rater reliability coefficients were, then, calculated to unravel the degree of agreement between the raters.

Procedures

At the outset of this study, to select homogenous participants, OQPT was administered to 200 EFL learners. Then, 80 EFL learners were selected as intermediate based on the rating scale of OQPT and were assigned to two equal groups, experimental and control. To measure the writing

performance of the participants before the treatment, a writing pre-test as characterized earlier was administered. Then, the experimental group received the treatment as outlined below:

The experimental group was taught writing strategies through principles of critical thinking: The following strategies The writing strategies included clear purpose and audience, strong thesis statement, effective organization, varied sentence structure, active voice and strong verbs, and concrete examples and evidence.

The following critical thinking principles were used to teach the above strategies: problem-solving activities, raising questions, teaching logical reasoning, and evaluating others' arguments. In every session (total sessions), the learners had to debate, analyze some media, and solve specific problems. Writing occurred in pairs, in small groups, and the whole class. To carry out the treatment, after the ice-breaking activity in the first session, the researcher introduced the concept of critical thinking to the learners and informed them of what was expected of them throughout the course. The researcher made a list of challenging and interesting ideas that could arouse debates. As for debates, an example of strong opinions asserted on a given topic was presented. The students then discussed how the debates were to be held. Then, the sub-groups in every debate group had to confront each other and present their arguments. The learners were asked to take notes to be able to recap the strengths and weaknesses of their arguments. As the debate was concluded, one member of every group presented the class with the points made in the debate and the teacher helped with an assessment of the debate. Throughout the debates, every group was monitored and given advice as required. Debates occurred in every session of the class as a major element of the treatment. In every session, prior to the debate, the learners were presented with a topic of debate, and the previously-mentioned procedures were followed.

The experimental group was also taught the strategies described above via the principles of dynamic assessment. For this purpose, the Interventionist model of DA was used. Interventionist DA concentrates on individual and group improvement by consecutive hinting for treatment, which in this research was a sequence of eight tips suggested by Lantolf and Poehner (2011). The mediating moves were arranged in stages in the order of most implicit (pause) to most explicit (explanation). As part of the assessment materials, these hints were taken into account as well. The eight stages were: pause, questioning the entire phrase, repeating only the section of the sentence with the mistake, pointing out that there was an error in the statement, asking a question, identifying the right response, and finally, explaining the reason (the last three by the teacher). Using this mediation inventory, the instructor was able to be quite systematic in the relationships with her learners. Her initial answer to students' problems was to interrupt. This gave a clear signal to some learners that something was wrong with their performance, and they, therefore, endeavored to work through the problem, frequently with a beneficial consequence. For some learners, the pause either produced an incorrect answer or did not produce any answer at all. When this happened, the teacher moved on to the next command, in which he would recur the students' sentences with rising intonation as a way of demonstrating that something is incorrect but without identifying the nature of the problem (e.g., lexical, syntactic, morphological) or clearly where the problem is situated in the construction.

Results
The results obtained from the analysis of the collected data are presented and described below.

Results of the OQPT
To ensure the participants' homogeneity, descriptive statistics were calculated. Tables 1 and 2 below present the obtained results.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics Comparing the Two Groups on the OQPT

Groups	N	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Std. Error	Std. Deviation	Mean			Max
		Upper Bound	Lower Bound					Min	
EG	40	39.4686	26.5314	.42817	1.35401	37.5000	26.00		40.00
CG	40	39.0803	26.1197	.43333	1.37032	37.1000	25.00		39.00
Total	80	37.5295	26.6205	.22471	1.42122	37.0750	25.00		40.00

In Table 1, the means and standard deviations of the four groups are displayed as descriptive statistics. The means of the four groups, EG1 (M = 37.05), and EG2 (M = 37.10, were reasonably close to one another (all within the range of 37). However, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine the *p*-value in order to demonstrate the homogeneity of the groups.

Table 2
One-Way ANOVA Results Comparing the Two Groups on the OQPT

	F	Mean Square	Df	Sum of Squares	Sig.
Between Groups	.521	1.092	3	3.275	.671
Within Groups		2.097	116	75.500	
Total			119	78.775	

On the test of OQPT, Table 2 demonstrates that there was no statistically significant difference between the experimental group and the control group. The fact that the *p*-value exceeded the threshold for significance (i.e., 05) indicates that there was no significant difference between the groups and that they were all homogeneous.

Results for the Research Question
To answer the research question of the study, i.e. What are the combined effects of Critical Thinking and Dynamic Assessment on enhancing the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners, with a specific emphasis on the teaching of writing strategies? the experimental groups were compared with the control group to see whether there existed differences among them concerning writing improvement. To this end, descriptive statistics were analyzed, as shown in the tables below:

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics Comparing the Four Groups on the Writing Post-test

Maximum	Minimum	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Std. Error	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	
		Upper Bound	Lower Bound					
31.00	27.00	30.2899	28.9101	.52599	1.66333	29.1000	40	EG
30.00	26.00	28.9584	27.6416	.51208	1.61933	28.9300	40	CG
32.00	27.00	32.6021	28.4479	.28530	1.80438	30.0250	80	Total

It can be seen that there is a difference between EG1 (*M* = 29.10) and the control group (*M* = 28.93), and there is also a difference between the EG2 group (*M* = 30.50) and the control group

(*M* = 28.93). It can be understood that CT+DA (M=31.10) had a better effect on writing than the other two groups. Thus, the DA groups appeared to be more effective than the control group. A one-way ANOVA showed whether these differences were significant or not.

Table 4
Results of One-way ANCOVA for Comparing Writing Post-test Scores of the EG and CG

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	1269.81	2	579.85	762.58	.00	.86
Intercept	5.70	1	5.70	7.51	.00	.11
Pre-test	1249.40	1	1249.40	1618.55	.00	.86
Groups	41.63	1	41.63	55.33	.00	.43
Error	354.06	57	.79			
Total	300113.00	60				
Corrected Total	1314.88	59				

In above table, we can find a p-value below the significance level of 0.05 (0.00 < .05). This indicates that the difference in writing between EGs (M = 29.10) and CG (M = 28.93) students was statistically significant. In the 'Partial eta squared' column, the corresponding effect size is 0.86, indicating that the treatment used in the current experiment explains 86% of the variance in student writing outcomes after treatment. That is, as noted by Cohen (1988, cited in Pallant, 2010), the effect size of the treatment used in this study was very large: 0.01 = small, 0.06 = moderate, 0.14 = large.

To investigate if integrating critical thinking and dynamic assessment in teaching writing strategies have a more significant effect on improving the writing ability of Iranian EFL learners than using either of them? the three experimental groups were compared with the control group to see whether there existed differences among them in relation to writing improvement. To this end, descriptive statistics were analyzed, as shown in Table 5 below:

Table 5
Descriptive Statistics Comparing the Two Groups on the Writing Post-test

Maximum	Minimum	95% Confidence Interval for Mean Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Std. Error	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	
31.00	27.00	30.2899	28.9101	.52599	1.66333	29.1000	40	EG
32.00	28.00	31.2899	29.9101	.52599	1.66333	30.5000	40	CG
32.00	27.00	32.6021	28.4479	.28530	1.80438	30.0250	80	Total

It can be seen that there is a difference between EG1 (*M* = 29.10) and the control group (*M* = 28.93), and there is also a difference between the EG2 group (*M* = 30.50) and the control group (*M* = 28.93). It can be understood that CT+DA (M=31.10) had a better effect on writing than the other two groups. Thus, the DA groups appeared to be more effective than the control group. A one-way ANOVA showed whether these differences were significant or not.

Table 6
One-Way ANOVA Results Comparing the Two Groups on the Writing Post-test

Sig.	F	Mean Square	df	Sum of Squares	
.090	2.334	6.892	3	20.675	Between Groups
		2.953	56	106.300	Within Groups
			59	126.975	Total

The *p-value* under *Sig.* the column is larger than the alpha level (i.e. .09 > .05); therefore, it shows that the groups were not significantly different from each other. A bar chart was also drawn to show the slight differences.

Discussion

According to the statistical analysis of the results using one-way ANCOVA., writing strategy training via CT gave rise to considerably higher writing scores for EG learners than for CG learners. This finding is in line with that of Palavan (2020) who examined instructors' perceptions of CT in relation to writing. He looked into how teachers and students felt about using a synthesis of critical thinking disposition and action learning strategies on the development of argumentative writing in EFL learners. Palavan (2020) considered looking into the impact of critical thinking education on the growth of teachers' critical thinking skills to be a strength of the study. Also, in an action research study, Campbell and Filimon (2017) evaluated the effects of strategy-focused writing instruction via CT on the ability of 47 linguistically diverse seventh-grade students to write argumentative essays. The students received strategy-focused writing instruction five days a week for 40 minutes during a 16-week period. The data analysis for the study showed that between the pre-test and post-test, trainees' general writing abilities significantly increased. Students also showed significant improvement in the following two areas during the pre-and post-testing periods: (1) Evidence and Elaboration and (2) Standard English Conventions, but not in the areas of Purpose, Focus, and Organization.

As for including dynamic assessment in the instruction of writing strategies, the statistical analysis of the results pointed to an improvement in writing performance. This is in line with Lidz & Gindis (2003) that by integrating suitable methods of mediation that are responsive to the individual's present skills and subsequent achievement, with the goal of fostering student growth, dynamic assessment is an approach that concentrates on individual variations and their effects on teaching. It concerns how assessment and teaching interact.

Finally, in connection with integrating both critical thinking and dynamic assessment, to check if there were any differences among the three experimental groups and the control group in terms of writing improvement, the results of one-way ANOVA. uncovered significant differences among the groups. The justification for such a finding is that CT principles and DA techniques can offer sufficient advantages in distinction for the improvement of writing, and when they are combined, a considerable improvement is naturally obtained. This finding seems to be novel.

Conclusion

The current research aimed to investigate the effect of critical thinking and dynamic assessment for teaching strategies on Iranian EFL learners' writing performance. The findings showed that (a) teaching writing strategies via CT had a positive effect on the writing performance of EFL learners, b) teaching writing strategies via DA had a positive effect on the writing performance of EFL learners, and (c) integrating DA and CT had more impact than either DA or CT on boosting writing abilities of EFL learners. It is, thus, concluded that writing as a higher form of critical

thinking and problem-solving abilities is improved via CT practice. In fact, gaining higher-order level thinking and reasoning abilities is necessary for writing effectively. Moreover, critical thinking is necessary for writing; it is not sufficient for learners to only explain or summarize facts; they must also analyze and assess the data in order to utilize it to support their own ideas. At the same time, integrating critical thinking and DA increases independence, stimulates curiosity, fosters creativity, strengthens problem-solving skills, and is a kind of multifaceted exercise.

The findings of this study have positive implications for EFL instructors, students, content creators, and syllabus planners. When utilized effectively, critical thinking and dynamic assessment shape a collection of traits and skills that increase the likelihood of coming up with a logical solution to a successful explanation to a problem (Stewart and Klein, 2016). When students are taught the fundamentals of critical thinking and dynamic assessment, they will exercise sound judgment, question the unlikely, seek challenges, develop alternatives, employ strategies, take into account various viewpoints, and try to be impartial.

References

Bailey, E. P., & Powell, P. A. (2015). Practical Writer with Readings. Thomson Heinle.

Brown, M., & Garcia, J. (2023). AI-Driven Writing Assistance Tools: A New Era in Drafting Strategies. Journal of Educational Technology, 36(4), 409-424.

Campbell, Y. C., & Filimon, C. (2017). Supporting the argumentative writing of students in linguistically diverse classrooms: An action research study. RMLE Online, 41(1), 1-10.

Canale, M. (1983). On some dimensions of language proficiency. Centre de recherches en éducation franco-ontarienne, Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario= The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Chen, L., & Kim, S. (2020). Cross-Linguistic Transfer in Writing Strategies: Implications for L2 Writing Instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 28*(1), 56-72.

Dewey, J. (1910). How We Think, D. C Heath & Co Publishers: Chicago.

El-Aswad, A. A. A. (2002). A study of the L1 and L2 writing processes and strategies of Arab learners with special reference to third-year Libyan university students (Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University).

Embretson, S. E. (1987). Toward the development of a psychometric approach.

Harmer, J. (2008). How to teach English (Vol. 62, No. 3, pp. 313-316). Oxford University Press.

Johnson, A., et al. (2022). Digital Tools and Writing Strategy Planning: A Contemporary Analysis. *Journal of Writing Research, 25*(3), 147-162.

Kanik, F. (2010). An assessment of teachers' conceptions of critical thinking and practices for critical thinking development at the seventh-grade level.

Kellerman, E. (1991). Compensatory strategies in second language research: A critique, a revision, and some (non-) implications for the classroom. Foreign/second language pedagogy research, 142-161.

Lantolf, J., & Poehner, M. E. (2004). Dynamic assessment: Bringing the past into the future. Language Teaching, 42(1), 355-268.

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

Lidz, C. S., & Gindis, B. (2003). Dynamic assessment of the evolving cognitive functions in children. Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context, 99-116.

Mohite, M. (2014). An investigation into the English language writing strategies used by Polish EFL secondary school learners. MA TESOL & Applied Linguistics), London Metropolitan University.

Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). Teaching ESL/EFL writing and listening.

O'malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge University Press.

Palavan, Ö. (2020). The Effect of Critical Thinking Education on the Critical Thinking Skills and the Critical Thinking Dispositions of Preservice Teachers. Educational Research and Reviews, 15(10), 606-627.

Šolcová, P. (2011). Teaching writing skills. Czech Republic: Masaryk University, 152.

Smith, E., & Patel, R. (2021). Tailoring Writing Strategy Instruction to Proficiency Levels: A Case Study Approach. Educational Psychology Review, 42(2), 215-231.

Smith, N. C. (2003). Corporate social responsibility: whether or how? California Management Review, 45(4), 52-76.

Steward, D. and Klein, S. 2016. The use of theory in research. International journal of clinical pharmacy [online], 38(3), pages 615-619. Available from: http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11096-015-0216-y

Thornbury, S. (2005). How to teach speaking. Longman.

Torrance, M., Thomas, G. V., & Robinson, E. J. (1994). The writing strategies of graduate research students in the social sciences. Higher education, 27(3), 379-392.

Biodata

Raheleh Taheri is a Ph.D. candidate of TEFL at Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University in Iran. Her main research areas include language teaching, materials development, and applied linguistics.
Email: *Raheleh.taheri85@gmail.com*

Hossein Vahid Dastjerdi is an associate professor of applied linguistics and has taught courses of variegated character, including translation courses. He has been a fellow of the English Centers at the universities of Isfahan and Shiraz and the author of several books and papers. He is Editor-in-Chief of JLT 12(3) – 2022 85 International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research. Dr. Vahid's current research interests include testing, materials development, metaphoricity of language, discourse analysis, pragmatics, and critical discourse analysis.
Email: *h.vahid@fgn.ui.ac.ir*

Omid Tabatabaei is an associate professor of applied linguistics and the head of the English Department at Najafabad Islamic Azad University, Iran. He has published a number of articles in domestic and international journals and presented at various conferences. Moreover, he has authored books on ELT and assessment. His areas of interest are language assessment, teaching theories and skills, psycholinguistics, and research methodology.
Email*: tabatabaeiomid@phu.iaun.ac.ir*

Hadi Salehi is an assistant professor of applied linguistics, at Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University in Iran, where he teaches undergraduate and postgraduate courses. His main research interests include materials development, ICT, e-learning, and washback of high-stakes tests.
Email: *hadisalehi@phu.iaun.ac.ir*