



## **The Impact of Multimodal Feedback on Writing Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency of Iranian EFL Learners in Flipped and Traditional Classrooms**

Maryam Farnia<sup>1,\*</sup>, Fatemeh Hemmati<sup>2</sup>, Raziye Rabbani Yekta<sup>3</sup>,  
and Shooramirsayafi<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Corresponding Author: Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English Language and Literature, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran, ORCID: 0000-0001-7046-6533 Email: mfarnia@pnu.ac.ir*

<sup>2</sup> *Associate Professor of TEFL, Department of English Language and Literature, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran, ORCID: 0000-0002-1237-5075 Email: hemmati@pnu.ac.ir*

<sup>3</sup> *Assistant Professor of TEFL, Department of English Language and Literature, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran, ORCID: 0000-0003-3045-1032 Email: r\_ryekta@pnu.ac.ir*

<sup>4</sup> *PhD Candidate in English Language Teaching, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran Email: shooramirsayafi@gmail.com*

### **Abstract**

This quasi-experimental research examined multimodal feedback impacts on writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) of Iranian EFL learners in flipped and traditional classrooms. Hence, 57 Iranian EFL learners from two different language institutes at Babol City were recruited and divided into four groups, including two experimental groups of flipped classroom plus multimodal feedback and traditional classroom plus multimodal feedback and two control groups of a flipped classroom plus monomodal (text-written) feedback and traditional classroom plus monomodal (text-written) feedback. Pretest and posttest were used to elicit information on the learners' writing CAF. Experimental groups received multimodal feedback, and control groups received monomodal feedback during 12 weeks (24 sessions). According to the results obtained from one-way analysis of multivariate (MANOVA), providing multimodal feedback significantly improved students' writing performance. Furthermore, using multimodal feedback via a flipped teaching model significantly influenced EFL learners' writing CAF, suggesting that foreign language educators could effectively employ multimodal feedback primarily via flipped instruction to improve writing performance in intermediate EFL learners. The study results were discussed and some suggestions were given.

**Keywords:** traditional classroom, flipped classroom, multimodal feedback, writing CAF

### **ARTICLE INFO**

#### **Review Article**

Received: Sunday, October 6, 2024

Accepted: Sunday, March 16, 2025

Published: Tuesday, April 1, 2025

Available Online: Sunday, March, 16, 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22049/jalda.2024.29175.1631>

Online ISSN: 2821-0204; Print ISSN: 28208986



© The Author(s)

## **Introduction**

Although English language learners are exposed to a vast array of written texts, the cognitive demands of producing their own written work often prove to be a formidable obstacle, hindering their progress in writing proficiency development (Hyland, 2019). Additionally, writing involves generating, organizing, and translating ideas into coherent text, which leads to difficulties for many foreign language learners (Faradhibah & Nur, 2017). Despite the various attempts to improve students' writing abilities, there has been no alteration in implementing the traditional writing curriculum in numerous institutions (Wen & Walters, 2022).

There has been a recent development in teaching writing and providing feedback that has demonstrated positive outcomes (Noordin & Khojasteh, 2021). Technology development has greatly affected language instruction and the application of technology-based instruction and feedback has expanded teachers' ability to create inventive approaches and methods to assist language learners' writing skills (Nourinezhad et al., 2021). Technology has also played a significant role in flipped classrooms by preparing interactive activities, problem-solving experiences, and collaboration by facilitating learners' access to pre-recorded materials (Fathi & Rahimi, 2022). Moreover, technology-based instruction is increasingly common in English language classes. It might be safe to say that almost all students possess smartphones and need preparation for technology integration into education and its impact on academic achievement (Kashefian-Naeini & Sheikhezami-Naeini, 2020).

As far as flipped classroom is concerned, it can enable learners to watch videos before class time and again, facilitating the class time allocation to learning activities (Hao, 2016; Lee & Wallace, 2018). Flipped classroom inverts the traditional model by placing learning exercises in the classroom and lectures at home (Wilson, 2013). Flipped classroom, as described by Abeysekera and Dawson (2015, p. 2), revolves around "moving tasks in time and space", indicating that traditional learning activities are rearranged. Lectures typically delivered in class are accessed by students outside of class time. Thus, classroom time is dedicated to activities that solidify their understanding, such as exercises and discussions.

Alongside the innovative flipped classroom model, multimodal feedback has emerged as a modern approach to provide student feedback. The sound, image, text, and animation incorporation empower educators to establish dynamic and engaging learning contexts that foster interactive dialogue. This instructional method offers new possibilities for enriching teaching and learning experiences (Martin, 2020). Multimodal feedback can enhance course design by structuring learning opportunities effectively, improving content clarity for all students, and recognizing the diverse ways students engage with information. This approach values students' varied communication skills and encourages their active participation in the learning process (Martin, 2020). Multimodal choices in modern learning technology sparkles a change in writing. Language learners use images, videos, and emoticons to build meaning (Hafner, 2014).

Even though technology-based feedback is increasing across various fields of study and education, including literacy (Camiciottoli & Campoy-Cubillo, 2018), online language teaching (Satar & Wigham, 2017), and traditional language classroom settings (Engman, 2021), appraising the function of multimodal feedback in writing performance is under-researched (Chang et al., 2017). Although there are studies on the effects of the multimodality of communication through computers on language learners' writing performance (Nourinezhad et al., 2021; Ziegler, 2016), there is inadequacy on how multimodality might help with feedback when teaching writing in a second language (Chang et al., 2017; Mousavi & Kashefian-Naeeni, 2011).

This study sought to fill this gap by studying multimodal feedback effects on foreign language learners' writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency (writing CAF) in flipped and traditional classrooms. Moreover, we intended to demonstrate how the combination of multimodal feedback and flipped or traditional classroom enhance students' writing performance. Considering the previously raised discussion, we embarked on answering the questions below:

1. Does multimodal feedback affect EFL learners' writing CAF significantly in flipped classrooms?
2. Does multimodal feedback affect EFL learners' writing CAF significantly in traditional classrooms?
3. Does applying multimodal feedback make any differences between EFL learners' writing CAF in flipped and traditional classrooms?

## **Literature Review**

### ***Multimodal Feedback***

Multimodal Feedback provides feedback for users in multiple sensory channels such as visual, auditory, and written forms (Jacko et al., 2004). Zhang' (2018) study of EFL learners over an eight-week period through diaries and follow-up interviews displayed that participants expressed favorable attitudes toward screencast feedback application for writing. Additionally, Cavaleri et al. (2019) employed a longitudinal mixed-methods design to investigate the impact of written and recorded audio-visual feedback on second language learners. An analysis of 80 papers from 20 undergraduate students indicated higher effectiveness of audio-visual feedback for 15 students. Written feedback worked better for three students and two benefited equally from both methods. Moreover, a study by Afshinfar and Shokouhifar (2016) conducted on advanced Iranian EFL learners confirmed the significant positive effects of written corrective feedback, with explicit feedback proving more effective than implicit feedback. Also, Sherafati et al. (2020) inspected the computer-generated and teacher-generated digital feedback effects on L2 learners' writing skills, indicating significant improvements in the writing abilities of the experimental groups receiving computer-mediated teacher feedback. In line with

these findings, Sadeghi et al. (2013) also examined the impact of different types of corrective feedback on EFL learners' writing, revealing that direct corrective feedback led to significantly better writing performance compared to indirect feedback.

In a comparative study of audio-visual feedback and teachers' written comments on Iranian EFL learners' essays, Tajallizadeh Khob and Rabi (2014) reported that the audio-visual comments were successful in both boosting motivation and changing negative learner attitudes. More recently, Nourinezhad et al. (2021) studied the audio-visual feedback effects on L2 learners' writing components (e.g., vocabulary, organization, content, sentence mechanics, and language use) in flipped and traditional instruction, indicating advancement on the writing skills, regardless of instructional style. Despite the similarity, however, the flipped group achieved even better results in all writing components and overall performance.

The research presented underscores the efficacy of audio-visual feedback in enhancing EFL learners' writing abilities. Tajallizadeh Khob and Rabi's findings (2014) highlight its positive impact on motivation and attitude, while Nourinezhad et al. (2021) demonstrate its effectiveness in improving various writing components. Notably, the latter emphasizes the potential synergy between audio-visual feedback and flipped classrooms for optimized learning outcomes. These studies collectively suggest that integrating audio-visual feedback into EFL writing instruction can be a valuable strategy for fostering language development.

### **Writing in Flipped and Traditional Classrooms**

A flipped classroom revolves around “moving tasks in time and space” (Abeysekera & Dawson, 2015, p. 2), reflecting the rearrangement of traditional learning activities. Lectures, typically delivered in class, are accessed by students outside of class time, allowing teachers to allocate classroom time to activities that solidify understanding, such as exercises and discussions.

Traditional writing instruction is too rigid and teacher-directed which heavily relies on pre-made materials, such as textbooks and worksheets instead of encouraging creativity and independent learning (Boyras & Ocak, 2017). Moreover, in traditional writing classrooms, teachers pick the skills students learn, often without connecting them to real-world writing situations, which often involves students being physically present together at the same time (synchronous learning) to receive new information (Lee & Wallace, 2018).

Nowadays, students are accustomed to a more engaging and interactive style of education, making traditional methods seem outdated and less effective in capturing their interest (Jony, 2016). Traditional teaching methods often struggle to address the learning challenges of today's generation, suggesting that instructors need to adapt and develop new approaches that cater for students' current interests. This requires exploring alternatives to traditional methods and incorporating innovative elements like video could be a promising way to transform writing classrooms from pen-and-paper environments into engaging and interactive spaces (Mayer, 2009).

On the other hand, flipped classrooms focus on shifting tasks across time and space, seeking to reshape other learning aspects like how instructors deliver content. The theory behind flipped classrooms suggests that social and cultural environments can support or hinder these goals. Specifically, the environment can either promote autonomy and self-motivation in learners, or it can rely on external control. Ultimately, this method seeks to create appropriate conditions to foster a strong internal drive to learn (Nourinezhad et al., 2021).

Fathi and Rahimi (2022) investigated writing skill improvement among Iranian EFL learners in flipped and conventional classrooms. While they found no statistically significant difference in writing complexity and accuracy between flipped and traditional classrooms, their study suggests that the flipped classroom model can enhance overall writing performance by providing students with foundational knowledge through pre-recorded lectures and online resources. This approach frees up valuable class time for collaborative activities such as brainstorming, peer review, and individualized teacher feedback, which can contribute to improved writing skills. However, further research is needed to definitively establish the impact of flipped classrooms on specific writing outcomes.

### **Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF) in EFL Writing**

The origin of the CAF goes back to the 1980s, when researchers first distinguished between fluency and accuracy of a second language to understand how well students were developing their L2 proficiency. Brumfit (1984) argued that activities designed for fluency helped students develop spontaneous production, while accuracy-oriented activities focused on the form. In the 1990s, complexity was added to the existing idea of fluency and accuracy based on Skehan (1991) who proposed a model where CAF became the three major L2 proficiency aspects. Complexity reflects the variety and density of structures a learner uses (Ellis, 2009). This can include using a broader spectrum of grammatical structures, even if they are not yet wholly mastered. Examples include using conjunctions to connect ideas and incorporating subordinate clauses into sentences (Skehan, 2009). Accuracy refers to how closely the learners' spoken or written language (interlanguage) matches the target language rules, highlighting their abilities (Skehan, 2009). Finally, fluency indicates the learner's ability to speak or write fluently and naturally, with minimal interruptions. This can involve prioritizing the flow of communication over perfect grammar (meaning over form). Ideally, fluency allows learners to express themselves with native-like speed (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). Many researchers use the concept of CAF to evaluate the impact of different factors on a learner's writing skills. This approach allows them to assess various aspects of writing performance, beyond just grammatical accuracy (Fathi & Rahimi, 2022; Marlowe & Asaba, 2022).

### **The Present Study**

This research has employed the cognitive theory of multimedia learning (CTML) developed by Mayer (2009) to assess the instructional efficacy of videos and images used in writing classes for feedback. Following this hypothesis, based on how the human mind functions, learning can be more effective and meaningful

when it involves multimedia instructions. According to Paivio's (1979) dual coding theory, which forms a critical component of the CTML, a combination of visual and auditory channels would assist learners in learning more deeply than just using words or pictures (Mayer, 2005).

In flipped classrooms, the use of videos and images that students watch would enable writing teachers to make their writing classes more engaging for learners through interaction with each other (Berrett, 2012). According to Mayer's (2009) developed CTML, presentations through monomodal feedback (here, for instance, receiving written feedback) would not have the same impact on learning that multisensory mode teaching would (Coffman, 2011). While some studies (Fathi & Rahimi, 2022; Nourinezhad et al., 2021) praise the flipped classroom method, there are not many resources exploring how effective it is for EFL learners in writing classes while using multimodal feedback.

Learning is not just a product of lectures; it is developed when we receive feedback. Traditional written feedback in classrooms can be limiting. Thanks to the powerful computers and software, students can get detailed spoken feedback outside of class, which can clear up any confusion caused by written comments or marks (Perkoski, 2017). Meanwhile, multimodal feedback goes even further. Imagine an instructor explaining concepts in a video, combining visuals with their voice. This personalized approach, combining visuals and conversational tone, makes learning more engaging, especially for students new to English (Cavaleri et al., 2019).

## **Methodology**

### **The Study Design**

This paper explored the impacts of multimodal feedback on L2 learners' writing CAF through a quasi-experimental design. The multimodal feedback formed the independent variable and EFL learners' writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency made up the dependent variables. Flipped and traditional methods of teaching were moderator variables. The researcher applied one-way analysis of Multivariate (MANOVA) to answer the research questions. Hence, four groups of Kish Air and Safir Goftehan Institutes in Babol were used: experimental group 1: flipped classroom plus multimodal feedback (14 participants), experimental group 2: traditional classroom plus multimodal feedback (14 participants), control group 1: flipped classroom plus monomodal (text-written) feedback (14 participants), and control group 2: traditional classroom plus monomodal (text-written) feedback (15 participants). To achieve the research objectives, the above-mentioned 57 students' writing scores were utilized to investigate multimodal feedback effects on students' writing CAF. Pretest data were collected at the early semester to establish a baseline. Post-test data collection and analysis were conducted following a 12-week period to determine the multimodal feedback effectiveness. The pretest and post-test data collection was conducted utilizing the learners' argumentative paragraphs.

### **Participants**

The participants in this study were 57 male and female Iranian language learners at Safir-e-Goftehan and Kish Air Institutes of Babol city with an average

age of 20 years old. Their proficiency level was intermediate, as assessed by the University of Michigan Examination for the Certificate of Competency in English (ECCE). All the participants were Persian language speakers. All participants provided informed consent before participating in the study and were recruited through convenience sampling (Dornyei, 2007).

### **Instruments**

Five instruments were utilized in this research to gather the needed data.

#### ***University of Michigan Examination***

Sixty-five students enrolled in an intermediate-level English language course were invited to participate in this study. After obtaining informed consent from all participants, 57 students agreed to participate. University of Michigan Examination for the Certificate of Competency in English (ECCE) was administered to all participants to confirm their intermediate English proficiency level. This test consists of 100 items in the form of paper-and-pencil, focuses on vocabulary, grammar, and reading (GVR) sections with one score for every single item (max = 100), and requires 80 minutes for completion. Participants took part in this exam at the outset of the term and prior to the experimentation. No participants were excluded based on their proficiency level, as all were assessed to be at an intermediate level. All 57 participants attended all sessions of the study and there were no instances of participant loss or refusal to continue participation.

#### ***EFL Learners' Writing Tasks***

To gather the pretest data, learners produced an argumentative writing on the topic, "Is there a correlation between excessive social media usage and negative mental health outcomes? If so, what strategies can mitigate these adverse effects?" at the beginning of the semester. After three months (12 weeks), post-test data were collected from the same group of learners, who were then asked to write on the topic, "Is online learning as effective as traditional classroom education and how should it be integrated into the educational system?" The topics were chosen based on their relevance to current societal issues and the participants' familiarity with these topics through their daily lives and media consumption.

The researchers explained to the managers of the institute the importance of writing in learning English and the pitfalls seen in the works of learners in spite of attending writing classes. Therefore, the study was approved by the institution's IRB. Data collection was conducted during regular class time, minimizing disruption to the academic schedule. Collected data was anonymized and securely stored to protect participant confidentiality.

#### ***Weblog Created by the Researcher***

The flipped classrooms utilized pre-recorded video writing tasks as instructional materials, uploaded to a weblog created by the researcher. These videos ranged from 10 to 20 minutes in length. The videos presented specific writing prompts, such as analyzing a short story, writing a persuasive essay, or creating a creative narrative. To complete these tasks, students were instructed to:



- Watch the video: Students watched the video to understand the prompt and any relevant background information.
- Plan their writing: Students developed a plan for their writing, outlining their main points and organizing their ideas.
- Write the draft: Students wrote a draft of their response, focusing on clarity, coherence, and grammar.
- Revise and edit: Students reviewed their draft, making necessary corrections and improvements.
- Submit their work: Students submitted their final draft via email.

The weblog was designed to provide students with accessible learning materials prior to class sessions.

### ***Academic Writing Coursebook***

Zemach and Rumisek (2003) "From Paragraph to Essay" was taught to improve the EFL learners' writing proficiency. The researcher used this book as the coursebook to teach participants how to improve their academic writing skills as EFL learners in all the groups. The book includes a workbook, precise exercises, targeted lessons, and ample practice opportunities, all of which assist students in developing their academic writing confidence. The units' tasks come with grades. Furthermore, this book focuses on students with intermediate level of English proficiency. Students first practiced recognizing and identifying crucial writing structures from sample paragraphs and essays. They then performed quick and short tasks on the structures. Last but not least, they used the structures in their writing. Students had the option of working individually, collaboratively, or in groups. The same materials from the course book and the workbook were administered to the four groups so that each group received parallel writing instruction to guarantee the findings' validity and reliability. In other words, the textbook was held constant for the four groups, so the internal validity of the research was not at risk.

### ***Measures of Writing CAF***

A list of measures presented by Fathi and Rahimi (2022) was employed to investigate writing CAF. The measures are provided below:

**Table 1**  
*Measures for Writing CAF*

Categories	Measures
<b>Complexity</b>	Words per clause (W/C)
	The dependent clause to clause ratio (DC/C)
<b>Accuracy</b>	Error-free Clauses (EFC/C)
	Error-free T-units (EFT/T)
<b>Fluency</b>	Number of T-units (NT)
	T-unit Length (TL)



## **Procedure**

### ***Experimental Group 1: Flipped Classroom Plus Multimodal Feedback***

Students in this group were trained for 12 weeks using the received flipped instruction. They watched the related videos on various writing-related topics from the book “Paragraph to Essay” written by Zemach and Rumisek (2003) at home via weblog created by the researcher and then came to class ready to apply what they learned through activities. Students could discuss the materials and chat online. The instructor of this academic writing course gave the students various writing assignments to complete during class. As part of their task, the students had to write the assignments at home; handwritten assignments were not permitted, and they had to turn in their completed assignments electronically via Email to the researcher. Each student received multimodal feedback from the writing instructor individually through the Eitaa app.

### ***Experimental Group 2: Traditional Classroom Plus Multimodal Feedback***

This group of students received traditional instruction, but they also used the Eitaa app to receive multimodal feedback on their tasks. The traditional method of instruction involved teaching every topic that the flipped group discussed (writing-related topics from the book “Paragraph to Essay” mentioned before). PowerPoint slides were utilized to present video content, rather than videos, followed by providing students with some homework to do at home. They were trained for 12 weeks like the other groups.

### ***Control Group 1: Flipped Classroom Plus Monomodal (Text-Written) Feedback***

Students in this group were trained for 12 weeks using the same instruction as experimental group 1. They watched the related videos on various writing-related topics from the book “Paragraph to Essay”, at home via weblog created by the researcher and then came to class ready to apply what they learned through activities. Students could discuss the material and chat online. The instructor of this academic writing course gave the students various writing assignments to complete during class. As part of their task, the students had to write the assignments at home; handwritten assignments were not permitted, and they had to turn in their completed assignments electronically via Email to their writing instructor. Writing instructor provided monomodal (text-written) feedback to all students separately via Microsoft Word and sent it to them through their Email.

### ***Control Group 2: Traditional Classroom Plus Monomodal (Text-Written) Feedback***

This group was supplied with traditional instruction like experimental group 2 but also received monomodal (text-written) feedback for their assignments via Microsoft Word. The traditional instruction covered similar content with the flipped classroom group (writing-related topics from the book “Paragraph to Essay”). PowerPoint slides were utilized to present video content, rather than videos, followed by providing students with some homework to complete at home. They were trained for 12 weeks like the other groups. Each student received separate monomodal (text-written) feedback by the writing instructor via Microsoft Word and through their Email.

## Results

The main results are reported below while checking and retaining the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances and covariance matrices. Table 2 shows the four groups' means on pretests of words per clauses (WC) and ratio of dependent clauses to clauses (DCC), based on which the groups showed homogenous means. Both WC and DCC were found to be related to complexity.

**Table 2**

*Mean, Standard Deviation and 95 % Confidence Intervals of WC and DCC Pretests by Group*

Dependent Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
PreWC	Flipped Multimodal	14	8.143	1.562	7.220	9.066
	Traditional Multimodal	14	9.714	1.383	8.791	10.638
	Flipped Monomodal	14	9.071	1.979	8.148	9.995
	Traditional Monomodal	15	8.533	1.885	7.641	9.425
PreDCC	Flipped Multimodal	14	.354	.117	.301	.408
	Traditional Multimodal	14	.294	.128	.240	.347
	Flipped Monomodal	14	.351	.097	.298	.405
	Traditional Monomodal	15	.297	.031	.246	.349

Table 3 further supported the close means reported in Table 2. The results of MANOVA revealed no significant differences between the four groups' means on complexity: a) the WC pretest ( $F(3, 53) = 2.20$ ,  $p = .098$ ,  $\eta^2 = .111$ ) and b) the DCC pretest ( $F(3, 53) = 1.57$ ,  $p = .205$ ,  $\eta^2 = .082$ ).

**Table 3**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects of WC and DCC Pretests by Group*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	$\eta^2$
Groups	PreWC	19.644	3	6.548	2.207	.098	.111
	PreDCC	.047	3	.016	1.579	.205	.082
Error	PreWC	157.233	53	2.967			
	PreDCC	.526	53	.010			
Total	PreWC	4651.000	57				
	PreDCC	6.545	57				

Table 4 shows the four groups' means on posttests of WC and DCC. The results of MANOVA (Table 5) indicated significant differences between the four groups' means DCC; however, the mean differences on WC were not significant.

**Table 4**

*Mean, Standard Deviation and 95 % Confidence Intervals of WC and DCC Posttests by Group*

Dependent Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
PostWC	Flipped Multimodal	14	9.786	1.477	8.958	10.613
	Traditional Multimodal	14	10.643	.929	9.815	11.470
	Flipped Monomodal	14	10.214	1.528	9.387	11.042
	Traditional Monomodal	15	9.200	2.007	8.400	10.000
	Monomodal					
PostDCC	Flipped Multimodal	14	.425	.099	.364	.486
	Traditional Multimodal	14	.422	.170	.361	.483
	Flipped Monomodal	14	.302	.048	.241	.363
	Flipped Multimodal	15	.327	.104	.268	.386

Table 5 presents MANOVA results aimed at probing into the first research question, highlighting significant differences between the four groups' means on DCC ( $F(3, 53) = 4.46$ ,  $p = .007$ ,  $\eta^2 = .202$ ). It was however revealed that no significant differences were reported between their means on the WC posttest ( $F(3, 53) = 2.30$ ,  $p = .087$ ,  $\eta^2 = .116$ ).

**Table 5**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects of WC and DCC Posttests by Group*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	$\eta^2$ Eta Squared
Group	PostWC	16.514	3	5.505	2.309	.087	.116
	PostDCC	.173	3	.058	4.460	.007	.202
Error	PostWC	126.329	53	2.384			
	PostDCC	.685	53	.013			
Total	PostWC	5783.000	57				
	PostDCC	8.587	57				

Before discussing the results of MANOVA for accuracy tests, it is worth noting that the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances and covariance matrices were checked and retained. Table 6 shows the four groups' means on pretests of error-free clauses (EFCC) and error-free T-units (EFTT), revealing homogenous means on these pretests. Both EFCC and EFTT are directly related to accuracy, as they measure the proportion of error-free elements (clauses and T-units) in the texts.

**Table 6**

*Mean, Standard Deviation and 95 % Confidence Intervals of EFCC and EFTT Pretests by Group*

Dependent Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
PreEFCC	Flipped Multimodal	14	.800	.105	.741	.859
	Traditional Multimodal	14	.785	.124	.726	.844
	Flipped Monomodal	14	.780	.096	.721	.839
	Traditional Monomodal	15	.756	.115	.699	.813
PreEFTT	Flipped Multimodal	14	.546	.054	.519	.574
	Traditional Multimodal	14	.536	.057	.509	.564
	Flipped Monomodal	14	.539	.048	.511	.567
	Traditional Monomodal	15	.529	.048	.502	.556

Table 7 further supported the close means presented in Table 6, highlighting no significant differences between the four groups' means on accuracy: a) the EFCC pretest ( $F(3, 53) = .397, p = .755, \eta^2 = .022$ ) and b) the EFTT pretest ( $F(3, 53) = .270, p = .847, \eta^2 = .015$ ).

**Table 7**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects of EFCC and EFTT Pretests by Group*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	$\eta^2$
Group	PreEFCC	.015	3	.005	.397	.755	.022
	PreEFTT	.002	3	.001	.270	.847	.015
Error	PreEFCC	.649	53	.012			
	PreEFTT	.142	53	.003			
Total	PreEFCC	35.326	57				
	PreEFTT	16.626	57				

Table 8 shows the four groups' means on posttests of EFCC and EFTT. The results of MANOVA (Table 8) indicated significant differences between the four groups' means EFCC and EFTT.

**Table 8**

*Mean, Standard Deviation and 95 % Confidence Intervals of EFCC and EFTT Posttests by Group*

Dependent Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
PostEFCC	Flipped Multimodal	14	.900	.098	.861	.939
	Traditional Multimodal	14	.889	.089	.850	.928
	Flipped Monomodal	14	.802	.036	.763	.841
	Traditional Monomodal	15	.832	.050	.794	.870
PostEFTT	Flipped Multimodal	14	.603	.053	.563	.643
	Traditional Multimodal	14	.616	.038	.576	.656
	Flipped Monomodal	14	.605	.050	.565	.645
	Flipped Multimodal	15	.507	.122	.469	.546

Table 9 shows the results of MANOVA which compared the groups' means on posttests of EFCC and EFTT in to appraise the second research questions. Table 9 further supported the close means reported in Table 8. The results of MANOVA revealed significant differences between the four groups' means on accuracy: a) the EFCC posttest ( $F(3, 53) = 5.79, p = .002, \eta^2 = .247$ ) and b) the EFTT posttest ( $F(3, 53) = 6.74, p = .001, \eta^2 = .276$ ).

**Table 9**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects of EFCC and EFTT Posttests by Group*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	$\eta^2$
Group	PostEFCC	.092	3	.031	5.792	.002	.247
	PostEFTT	.113	3	.038	6.744	.001	.276
Error	PostEFCC	.280	53	.005			
	PostEFTT	.296	53	.006			
Total	PostEFCC	42.083	57				
	PostEFTT	19.677	57				

Before discussing the results of MANOVA for fluency, it is worth noting that the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances and covariance matrices were checked and retained. Table 10 shows the four groups' means on pretests of number of T-units (NT) and T-unit length (TL), revealing homogenous means on these pretests. Both NT and TL are directly related to fluency, as they measure the quantity and length of language production, with higher values indicating more fluid and sustained speech or writing.

**Table 10**

*Mean, Standard Deviation and 95 % Confidence Intervals of NT and TL Pretests by Group*

Dependent Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
PreNT	Flipped Multimodal	14	17.714	3.074	16.193	19.236
	Traditional Multimodal	14	18.000	2.774	16.478	19.522
	Flipped Monomodal	14	18.357	2.560	16.836	19.879
	Traditional Monomodal	15	19.067	2.915	17.597	20.537
PreTL	Flipped Multimodal	14	15.929	1.207	15.187	16.670
	Traditional Multimodal	14	15.357	1.216	14.616	16.099
	Flipped Monomodal	14	15.500	1.092	14.759	16.241
	Traditional Monomodal	15	15.467	1.846	14.750	16.183

Table 11 shows the results of MANOVA which compared the groups' means on pretests of NT and TL. The analyses were carried out to show that the groups were homogenous in terms of their NT and TL. These results further supported the close means presented in Table 10, highlighting no significant differences between the four groups' means on fluency: a) the NT pretest ( $F(3, 53) = .618, p = .607, \eta^2 = .034$ ) and b) the TL pretest ( $F(3, 53) = .270, p = .847, \eta^2 = .015$ ).

**Table 11**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects of NT and TL Pretests by Group*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	$\eta^2$
Group	PreNT	14.925	3	4.975	.618	.607	.034
	PreTL	2.659	3	.886	.463	.709	.026
Error	PreNT	427.005	53	8.057			
	PreTL	101.376	53	1.913			
Total	PreNT	19527.000	57				
	PreTL	13907.000	57				

Table 12 shows the four groups' means on posttests of NT and TL. The MANOVA results (Table 13) highlighted significant differences between the four groups' means NT and TL.

**Table 12**

*Mean, Standard Deviation and 95 % Confidence Intervals of NT and TL Posttests by Group*

Dependent Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
PostNT	Flipped Multimodal	14	21.603	3.184	20.348	22.858
	Traditional Multimodal	14	20.214	1.578	18.959	21.469
	Flipped Monomodal	14	18.429	2.738	17.174	19.684
	Traditional Monomodal	15	18.067	1.438	16.854	19.279
PostTL	Flipped Multimodal	14	17.357	1.447	16.617	18.097
	Traditional Multimodal	14	16.643	1.151	15.903	17.383
	Flipped Monomodal	14	15.286	1.326	14.546	16.026
	Flipped Multimodal	15	15.867	1.552	15.152	16.582

Table 13 shows the results of MANOVA which compared the groups' means on posttests of NT and TL to examine the third research question. Table 13 shows the MANOVA results, revealing significant differences between the four groups' means on NT ( $F(3, 53) = 7.04, p = .000, \eta^2 = .258$ ) and the TL posttest ( $F(3, 53) = 6.03, p = .001, \eta^2 = .255$ ).

**Table 13**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects of NT and TL Posttests by Group*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	$\eta^2$
Group	PostNT	115.787	3	38.596	7.042	.000	.285
	PostTL	34.490	3	11.497	6.032	.001	.255
Error	PostNT	290.485	53	5.481			
	PostTL	101.019	53	1.906			
Total	PostNT	22195.334	57				



## **Discussion**

This study compared multimodal feedback effects on EFL students' writing CAF, seeking to discover how the complexity, accuracy, and fluency of EFL students' writing would be altered following multimodal feedback for 12 weeks. The results revealed a significantly greater CAF increase in the writing of learners receiving multimodal rather than monomodal (text-written) feedback. Further, it was indicated that using multimodal feedback via flipped teaching model significantly contributed to EFL learners' writing CAF.

The research findings provide compelling support for Mayer's Multimedia Learning Theory. The significant improvement in writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency observed in the experimental groups can be attributed to the synergistic effects of the multimodal feedback in conjunction with the flipped classroom.

**Cognitive Load:** The multimodal nature of the feedback, incorporating both visual and auditory elements, potentially reduced cognitive load by distributing the processing of information across multiple sensory channels. This allowed learners to focus more on the content of the feedback rather than struggling to process the information itself.

**Dual Coding:** The combination of written comments, audio recordings, and video demonstrations facilitated dual coding, as proposed by Mayer. By presenting information in both visual and auditory formats, learners could create multiple representations of the concepts, leading to deeper understanding and better retention.

**Coherence Principle:** The feedback was carefully structured to ensure coherence and avoid extraneous material. The sequential presentation of information and the apparent connections between the different components of the feedback potentially enhanced learner understanding.

**Modality Principle:** Using both visual and auditory modalities in the feedback was consistent with Mayer's modality principle. By providing information through multiple sensory channels, learners could create more robust mental representations of the concepts.

**Redundancy Principle:** While not explicitly tested in this study, the absence of redundant information in the feedback potentially contributed to the observed learning gains. By avoiding redundant presentations of the same information, learners could focus on the main feedback aspects.

**Spatial Contiguity Principle:** The spatial arrangement of the elements within the feedback may have also influenced learning outcomes. While not explicitly manipulated in this study, future research could explore how the spatial arrangement of visual and auditory elements affects learning.

**Temporal Contiguity Principle:** The temporal synchronization of the visual and auditory elements in the feedback may have contributed to better learning outcomes. By presenting the visual and auditory information simultaneously, learners could more easily integrate the two sources of information.

The first question focused on whether multimodal feedback would affect EFL learners' writing CAF particularly in flipped classrooms. As highlighted by the results of Table 5, the flipped classroom groups considerably outperformed the traditional groups in posttest writing scores. Multimodal feedback employed as a treatment in these groups enhanced the participants' writing CAF, being in tandem

with the finding of Nourinezhad et al. (2021), reporting that learners' writing components, i.e. organization, vocabulary, content, sentence mechanics, and language use, enhanced using audio-visual feedback. However, the difference is that this study has investigated writing CAF not writing components. The results also show consistency with those of Sherafati et al. (2020) who echoed the advantages of using computers to give feedback in writing classes. As revealed, learners had significant enthusiasm for using computer-mediated feedback, but the flipped instruction was not considered in their study.

The multimodal feedback effects on writing CAF in the flipped classroom were significant in this paper. Consequently, the instructor's comments in different modes (text, image, video) were more effective via flipped instruction. These findings corroborate previous research on the efficacy of audiovisual and computer-aided feedback. For example, Mardian and Nafissi (2022) asserted that learners reached self-independence in grammatical knowledge through text-based online chatting. However, they merely focused on grammatical knowledge rather than the writing CAF.

Regarding the second research question, which investigated whether multimodal feedback affected EFL learners' writing CAF significantly in traditional classrooms, as can be seen in Table 9, the results related illustrated higher post-test mean scores for writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency in the traditional group than their equivalents in the pretest, revealing the effective enhancement of the participants' writing CAF using multimodal feedback.

Irrespective of teaching method, these findings align with other studies like Cavaleri et al. (2019) who found that conversational tone, spoken explanations, multimodal style, and personalized feel of the audio-visual feedback would enhance students' involvement in the feedback, especially those who did not speak English as their first language. Tajallizadeh Khob and Rabi (2014) also focused on the audiovisual feedback's significance as a means of providing participants with an incentive medium and boosting their motivation. Iranian EFL learners were given audiovisual feedback instead of the typical textual feedback. The results showed that meaning-focused audiovisual feedbacks were not only good at making students more motivated to write, but also at altering their negative perceptions of writing, which could encourage students to keep up their efforts and advance their English language education.

The third research question focused on whether applying multimodal feedback would make any differences between EFL learners' writing CAF in flipped and traditional classrooms. According to the results depicted Table 13, the flipped classroom groups significantly outperformed the traditional groups in all writing CAF, as measured by post-test scores, endorsed significant enhancement of the students' writing CAF through a combination of multimodal feedback and flipped instruction. In traditional classrooms, students often lack the opportunity to review writing instructors' comments and guidance outside of class time, making it difficult for them to understand the revision process and apply feedback effectively. This study investigated this issue by comparing four groups. The flipped groups consistently performed better, suggesting that additional resources and explanations outside the classroom could significantly improve students' writing skills. Though there are no comparable studies to compare our results with, we can say that the results of our study align with those of Thai et al. (2017), investigating the flipped classroom impact on learning performance not the writing. The results of our third

research question are in line with those of Fathi and Rahimi (2022), examining the flipped classroom effects on writing CAF and showed that the flipped classroom approach to writing enables students to acquire core concepts like essay structure or grammar through pre-recorded lectures or online resources.

### **Conclusion**

This paper examined the multimodal feedback effects on writing CAF among EFL learners in both flipped and traditional classroom settings. The findings revealed that multimodal feedback groups, particularly in flipped classrooms, significantly outperformed traditional text-based feedback groups. Integrating visual and auditory elements in multimodal feedback contributed to a more engaging and practical learning experience, leading to improved writing outcomes.

While the findings were promising, the research also encountered some certain limitations. The small sample size and focus on institute-level learners may limit the generalizability of the results. Additionally, relying on numerical data collection methods may have hindered deeper insights into student experiences and preferences. Future research should consider the following recommendations to address these limitations and further explore the potential of multimodal feedback.

Future research should aim to include larger sample sizes and more diverse populations to enhance the generalizability of the findings across a broader range of learners. Additionally, investigating individual student preferences for various types of feedback can help educators tailor their instructional approaches more effectively.

Multimodal feedback should also be explored in a variety of language learning contexts, extending beyond institute-level EFL learners to encompass other educational settings. To ensure the successful implementation of multimodal feedback and flipped classrooms, professional development programs are essential for equipping teachers with the necessary skills and strategies.

Finally, adequate technological infrastructure and resources must be provided in educational institutions to support these innovative approaches, enabling their seamless integration into teaching and learning practices.

### **References**

- Abeysekera, L., & Dawson, P. (2015). Motivation and cognitive load in the flipped classroom: definition, rationale and a call for research. *Higher education research & development*, 34(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2014.934336>
- Afshinfar, J., & Shokouhifar, A. (2016). The effect of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on the narrative writing of advanced EFL learners. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, 4(2), 15–41. <https://doi.org/10.22049/jalda.2018.26273.1075>
- Berrett, D. (2012). How 'flipping' the classroom can improve the traditional lecture. *The chronicle of higher education*, 12(19), 1-3.
- Boyras, S., & Ocak, G. (2017). Implementation of flipped education into Turkish EFL teaching context. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(2), 426-439.

- Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching: The Roles of Fluency and Accuracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Camiciottoli, B. C., & Campoy-Cubillo, M. C. (2018). Introduction: The nexus of multimodality, multimodal literacy, and English language teaching in research and practice in higher education settings. *System*, 77, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.03.005>
- Cavaleri, M., Kawaguchi, S., Di Biase, B., & Power, C. (2019). How recorded audio-visual feedback can improve academic language support. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 16(4). <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.16.4.6>
- Chang, C., Cunningham, K. J., Satar, H. M., & Strobl, C. (2017). Electronic feedback on second language writing: A retrospective and prospective essay on multimodality. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 9(3). <https://doi.org.erlib.ncku.edu.tw/10.1558/>
- Coffman, M. L. (2011). *The Impacts of Web-Enhanced Versus Traditional Writing Instruction*. Union University. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/fe3f80f0>
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). The differential effects of three types of task planning on the fluency, complexity, and accuracy in L2 oral production. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 474-509. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp042>
- Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing Learner Language*. Oxford University Press.
- Engman, M. M. (2021). A worksheet, a whiteboard, a teacher-learner: Leveraging materials and colonial language frames for multimodal Indigenous language learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 12(1-2), 75-100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2020.1856696>
- Faradhibah, R. N., & Nur, N. A. (2017). Analyzing students' difficulties in maintaining their coherence and cohesion in writing process. *English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal*, 3(2), 183-194. <https://doi.org/10.24252/Eternal.V32.2017.A7>
- Fathi, J., & Rahimi, M. (2022). Examining the impact of flipped classroom on writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency: A case of EFL students. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(7), 1668-1706. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1825097>
- Hafner, C. A. (2014). Embedding digital literacies in English language teaching: Students' digital video projects as multimodal ensembles. *TESOL quarterly*, 48(4), 655-685. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.138>

- Hao, Y. (2016). Middle school students' flipped learning readiness in foreign language classrooms: Exploring its relationship with personal characteristics and individual circumstances. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 59, 295-303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.01.031>
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jacko, J., Emery, V. K., Edwards, P. J., Ashok, M., Barnard, L., Kongnakorn, T., Moloney, K. P., & Sainfort, F. (2004). The effects of multimodal feedback on older adults' task performance given varying levels of computer experience. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 23(4), 247-264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01449290310001659213>
- Jony, M. S. (2016). Student centered instruction for interactive and effective teaching learning: Perceptions of teachers in Bangladesh. *Online Submission*, 3(3), 172-178. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5669776>
- Kashefian-Naeeni, S., & Sheikhnezami-Naeini, Z. (2020). Communication skills among school masters of different gender in Shiraz, Iran. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(2), 1607-1611. <http://sersc.org/journals/index.php/IJAST/article/view/3405/2350>
- Lee, G., & Wallace, A. (2018). Flipped learning in the English as a foreign language classroom: Outcomes and perceptions. *TESOL quarterly*, 52(1), 62-84. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.372>
- Mardian, F., & Nafissi, Z. (2022). Synchronous computer-mediated corrective feedback and EFL learners' grammatical knowledge development: A sociocultural perspective. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 10(2), 115-136.
- Marlowe, J. P., & Asaba, M. (2022). A CAF perspective on L2 development through writing practice: An exploratory study. *Reflections and new perspectives. JALT.*, 2021(1), 124. <https://doi.org/10.37546/jaltpcp2021-15>
- Martin, D. (2020). Providing students with multimodal feedback experiences. *Journal of Curriculum, Teaching, Learning and Leadership in Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.32873/uno.dc.ctlle.05.01.1082>
- Mayer, R. (2005). *The Cambridge Handbook of Multimedia Learning*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511816819>
- Mayer, R. E. (2009). *Multimedia Learning* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511811678>
- Mousavi, H. S., & Kashefian-Naeeni, S. (2011). Academic writing problems of Iranian post-graduate students at national university of Malaysia (UKM). *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(4), 593-603.
- Noordin, N., & Khojasteh, L. (2021). The effects of electronic feedback on medical university students' writing performance. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 10(4), 124-134. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v10n4p124>

- Nourinezhad, S., Hadipourfard, E., & Bavali, M. (2021). The effect of audio-visual feedback on writing components and writing performance of medical university students in two different modes of instruction, flipped and traditional. *Cogent Education*, 8(1), 1978621. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1978621>
- Perkoski, R. R. (2017). *The impact of multimedia feedback on student perceptions: Video screencast with audio compared to text-based email* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh]. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/7e873189d4adf340c6575c00a7c70e0d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750>
- Paivio, A. (1979). *Imagery and Verbal Processes* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315798868>
- Satar, H. M., & Wigham, C. R. (2017). Multimodal instruction-giving practices in webconferencing-supported language teaching. *System*, 70, 63-80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.09.002>
- Sherafati, N., Largani, F. M., & Amini, S. (2020). Exploring the effect of computer-mediated teacher feedback on the writing achievement of Iranian EFL learners: Does motivation count? *Education and Information Technologies*, 25(5), 4591-4613. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10177-5>
- Sadeghi, K., Abolfazli Khonbi, Z., & Gheytranzadeh, F. (2013). The effect of type of corrective feedback (direct vs. indirect) on Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' writing. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, 1(2), 71-86. <https://doi.org/10.22049/jalda.2013.13527>
- Skehan, P. (1991). Individual differences in second language learning. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 13(2), 275-298. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100009979>
- Skehan, P. (2009). Modelling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. *Applied linguistics*, 30(4), 510-532. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp047>
- Tajallizadeh Khob, M., & Rabi, A. (2014). Meaning-focused audiovisual feedback and EFL writing motivation. *Journal of Language and Translation*, 4(2), 61-70. [http://journals.iau.ir/article\\_515892\\_d31ebd54f4d8f8be42db61abb08d0f576.pdf](http://journals.iau.ir/article_515892_d31ebd54f4d8f8be42db61abb08d0f576.pdf)
- Thai, N. T. T., De Wever, B., & Valcke, M. (2017). The impact of a flipped classroom design on learning performance in higher education: Looking for the best “blend” of lectures and guiding questions with feedback. *Computers & Education*, 107, 113-126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2017.01.003>
- Wen, X., & Walters, S. M. (2022). The impact of technology on students' writing performances in elementary classrooms: A meta-analysis. *Computers and Education Open*, 3, 100082. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2022.100082>

- Wilson, S. G. (2013). The flipped class: A method to address the challenges of an undergraduate statistics course. *Teaching of Psychology*, 40(3), 193-199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628313487461>
- Zemach, D. E., & Rumisek, L. A. (2003). *Academic Writing from Paragraph to Essay*. Oxford University Press.
- Zhang, Y. (2018). Analysis of using multimodal feedback in writing instruction from EFL learners' perspective. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 8(4), 21-29. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ELLS.V8N4P21>
- Ziegler, N. (2016). Synchronous computer-mediated communication and interaction: A meta-analysis. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 38(3), 553-586. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226311500025X>

### Authors' Biographies

---



**Maryam Farnia** is an Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics at the Department of English Language and Literature, Payame Noor University, Iran, where she teaches graduate and undergraduate courses. She has published papers in several national and international journals. Her areas of research include Sociolinguistics, ESP, and Discourse Analysis.



**Fatemeh Hemmati** is an Associate Professor of TEFL at Payame Noor University of Tehran, Iran, where she has been teaching courses such as Critique of Issues in Language Teaching, Language Curriculum Development, Discourse Analysis, and Research in Language Education. Her current areas of interest are Classroom Discourse Analysis, Teacher Education, and ESL Writing.



**Razieh Rabbani Yekta** received her M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in TEFL from Isfahan University. In 2013, Rabbani joined the Department of Literature and Foreign Languages, Payame Noor University, as Assistant Professor for teaching Translation and English Language courses. Since then, she has had over twenty publications on TEFL and Translation Studies in domestic and international journals. She has also supervised some seventy MA students.



**Shoora Mirsayafi** received her M. A. in TEFL from PNU of Qom. She is a PhD student of TEFL in PNU of Tehran