
Teaching Information Structure of Non-Canonical Sentences through a Deductive Vs. an Inductive Approach: Effects on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Products

Hamidreza Sheikhi¹, Bahram Hadian^{2*}, Mehdi Vaez Dalili³

¹Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English, Isfahan Branch (Khorasgan), Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

^{2*}Assistant Professor, English Language Teaching Department, Isfahan Branch (Khorasgan), Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

³Assistant Professor, English Language Teaching Department, Isfahan Branch (Khorasgan), Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

Received December 08, 2022

Accepted: February 08, 2023

Abstract

This study investigates the effect of deductive versus inductive teaching of Information Structure (IS) of non-canonical sentences on Iranian EFL learners' writing productions. To do so 69 participants majoring in English literature and English translation, fourth semester, Arak University, participated in this study in the form of two intact groups called Deductive (experimental) and Inductive (control) groups, comprising 36 and 33 participants in that order. Under the effect of twelve treatment sessions of deductive vs. inductive instructions of IS principles, six weeks, the statistical analyses of the results regarding the pretest-posttest phase disclosed significant improvement of the participants' writing scores in both groups. Concerning the post-test results, no statistically significant difference was observed in the Deductive vs. Inductive groups' writing scores. Regarding the posttest-delayed posttest results, the statistical analyses showed a significant decrease in the Deductive group' writing scores while the writing scores reduction in the Inductive group was not significant. So, the findings revealed a significant retention of improved writing skills in association with the Inductive group. Possible explanations for the writing improvement and implications of the findings for language teaching have been discussed.

Keywords: Information Structure (IS), Inductive Approach, Deductive Approach, L2 learning, Writing skill, EFL/ESL learners

INTRODUCTION

Belonged to the hearer's mental model of the context or discourse, information structure (IS) which indicates how linguistic means transfer information "is a structuring of sentences by syntactic, prosodic, or morphological means that arises from the need to meet the communicative demands of a particular context or discourse" (Vallduví & Engdahl, 1996 p.460). When it comes to English there exist a number of

linguistic constructions which are used to create discourse organization and put emphasis on information within the discourse. Along with prosodic and lexico-grammatical devices, there are more word order and syntactic means like clefting and preposing etc. which are used to organize and emphasize information in written and spoken discourse. Based on communicative needs native speakers choose from a variety of syntactic structures to convey their intentions in general and achieve cohesion

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

and contrast in particular; for instance, by using it-clefts the speaker/writer wants to put emphasis on important information at the beginning of the sentence; or by making use of wh-clefts important information at the end of the clause is highlighted (Prince, 1978; Erdmann, 1986; Collins, 1991).

Lack of awareness concerning the appropriate use of syntactic means in association with their functions, namely information structure (IS), in different contexts seemingly act as one of the potential elements which causes EFL/ESL learners' writing products seem odd or different from the native speakers' ones. A number of studies reveal evidence that information structure is a sensitive area and unfamiliarity with principles of information structure may act as an obstacle on the way of ESL/EFL learners in both spoken and written phases (Plag, 1994; Bülow-Møller, 1996; Leube, 2000; Carroll, Murcia-Serra, Watorek, & Bendiscioli, 2000).

More than five years of our EFL learners' writings analyses accompanied by observational evidence show that the lack of awareness in association with Information Structure (IS) in general, and non-canonical sentences in particular, can cause writing problems as follows:

1. Not stating or unclearly stating thesis statements and topic sentences.
2. Developing ideas illogically.
3. Beating about the bush; distracting from the main idea, lacking a true introduction toward the topic.
4. Lack of coherence; coming to conclusion with no explicit answer/s to the question/s raised previously; making use of transitional signals inadequately.
5. Lack of writing organization; too much attention is paid to local constructions while the global aspects of the text comprising its communicative purposes or its social functions are overlooked.

To address the above-mentioned problematic issues, this paper investigated the possible effects of teaching Information Structure (IS) of non-canonical sentences on Iranian EFL learners' writing proficiency. To do so, the researchers of the study decided to provide their participants with proper instructions

within the framework of deductive vs. inductive teaching approaches. Therefore, the study tried to find whether the improvement of EFL learners' awareness about Information Structure (IS) of non-canonical sentences can bring about enhancement of their writing proficiency; and if so, which method of teaching, deductive vs. inductive, leaves lasting and stabilizing effects.

Literature Review

Information Structure (IS) in ESL/EFL Writing

There exists a long history behind the studies in relation to the tangible and analyzable aspects of writing which conceivably enlightens most of research associated with writing around the world (Hyland, 2021). "Texts have a structure, they are orderly arrangements of words, clauses and sentences, and by following grammatical rules writers can encode a full semantic representation of their intended meanings" (Hyland, 2009 p.8). Based on the beliefs that originated from structuralism, texts can function independently of a context; this notion implies that human communication happens when ideas from one mind to another one transfer through language (Shannon & Weaver, 1963). In this way, writing is an autonomous object and is not dependent on particular contexts and works independently of the personal experiences of writers and readers thus anyone with the right decoding skills is able to recover encoded meanings in texts (Hyland, 2021). So, writers and readers follow homogeneous traditions which turns writing into an independent object with specified rules; the rules which are imposed on passive users. In this manner grammatical accuracy, clear and detailed explanation usually turns into the main standards of good writing. In this respect a good writing is accurate and delivers the writer's intention/s explicitly. Significant number of studies in association with existing regularities in text have been the outcome of such a focus on form (Tottie, 1991; Shaw & Liu, 1998; Biber, 2006; White, 2007; De Cock, 2011; Hyland, 2012).

In this perspective, autonomous view of texts, a text has a solo incontrovertible sense

and it is believed that the main meanings can be written down and understood by reader/s precisely based on original intention/s of the writer. According to this argument there remain no place for conflicts of interpretations, reader positions, different considerations, since everyone sees things in similar fashion. Meanings and words have a similar position, and writing instead of construction of meanings is transparent in reflecting them (Hyland, 2021).

However, there is another point of view which takes writing into consideration as discourse and looks at it beyond the surface structure. In this view, language in action, and the purposes and functions which are served in communication among people or 'language-in-use' are referred to as discourse (Hanks, 1996; Brown & Yule, 1983; de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981). In this regard, context, beyond the page, is presented by linguistic patterns signifying a range of social constraints and options which have profound effect/s on writers in any context. There exist definite goals, intentions, and information in the mind of a writer that s/he can convey them to their readers by selecting a particular form in text and in this way, s/he creates an appropriate communicative bridge between her/himself and her/his reader/s. There are various methods that consider text as discourse but all of them attempt to find how the elements of language in the mind of the writer are organized to produce coherent and purposeful prose (Hyland, 2021).

When it comes to L2 learners in general and ESL/EFL learners in particular, researchers noticed that the L2 writings and conversations produced by majority of ESL/EFL learners who have mastered English grammatical rules, even with being free of grammatical errors, often look weird or unidiomatic (Abduljawad, 2020). The documentation of underlying reasons behind the curtain of this non-nativeness seems difficult and are often discussed and explained through vague concepts such as 'style' or 'unidiomaticity' (Callies, 2009). A number of studies have been conducted in the realm of ESL/EFL teaching over the past twenty years showing that ESL/EFL learners produce spoken and written texts which, in connection with syntactic structures, words, and phrases

frequently used by native speakers are quite different (Granger, 1977; Hinkel, 2002; Aronsson, 2003; Nesselhauf, 2005; Callies, 2009).

The way L2 learners make use of linguistic structures to package information within the framework of discourse, based on principles of Information Structure (IS), to cover communicative needs is one of the known factors which makes them different from native speakers (Abduljawad, 2020); so second language learners with near native L2 grammatical competence get into trouble when it comes to application of grammatical rules in line with IS functions (Carroll, Murcia-Serra, Watorek, & Bendiscioli, 2000; von Stutterheim, 2003). Given the importance of discourse factors in association with L2 acquisition from the starting point (Klein & Dittmar, 1979; Rutherford, 1984; Perdue, 1993), the functions served by grammatical form to generate an appropriate information structure for sentences created in context are taken into consideration as the crucial elements. In this respect, there exists an important difference between L1 and L2 acquisition: concerning the children the construction of the grammar happens at the same time with the construction of semantic/pragmatic concepts. However, the construction of the grammar in association with adults usually happens under the shadow of a semantic/pragmatic concepts revision which might be accompanied by an additional challenging task of perceptual identification of the relevant morphological elements (Slobin, 1993). L2 learners, particularly the adult ones, come to the stage of L2 learning with mature variants of the social-cognitive capabilities which is like a foundation for structure distinctions in language (Christine & Narasimhan, 2018). Therefore, theoretically, universal principles like 'learn forms for given information', or 'topical information first' seemingly have an important influence on L2 utterance structure of novice L2 learners (Perdue 1993). Hence the uncertain nature of interaction between grammar and information structure in discourse still remains as an unsolved problem on the path to reach the level of nativeness regarding oral and written production.

Deductive vs. Inductive L2 Teaching

Grammatical competence as the foundation of language proficiency in traditional context of language teaching was given high priority. The prevailing belief in traditional approaches was that grammar could be properly taught by direct instruction and through a method which repetitive practice and drilling are highly used. “Traditional teaching has too often been based on a passive lecture model, dependent on an expert teacher who funnels knowledge into the somewhat retentive minds of students” (Smart, Witt, & Scott, 2012 p.392). This approach of teaching materials was called deductive approach (Richards, 2006). So when it comes to deductive approach of SL/FL teaching the language learners are provided with L2 syntactic/semantic/pragmatic rules and then they are given opportunities to practice using them. David Nunan describes deductive learning as, “the process of learning in which one begins with rules and principles and then applies the rules to particular examples and instances” (1999, p.305). So, deduction is assumed as a process which starts with the general and goes to the specific, from consciously formulated rules to the application of those rules in language use. Deduction is a reminder of the grammar-based methods and of cognitive approaches. “In contemporary terminology it is easily identified with learning” (Decoo, 1996 p.96).

Furthermore, the application and implementation of an explicit teaching method (deductive approach) provide L2 learners with opportunities which help them understand and learn complex L2 linguistic forms and patterns that are hard to learn implicitly or inductively. Findings show that deductive approach of teaching or explicit instructions can raise L2 learners’ attention in association with any specific linguistic form/s (Mueller, 2010) and can improve L2 learners’ self-awareness about linguistic structures (Hudson, 1999). Explicit instructions which provide L2 learners with comprehensive explanations and examples of English information structure principles has led to positive results (Palacios-Martínez & Martínez-Insua, 2006).

However, providing L2 learners with the spelling, rules, and meaning by instructor can

lead to the limitation of L2 learners’ ability to discover the new structure on their own. “Constructivists approaches emphasize learners’ actively constructing their own knowledge rather than passively receiving information transmitted to them from teachers and textbooks. From a constructivist perspective, knowledge cannot simply be given to students: Students must construct their own meanings” (Stage, Muller, Kinzie, & Simmons, 1998 p. 45).

In SL/FL teaching context to increase the learners’ role related to the process of language learning inductive approach of teaching is taken into practice by and large. For instance, to teach L2 grammatical rules according to this educational approach the language teachers provide their language learners with examples of the target language, such as sentences containing a grammar rule, at the outset of the class and at the end of the class L2 learners are asked to work out the rule/s, formulate the pattern/s, and generalize the hypotheses (Emre, 2015). Nunan describes inductive learning as “the process by which the learner arrives at rules and principles by studying examples and instances” (1999, p. 309). Making use of inductive approach does not mean that teachers keep silent and do not lecture; rather, they make an assessment of their students’ knowledge, and then work to ease the construction of new knowledge (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999). So, induction can be considered as a process which moves from the specific to the general, that is the real language use comes first, then the patterns and generalizations will emerge. It is a reminder of the natural language learning and a variety of direct methods. “In contemporary terminology it is easily identified with acquisition” (Decoo, 1996 p.96).

Inductive approach of L2 teaching by inclusion of implicit instructions such as making use of authentic materials and encouraging communication among EFL/ESL Learners results in improved awareness and initial noticing of forms and their functions and clearly heightens L2 learning (Long, 1991; van Lier, 2001). Using literary texts (like narrative texts implemented in this study as tasks of elicitation) help L2 learners notice how information

can be highlighted or emphasized since short narratives are full of pragmalinguistic samples (Callies, 2009). A series of studies revealed that the type of texts used as tasks of elicitation has implicitly constructive effects on L2 learners' process of L2 learning (Ahmadian & Pashangzadeh, 2013; Ahmadian & Pashangzadeh, 2014; Pashangzadeh, Ahmadian, & Yazdani, 2016).

Decoo (1996 p.96) defined five modalities on the deduction–induction continuum including A; Actual deduction; B: Conscious induction as guided discovery; C: Induction leading to an explicit “summary of behavior”; D: Subconscious induction on structured material; and finally, modality E: Subconscious induction on unstructured material. The modalities related to our study were A and B, which according to Decoo (1996 p.97) can be defined in depth as follows:

Modality A: Actual deduction: The Information Structure (IS) principles or patterns are explicitly stated at the beginning of the treatment sessions and EFL learners move into the applications of these (examples and exercises).

Modality B: Conscious induction as guided discovery: Our participants first are provided with a number of examples, often sentences. The “conscious discovery” of the information structure is then directed by the instructor: on the basis of the provided examples the instructor typically fires a few key questions and EFL learners are led to discover and formulate the rule.

Concerning the present study, the inductive approach was not equal to implicit learning, because implicit learning includes neither rule presentations nor directions to attract attentions to particular structures. In this study, both the deductive and inductive approaches comprised forms of explicit learning.

The Study

In this study we tried to investigate teaching Information Structure (IS) of non-canonical sentences through a deductive versus an inductive approach and its possible effect/s on Iranian EFL learners' writing products; doing so, the following research questions have been posed:

1. Does teaching Information Structure (IS) of non-canonical sentences through a deductive approach have any significant effect/s on Iranian EFL learners' writing products?
2. Does teaching Information Structure (IS) of non-canonical sentences through an inductive approach have any significant effect/s on Iranian EFL learners' writing products?
3. Is there any significant priority in using deductive vs. inductive teaching Information Structure (IS) of non-canonical sentences to achieve a significant improvement associated with Iranian EFL learners' writing products?

The subsequent null hypotheses were developed to arrange for more objective answers to the raised research questions:

1. Teaching Information Structure (IS) of non-canonical sentences through a deductive approach has no significant effect/s on Iranian EFL learners' writing products.
2. Teaching Information Structure (IS) of non-canonical sentences through an inductive approach has no significant effect/s on Iranian EFL learners' writing products?
3. There is no significant difference in using deductive vs. inductive teaching Information Structure (IS) of non-canonical sentences to achieve a significant improvement associated with Iranian EFL learners' writing products.

Participants

In this study 69 undergraduate Persian speaking EFL learners majoring in English Literature and English Translation, Arak University, Iran, were asked to participate in this study. Participants in this study included 28 males and 41 females. The mean age of the participants was nearly equal to 21 and their age was ranged from 19 to 23 years old. All participants in this study had almost 8 years of EFL learning experience. Homogeneity of this statistical population, in terms of language proficiency, was achieved through the administration of the

Oxford Placement Test (OPT) at the outset. Based on the OPT results, there existed no extreme points and outlier cases so nobody was removed from the process of data collection. The participants were put into two homogeneous intact groups. Hereafter, for the ease of reference to the groups of subjects in this study, we refer to them as Deductive group (13 males & 20 females) and Inductive group (15 males & 21 females). Our participants had already passed writing courses including *Advanced Writing* and *Essay Writing*; so, they were experienced enough in association with basic writing skills and they knew how to write an essay.

Instrumentation

Essay Scoring Rubric

To assess the participants' writing proficiency of this study essay scoring rubric designed by Paulus (1999) was used to calculate the pretest, the posttest, and the delayed posttest scores. This writing rating scale was selected because it could provide us with two aspects of analytical assessment including the global aspect (organization/unity, development, cohesion/coherence) and the local aspect of writing (vocabulary, structure, mechanics); a holistic, overall final assessment score is provided by using this essay scoring rubric. It is based on a one hundred-point scale, and the students' essays were assigned a score from 10 (the lowest) to 100 (the highest) for each of the six features of the writing. In each assessment phase of this study (pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest) the essays were graded by three raters. To guarantee the reliability of rating, the inter-rater reliability was calculated through the intra-class correlation.

Tasks of Elicitation

Relevant and proper tasks of elicitation have always been a salient point of each study.

Regarding this study, the researchers made use of twelve texts. Six texts with certain characteristics (Pashangzadeh, 2012) were used as instructional content in classroom context and six texts were assigned as homework. Regarding classroom phase, the selected texts was a combination of three narrative texts and three non-narrative texts since a number of studies revealed that the text variation can act as a constructive variable and strengthens the process of L2 learning (Ahmadian & Pashangzadeh, 2013; Ahmadian & Pashangzadeh, 2014; Pashangzadeh, Ahmadian, & Yazdani, 2016). So, making use of a combination of narratives and non-narratives helped us to neutralize the implicit effect of the text variation on L2 learning improvement. Selected texts were neither too long nor too short; because when a text is too long the task of reading turns into a tedious one and when it is too short the worth and the value of the text in the eyes of reader/s is lost. Another variable that needed to be controlled was Flesch Reading Ease. According to the background of this study's participants, such as nearly 8 to 9 years of formal education in EFL learning, we needed texts with readability scores between 65 to 75. In this way the texts were just far enough beyond EFL learners' current competence so that they could understand most of the texts but still remain challenging to make progress (comprehensible input (Krashen, 1981, 1982)). However, some studies found that comprehension of a text may not be affected by the textual complexity. For instance, Blau (1982) found that lower readability score necessarily does not lead to better understanding of the text by students. Likewise, Bernhardt (1984 p.324 quoted in Chastain, 1988) explains that "syntactic simplicity may decrease text cohesion and thereby hinder comprehension."

Table 1
Specification of Reading Texts (Information Extracted from Pashangzadeh (2012, p.52))

Title of the Text	Type of the Text	Author	Flesch Reading Ease	Number of words
It happened on the Brooklyn Subway	Narrative	Paul Deutschman	70.51	1,605
Mystery Surrounding the Phoenix Lights: Evidence of UFO Sighting?	Non-Narrative	Unknown	66.83	1,563
The Hungry Man was Fed	Narrative	Richard Harding Davis	72.45	1,386
My Mother Never Worked	Non-Narrative	Bonnie Smith-Yackel	72.85	1,373
Personal Narrative-Track Competition	Narrative	Unknown	73.90	1,613
The Nature of the Mankind	Non-Narrative	Unknown	67.23	1,622

Concerning the phase of homework, six texts in the format of four or five paragraph essays with titles that probably have occupied the mind of every person with our participants' characteristics were used. So, the first criterion for selection of these texts as tasks of elicitation was familiarity of the participants in this study with the issues raised in these texts; consequently, they could communicate better with the texts. In the next step, it was tried to select texts not so long that it

would turn dealing with the texts into an exhausting task and not too short so that the significance of the texts to the students' point of view disappears. In this study, we intentionally used four/five-paragraph texts to revive the essay format in our participants' minds implicitly. These texts were selected from 450 essays which covers 100% of 185 Educational Testing Service (ETS) official topics. The following table shows the specifications of the selected texts:

Table 2
Specifications of Texts Selected from "Answers to All TOEFL Essay Questions"

Title of the Text	Type of the Text	Flesch Reading Ease	Number of words
Why go to university?	Non-Narrative	43.11	441
What are the qualities of a good neighbor?	Non-Narrative	62.45	480
Has human harmed the Earth or made it a better place?	Non-Narrative	67.83	371
Is learning about the past useful?	Non-Narrative	66.65	335
Should parents make decisions for their teenage children?	Non-Narrative	54.78	333
Can young people teach older people?	Non-Narrative	60.26	468

Design

Making use of randomization to make sure that the study participants have the same opportunity of assignment to an experimental or control group is desirable. But regarding this study, forming the experimental (Deductive) and the control (Inductive) groups based on randomization was not possible, so the researchers had to use quasi-experimental design for this study. As Hatch and Farhady (1982, p.24) affirm "Quasi-Experimental designs are

practical compromises between true experimentation and the nature of human language behavior which we wish to investigate. However, given the present state of our art, they are the best alternatives available to us."

Procedure

Administration of OPT led to the selection of participants according to the obtained results. Two intact groups namely Deductive group (the experimental group) and the other one as

Inductive group (the control group) were determined. Then, the participants of both groups were asked to choose one of the three suggested topics and write a five-paragraph essay on the chosen topic (The writing time of the essays was 50 minutes). The submitted essays were considered as pretests. This pretest was also taken into consideration as a screening test which according to the results homogeneous students concerning writing proficiency were permitted to participate in the continuation of this study; three raters based on essay scoring rubric designed by Paulus (1999) carried out the assessment of the submitted essays. All participants were kept for the process of data collection since concerning the results there were no extreme points and outlier cases (see section 4.2). Consistent with the roadmap after the pretest administration, for both groups, twelve treatment sessions were held. The interval comprised 6 weeks (1, 2, ..., 6) and each week consisted of two treatment sessions (I, II); each treatment session was divided to two halves of fifty minutes (a=50 minutes, b=50 minutes).

As mentioned through previous sections six texts, including three narratives and three non-narratives were used as tasks of elicitation in six two-treatment session weeks regarding the phase of classroom. For instance, the first half (a) of the first session (I) of the first week (1) was dedicated to introduce and teach content comprising Old (=given, familiar) information vs. New (=unfamiliar) information/ Discourse familiarity: Discourse-old vs. Discourse-new information/ Hearer familiarity: Hearer-old information. Needless to say that deductive method of teaching was used in Deductive group of participants and inductive instructions was used in association with Inductive group of participants.

Then, through the second half of the first session (I, b) participants were asked to read the first part of the provided narrative text titled "It happened on the Brooklyn Subway?" Reading each paragraph, participants had to find and discuss each other the related examples of what have been learnt based on the provided instruction through the previous section (I (a)).

The first fifty minutes of the second session (II, a) was devoted to the review on the content taught in the previous session. So, students explain and discuss what they had learned before. Then, the second half of the second session (II, b), reading the rest of the text, remainder from previous session, was continued by students based on what has been done in I (b). The phases described in this section were the process occurred in the first week of the treatment sessions. The procedure of in-class training continued in the same way for the remaining five weeks by providing our learners with new texts and new instruction concerning information structure principles.

Regarding the out-class or homework phase, in the interval between six weeks of treatment sessions, as mentioned through previous sections, six five-paragraph non-narratives essay types were given to students as out-of-class assignments. For the first part of this phase, after the first week of treatment session, EFL learners were supposed to read the provided text, e.g. the text titled "Why go to university?"; reading each paragraph, participants had to find the related examples of information structures based on what have been learnt according to the provided instructions through the previous treatment sessions. The second part of the out-class or homework phase is devoted to write a five-paragraph essay by students about a predetermined topic. In the last stage, students give their essays to their friends so that they can read their essays and share their feedbacks with them.

Data Analysis and Results

Inter-rater Reliability Writing Scores, Deductive and Inductive Group

Table 4 shows that the intra-class correlations for the writing pre-test, posttest, and delayed post-test scores Deductive Group Average Measures equals 0.977 (= 97%), 0.894 (=89%), and 0.899 (=89%); and considering Single Measures is equal to 0.935 (=93%), 0.738 (=73%), and 0.748 (=74%). According to the table, the intra-class correlations for the writing pre-test posttest, and delayed Post-test scores Inductive group equals 0.986 (=98%),

0.922 (=92), and 0.941(=94%) concerning Average Measures; and the intra-class correlations were 0.958 (=95%), 0.798 (79%), and 0.841(=84%) considering Single Measures. So, based on the results we can come to conclusion that there is a very good agreement with a p-value much smaller than 0.05, namely 0.000. As Cleophas and Zwinderman (2010) explain an intra-class correlation of 0 means that the reproducibility/agreement between the two [or more] assessments in the same subject is 0 and an intra-class correlation of

1 indicates 100% reproducibility/agreement. An agreement of 40% is moderate and of 80% is excellent.” In the above example there is, thus, a very good agreement with a p-value much smaller than 0.05, namely 0.000. So, based on the gained results relating to Inter-rater reliability calculations, the results of Inter-rater reliability enjoyed very high agreement and reproducibility which encouraged the researcher continue statistical operations based on obtained results by the three raters.

Table 3
The First Week of the Treatment Sessions Roadmap

Training week	Treatment Session	Part (each part 50	Provided instruction by Instructor in each Treatment Session (all treatment sessions consist of two 50-minute sections.) Inductive method of teaching was used in Inductive group of participants and Deductive instructions was used in association with Deductive group of participants.
1 st week (in-class phase)	I	a	Old (=given, familiar) information vs. New (=unfamiliar) information/ Discourse familiarity: Discourse-old vs. Discourse-new information/ Hearer familiarity: Hearer-old information
		b	Reading the first part of the narrative text titled ‘It happened on the Brooklyn Subway.’ Reading each paragraph, participants were supposed to find and discuss each other the relevant examples of what have been learnt based on provided instructions in previous section (I(a)) (this procedure is repeated in III(b), V(b), VII(b), IX(b), XI(b) concerning newly provided texts and newly taught material).
	II	a	A review on the content presented in the previous session. A number of students explained what they had learned in the previous session (this procedure is repeated in IV(a), VI(a), VIII(a), X(a), XII(a).
		b	Reading the rest of the text, remainder from previous session, was continued by students based on what has been done in I(b).
1st week (out-class or homework phase)			
Reading the essay titled ‘Why go to university?’ at the first part of this phase. Reading each paragraph, participants were supposed to find the relevant examples of what have been learnt based on provided instruction through the first week of treatment sessions. At the second part of this phase students are supposed to write a five paragraph essay about a predetermined topic. Finally students give their essays to their friends so that they can read their essays and share their feedbacks with them (this procedure is repeated in 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th concerning newly provided texts and newly taught material).			

Table 4
Intra-class Correlation Coefficient

Writing Pre-test Scores-Deductive Group							
	Intra-class Correlation	95% Confidence Interval		F Test with True Value 0			
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single Measures	.935	.888	.965	44.109	32	64	.000
Average Measures	.977	.960	.988	44.109	32	64	.000
Writing Pre-test Scores-Inductive Group							
	Intra-class Correlation	95% Confidence Interval		F Test with True Value 0			
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single Measures	.958	.928	.977	69.404	35	70	.000
Average Measures	.986	.975	.992	69.404	35	70	.000
Writing Post-test Scores-Deductive Group							
	Intra-class Correlation	95% Confidence Interval		F Test with True Value 0			
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single Measures	.738	.590	.850	9.472	32	64	.000
Average Measures	.894	.812	.944	9.472	32	64	.000
Writing Post-test Scores-Inductive Group							
	Intra-class Correlation	95% Confidence Interval		F Test with True Value 0			
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single Measures	.798	.681	.883	12.851	35	70	.000
Average Measures	.922	.865	.958	12.851	35	70	.000
Writing Delayed Post-test Scores-Deductive Group							
	Intra-class Correlation	95% Confidence Interval		F Test with True Value 0			
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single Measures	.748	.602	.855	9.881	32	64	.000
Average Measures	.899	.820	.947	9.881	32	64	.000
Writing Delayed Post-test Scores-Inductive Group							
	Intra-class Correlation	95% Confidence Interval		F Test with True Value 0			
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single Measures	.841	.743	.909	16.845	35	70	.000
Average Measures	.941	.897	.968	16.845	35	70	.000

Based on Table 5, the number of participants that were rated, regarding Deductive group and Inductive group, was 33 and 36. No one was excluded. Also in this case Cronbach's

Alpha value regarding Deductive group writing pretest, posttest, and delayed post-test scores and Inductive group pretest, posttest, and delayed post-test scores in that order is

equal to .977, .894, .899 and .986, .922, .941. The results, in association with all cases, suggest a very good internal consistency

reliability for the scale with this study. And finally the table shows that the number of raters was 3.

Table 5
Case Processing Summary and Reliability Statistics

		N	%
Cases	Valid	33	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	33	100.0
Writing Pre-test Scores-Deductive Group (Cronbach's Alpha)		.977	
Writing Post-test Scores-Deductive Group (Cronbach's Alpha)		.894	
Writing Delayed Post-test Scores-Deductive Group (Cronbach's Alpha)		.899	
		N	%
Cases	Valid	36	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	36	100.0
Writing Pre-test Scores-Inductive Group (Cronbach's Alpha)		.986	
Writing Post-test Scores-Inductive Group (Cronbach's Alpha)		.922	
Writing Delayed Post-test Scores-Inductive Group (Cronbach's Alpha)		.941	
Number of Raters		3	

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Independent-samples t-test (Deductive and Inductive Groups' Writing Pretests Scores)

Statistical analyses in this section is established on independent-samples t-tests to make it possible between-groups comparison in the occasions including the pretest, the post-test, and the delayed posttest.

To achieve the purpose/s of the study two groups of participants who are homogenous based on their writing proficiency were needed; that is to say making between group comparison possible, when it comes to the starting point of Deductive and Inductive groups, regarding the variable under investigation, there should be no statistically significant difference.

Doing so, in the pretest phase, an inde-

pendent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the writing test scores. According to the presented information in Tables 6 and 7, there was not a statistically significant difference in writing mean scores, based on the writing test, between Deductive group (M = 63.5, SD = 6.77) and Inductive group, M = 63.55, SD = 8.84; $t(67) = -.026$, $p = .97 > .05$ (two-tailed) in the pretest occasions. The mean difference = .05 (95% CI: -3.863 to 3.762) was not significant and eta squared = .000 indicates no effect size. The guidelines (proposed by Cohen 1988, pp. 284-7 cited in Pallant, 2016) for interpreting the eta squared value are: .01 =small effect, .06=moderate effect, and .14=large effect).

Table 6
Group Statistics (Writing Pretests-Deductive and Inductive Groups)

groups		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pretest	Deductive Group	33	63.50	6.77	1.179
	Inductive Group	36	63.55	8.84	1.474

Table 7
Independent Samples Test (Writing Pretests-Deductive and Inductive Groups)

Writing Pretests	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		Eta squared
								Lower	Upper	
Equal variances assumed	1.960	.166	-.026	67	.97	.05	1.910	-3.863	3.762	.000
Equal variances not assumed			-.027	65.01	.97	.05	1.888	-3.821	3.721	

As a result, based on independent-samples t-test results which indicate there exists statistically no significant difference between Deductive and Inductive groups' writing mean scores, it can be concluded that the both groups stand on the same starting point by and large.

Independent-samples t-test (Deductive and Inductive Groups' Writing Posttests Scores)

Once again, an independent-samples t-test was run to compare the posttest scores for Deductive and Inductive groups.

Table 8
Group Statistics (Writing Posttests-Deductive and Inductive Groups)

	groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Posttest	Deductive Group	33	71.10	6.421	1.117
	Inductive Group	36	69.75	7.720	1.286

Table 9
Independent Samples Test (Writing Posttests-Deductive and Inductive Groups)

Writing Posttests	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		Eta squared
								Lower	Upper	
Equal variances assumed	1.32	.254	.787	67	.43	1.35	1.71	-2.077	4.781	0

Based on tabulated information in Tables 8 and 9, no statistically significant difference is observed in writing mean scores between Deductive group (M = 71.10, SD = 6.42) and Inductive group (M = 69.75, SD = 7.72); $t(67) = .78$, $p = .43 > .05$ (two-tailed) in posttest occasion. The mean difference = 1.35 (95% CI: -.2077 to 4.781) was not significant (eta squared = .007 which is an indication of very small effect size). Therefore, we may come to conclusion that, compared to Inductive group,

there is no significant difference in using deductive versus inductive approach in teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences, in EFL contexts, on improvement of EFL learners' writing scores.

Paired-samples t-test (Deductive Group Pretest-Posttest-Delayed posttest)

Under the influence of treatment sessions based on deductive approach in teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences,

concerning different occasions including pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest in Deductive group, a paired-samples t-test

was performed to measure the possible change in the EFL learners' writing mean scores.

Table 10
Paired Samples Statistics (Deductive Group)

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Writing	Pretest	63.50	33	6.77	1.17
	Posttest	71.10	33	6.42	1.11
	Delayed Posttest	67.59	33	6.17	1.074

Table 11
Paired Samples Test (Deductive Group)

Writing	Paired Differences						t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Eta squared
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference						
				Lower	Upper					
Pretest – Posttest	7.60	4.24	.739	-9.113	-6.100	-10.28	32	.000	.74	
Posttest -Delayed Posttest	3.51	3.248	.565	2.362	4.665	6.21	32	.000	.54	
Pretest -Delayed Posttest	4.092	5.86	1.021	-6.172	-2.012	-4.008	32	.000	.33	

Presented information by Tables 10 and 11 shows statistically significant difference (increase) in the writing mean scores from the pretest (M=63.50, SD=6.77) to the post-test (M=71.10, SD=6.42), $t(32) = -10.28$, $p=.00<.05$ (two-tailed). The mean increase (improvement) in the writing test scores (from the pretest to the post-test) was 7.60 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -9.113 to -6.100. Given our Eta squared value of .74, we can argue that there was a large effect size, with substantial difference in the writing test scores obtained before and after the intervention. So, we may say that the deductive approach in teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences does have significant effect on the development of writing abilities of EFL learners participated in this study.

Also, based on the tabulated information by Tables 10 and 11, there exists statistically significant difference (deterioration) in the writing mean scores from the posttest (M=71.10, SD=6.42) to the delayed post-test (M=67.59, SD=6.17), $t(32) = 6.21$, $p=.00<.05$ (two-tailed). The mean decrease (deterioration) in the reading test scores (from the posttest to the delayed posttest) was 3.51 with a 95% con-

fidence interval ranging from 2.362 to 4.665. Given our Eta squared value of .54, we can argue that there was a large effect size, with substantial difference in the writing test scores obtained from posttest to delayed posttest occasions. So, we may say that the obtained improvement related to writing proficiency under the effect of deductive teaching of information structure of non-canonical sentences did not show stability in retention of writing abilities of EFL learners participated in this study from posttest to delayed posttest occasions.

Finally, the presented information by Tables 10 and 11, shows statistically significant difference (increase) in the writing mean scores from the pretest (M=63.50, SD=6.77) to the delayed post-test (M=67.59, SD=6.17), $t(32) = -4.008$, $p=.001<.05$ (two-tailed). The mean increase (improvement) in the writing test scores (from the pretest to the delayed post-test) was 4.092 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -6.172 to -2.012. Given our Eta squared value of .33, we can argue that there was a large effect size, with substantial difference in the writing test scores obtained from pretest to delayed posttest occasion. So,

we may say that although the deductive approach in teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences did not show stability in preservation of EFL learners' reading abilities participated in this study from posttest to delayed posttest occasions, yet a significant improvement under the effect of deductive approach in teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences can be observed from pretest to delayed posttest.

Table 12
Paired Samples Statistics (Inductive Group)

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Writing	Pretest	63.55	36	8.84	1.474
	Posttest	69.75	36	7.72	1.286
	Delayed Posttest	68.72	36	7.50	1.300

Table 13
Paired Samples Test (Inductive Group)

Writing	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Eta squared
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
				Lower	Upper				
Pretest – Posttest	6.20	4.374	.729	-7.684	-4.724	-8.51	35	.000	.66
Posttest - Delayed Posttest	1.02	4.781	.7969	-.5903	2.645	1.28	35	.30	.044

Accessible information in Tables 12 and 13 reveals statistically significant improvement in the writing mean scores from the pretest ($M=63.55$, $SD=8.84$) to the post-test ($M=69.75$, $SD=7.72$), $t(35) = -8.51$, $p=.00<.05$ (two-tailed). The mean increase (improvement) in the writing test scores (from the pretest to the post-test) was 6.20 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -7.684 to -4.724. Given our Eta squared value of .66, we can maintain that there was a large effect size, with substantial difference in the writing test scores obtained before and after the intervention. So, we may say that the inductive approach in teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences does have significant effect on the development of writing abilities of EFL learners participated in this study.

Also, existing information in Tables 12 and 13, shows statistically there is no significant difference (deterioration) in the writing mean scores from the posttest ($M=69.75$, $SD=7.72$) to the delayed post-test ($M=68.72$, $SD=7.50$), t

Paired-samples t-test (Inductive Group Pretest-Posttest-Delayed posttest)

Another time, a paired-samples t-test was performed to measure the possible change in the EFL learners' writing mean scores concerning different occasions including pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest in Inductive group, under the effect of treatment sessions based on inductive approach in teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences.

(35) = 1.28, $p=.30<.05$ (two-tailed). The mean decrease (deterioration) in the writing test scores (from the posttest to the delayed posttest) was 1.02 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -.5903 to 2.645. Given our Eta squared value of .044, we can argue that there was not a large effect size, with no substantial difference in the writing test scores obtained from posttest to delayed posttest occasions. So, we may say that the obtained improvement related to writing proficiency under the effect of inductive teaching of information structure of non-canonical sentences did show stability in retention of writing abilities of EFL learners participated in this study from posttest to delayed posttest occasions.

DISCUSSION

The present study tried to demonstrate the possible effect/s of application and implementation of deductive vs. inductive approach in EFL context to teach information structure of non-canonical sentences on Iranian EFL learners'

writing proficiency. A number of findings have been released in line with the results of data analyses which are summarized as follows:

Writing skills of Deductive group participants under the effect of using a deductive approach in teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences, from the pretest to the posttest occasions, based on results, was accompanied by significant improvement on EFL learners' writing proficiency. Likewise, the findings related to Inductive group revealed that an inductive approach in teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences has been significantly led to a positive effect on EFL learners' writing production.

However, when it came to the posttest to the delayed posttest occasion in Deductive group, the results, compared to the primarily significant improvement from pretest to posttest phase, revealed a significant deterioration of writing proficiency. Nevertheless, the writing skills of Deductive group participants under the effect of using a deductive approach in teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences, from the pretest to the delayed posttest still showed significant improvement. Consequently, despite the significant deterioration of EFL learners' writing proficiency from posttest to delayed posttest in Deductive group, it can be claimed that deductive approach in teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences proved to be effective as much as needed.

On the contrary, the results, regarding Inductive group, from posttest to delayed posttest occasion, did not revealed a significant deterioration in association with EFL learners' writing proficiency. So, someone may conclude that teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences under the effect of inductive approach can lead to a better retention of obtained writing skill/s by EFL learners participated in Inductive group. In this regard, the findings of the study support Bruner's (1961) finding that learners show better performance when they are obliged to discover underlying rules than when they are merely provided with explicit explanations about the rules.

Observational evidence demonstrated that the participants' attitude and practices in

Inductive group were indicative of a significant shift in the role of the teacher from an all-wise source of information to a facilitator of learning—a shift of crucial importance to a learner centered class (Weimer, 2002). Teacher-student interactions are as important as student-student and student-information relationships. The shift from teacher centered class to an active and reflective context of learning helped our EFL learners create a learning community where both EFL learners and the teacher are empowered to pose questions and communicate ideas. Fleming (2018) found that under the effect of inductive instruction learners' participation and involvement enhances frequently. This active and reflective participation often enriches intake. Concerning this study, the significant retention of obtained writing skill/s by EFL learners participated in Inductive group from posttest to delayed posttest may be the outcome of above mentioned factors. Yet, valid and ultimate conclusion in this regard needs further research and more comprehensive studies.

Comparison between Deductive and Inductive Groups' Writing posttests scores statistically depicted no significant difference. Based on the results, we may possibly come to conclusion that, from a statistical point of view, there is no advantage in using either of these teaching approaches, deductive vs. inductive, in teaching information structure of non-canonical sentences, in EFL contexts, on improvement of EFL learners' writing scores.

CONCLUSION

Concerning EFL/ESL curricula in Iran the instruction of English information structure (IS) has been neglected in all EFL/ESL teaching environments including private language institutes, high schools, and universities; even the majority of English instructors seemingly are not familiar with the principles of information structure and do not have accurate and effective knowledge in this regard. The findings of this study disclosed that the inclusion of information structure teaching in EFL/ESL curricula along with grammar instruction, besides the improvement of syntactic knowledge can lead to the development of some pragmalinguistic

knowledge. In this way EFL/ESL students learn to use IS principles in their written productions and produce good writings in terms of unity, development, cohesion etc. That is to say, making use of pragmalinguistic structures by EFL/ESL learners lead to the production of less strange or awkward sentences and it makes their writings more similar to that of the native speakers' ones. So, based on the findings of this study we may come to conclusion that the inclusion of English IS in EFL/ESL curricula needs to be taken into consideration seriously. According to the results of the study English instructors can apply each of the teaching approaches used in this study, deductive approach of teaching vs. inductive one, to raise their EFL/ESL learners' awareness in association with English IS.

The findings of this study support the hypothesis that the grammatical competence and pragmatic competence development do not necessarily occur simultaneously. Although L2 pragma linguistic structures (information structure) can be affected by some elements including L1 interference, typological universals and markedness (Kasper & Rose, 1999, 2003; Jung, 2004), findings of this study revealed evidence suggesting that Iranian EFL/ESL learners can acquire these structures through adequate instructions and raising awareness. This study found that the teaching of information structure can lead to the promotion of writing productions which may prove that the EFL/ESL learners' pragma linguistic knowledge and awareness have been increased in association with English IS and practical usage of their improved knowledge and awareness.

When it comes to social sciences, which typically deal with human beings, bringing all variables under control turns into a difficult task if not an impossible one. Concerning the present study, one of the fundamental limitations was lack of randomization in selection of participants and put them in randomly selected groups. So, the researches of the study had to use two homogenous intact groups to do the study. Likewise, this study has been done with university students majoring in English literature and English translation; their field of study

possibly might have had some effects on their performance which have not been monitored. Furthermore, the element of 'age' can be mentioned as another limitation of the study. The mean age of the EFL learners participated in this study was equal to 21 and their age was ranged from 19 to 23 years old. So, we cannot claim that the findings of this study can be generalizable to the EFL/ESL learners before the age of puberty. As a final point, our findings may not be generalizable to all the EFL university students in Iran, since the sample size in this study was only 69 EFL students of Arak University.

References

- Abduljawad, S. (2020). *The syntax-pragmatics interface in L2: Aspects of information structure teaching and learning in a Saudi ESL context*. Manchester: Doctoral dissertation, University of Salford; School of Arts and Media. Retrieved May 22, 2022, from <http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/58661>
- Ahmadian, M., & Pashangzadeh, A. (2013). A study of the effect of using narratives on Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension ability. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 2(3), 153-162. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.3p.153>
- Ahmadian, M., & Pashangzadeh, A. (2014). An investigation of the effects of text variation on EFL learners' reading comprehension ability. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 4(6), 691-707. doi:<https://doi.org/10.9734/BJESBS/2014/7767>
- Answers to all TOEFL essay questions. (n.d.). Retrieved 3 14, 2022, from <http://englishonlineclub.com/>
- Aronsson, M. B. (2003). On clefts and information structure in Swedish EFL writing. In S. Granger-Legrand, & S. Petch-Tyson (Eds.), *Extending the scope of corpus-based research: New applications, new challenges* (pp. 195–210). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

- Biber, D. (2006). Stance in spoken and written university registers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5(2), 97-116. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2006.05.001>
- Blau, E. K. (1982). The effect of syntax on readability for ESL students in Puerto Rico. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(4), 517-528. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2307/3586469>
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (1999). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805226>
- Bruner, J. S. (1961). The act of discovery. *Harvard Educational Review*, 31, 21-32.
- Bülöw-Møller, A. (1996). Control from the background: a study of information structure in native and non-native discourse. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 21-42. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.1996.tb00087.x>
- C. D., & Narasimhan, B. (2018). Special collection in linguistics vanguard: "The acquisition of information structure". *Linguistics Vanguard*, 4(1), 1-3. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1515/lingvan-2018-1001>
- Callies, M. (2009). *Information highlighting in advanced learner English: The syntax-pragmatics Interface in second language acquisition* (Vol. 186). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Carroll, M., Murcia-Serra, J., Watorek, M., & Bendiscioli, A. (2000). THE RELEVANCE OF INFORMATION ORGANIZATION TO SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION STUDIES. The Descriptive Discourse of Advanced Adult Learners of German. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22(3), 441-466.
- Carroll, M., Murcia-Serra, J., Watorek, M., & Bendiscioli, A. (2000). The relevance of information organization to second language acquisition: The descriptive discourse of advanced adult learners of German. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22(3), 441-466. doi:<https://www.jstor.org/stable/44486501>
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second-language skills : theory and practice* (3 ed.). San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Cleophas, T. J., & Zwinderman, A. H. (2010). *SPSS for starters*. Springer.
- Collins, P. C. (1991). *Cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions in English* (1 ed.). Routledge.
- de Beaugrande, R.-A., & Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- De Cock, S. (2011). Preferred patterns of use of positive and negative evaluative adjectives in native and learner speech: an ELT perspective. In A. Frankenberg-Garcia, L. Flowerdew, & G. Aston (Eds.), *New Trends in Corpora and Language Learning* (pp. 198-212). London: Continuum.
- Decoo, W. (1996). The induction-deduction opposition: ambiguities and complexities of the didactic reality. *IRAL*, 34(2), 95-118. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1996.34.2.95>
- Emre, D. (2015). *The effects of inductive and deductive approach on written output [Master's Thesis, Bilkent University]*. Semantic Scholar. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/THE-EFFECTS-OF-INDUCTIVE-AND-DEDUCTIVE-APPROACH-ON-Master-Thesis/9aa929b5efe6a0577e889fe16a9087888cfcfd1f>
- Erdmann, P. (1986). A note on reverse wh-clefts in English. In D. Kastovsky, & A. Szwedek (Eds.), *Linguistics across Historical and Geographical Boundaries. Descriptive, Contrastive, and Applied Linguistics. In Honour of Jacek Fisiak on the Occasion of His*

- Fiftieth Birthday* (Vol. 2, pp. 851–858). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110856132>
- Granger, S. (1977). On identifying the syntactic and discourse features of participle clauses in academic English: Native and non-native writers compared. In J. Aarts, I. de Mönink, & H. Wekker (Eds.), *Studies in English language and teaching* (pp. 185-198). Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Hanks, W. F. (1996). *Language and noncommunicative practices*. Routledge.
- Hatch, E. M., & Farhady, H. (1982). *Research design and statistics for applied linguistics* (1 ed.). Newbury House Pub.
- Hinkel, E. (2002). *Second language writers' text: Linguistic and rhetorical features*. Mahwah, New Jersey: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, PUBLISHERS.
- Hudson, R. (1999). Grammar teaching is dead-not! In R. S. Wheeler (Ed.), *Language Alive in the Classroom* (pp. 101-112). Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Teaching and researching writing* (2 ed.). London: Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2012). Bundles in academic discourse. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 32, 150 - 169. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000037>
- Hyland, K. (2021). *Teaching and researching writing* (4 ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Jung, E. H. (2004). Topic and subject prominence in interlanguage development. *Language Learning*, 54(4), 713–738. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.00284.x>
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2003). *Pragmatic development in a second language* (1 ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 81-104. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719059190056>
- Klein, W., & Dittmar, N. (1979). *Developing grammars: The acquisition of German syntax by foreign workers*. Berlin: Springer.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Pergamon Press Inc.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press Inc.
- Leube, K. (2000). *Information structure and word order In the advanced learner variety. An empirical study with applications for the foreign language classroom*. Hamburg: Books On Demand.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. B. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.2>
- Mueller, C. M. (2010). Effects of explicit instruction on incidental noticing of metaphorical word sequences during a subsequent reading task. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(1), 81-101. doi:<https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/1/113991>
- Nesselhauf, N. (2005). *Collocations in a learner corpus*. Amsterdam: Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Palacios-Martínez, I., & Martínez-Insua, A. (2006). Connecting linguistic description and language teaching: native and learner use of existential there. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 213-231. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2006.00114.x>
- Pallant, J. (2016). *Spss survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (6 ed.). Open University Press.
- Pashangzadeh, A. (2012). *The effect of using narratives on Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension [MA thesis, Arak University]*. Arak, Iran.

- Pashangzadeh, A., Ahmadian, M., & Yazdani, H. (2016). From narativity to criticality: Developing EFL learners' critical thinking skills through short narratives/stories reading. *Education and Linguistics Research*, 2(1), 98-119. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5296/elr.v2i1.8952>
- Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265-289. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80117-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80117-9)
- Perdue, C. (Ed.). (1993). *Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives: Vol 2. The results*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Plag, I. (1994). Avoidance in oral L2 production. The encoding of new referents in English interlanguage narratives. In G. Bartelt (Ed.), *The Dynamics of Language Processes: Essays in Honor of Hans W. Dechert* (pp. 33-44). Narr Francke Attempto.
- Prince, E. F. (1978). A comparison of wh-clefts and it-clefts in discourse. *Language*, 54(4), 883-906. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2307/413238>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rutherford, W. E. (1984). *Language universals and second language acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Shannon, C. E., & Weaver, W. (1963). *The mathematical theory of communication*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Shaw, P., & Liu, E. T.-K. (1998). What develops in the development of second-language writing? *Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 225-254. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.2.225>
- Slobin, D. I. (1993). Adult language acquisition: A view from child language study. In C. Perdue (Ed.), *Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives* (pp. 239-252). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smart, K. L., Witt, C., & Scott, J. P. (2012). Toward learner-centered teaching: An inductive approach. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 7(4), 392-.
- Stage, F. K., Muller, P. A., Kinzie, J., & Simmons, A. (1998). *Creating learning centered classrooms. What does learning theory have to say? ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education and the Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Tottie, G. (1991). *Negation in English speech and writing: A study in variation*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Vallduví, E., & Engdahl, E. (1996). The linguistic realization of information packaging. *Linguistics*, 34, 459-519.
- van Lier, L. (2001). Language awareness. In R. Carter, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 160-165). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- von Stutterheim, C. (2003). Linguistic structure and information organisation: The case of very advanced learners. In S. H. Foster-Cohen, & S. P. Doehler (Eds.), *EUROSLA Yearbook* (Vol. 3, pp. 183 - 206). John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1075/eurosla.3.11stu>
- Weimer, M. (2002). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice* (1 ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- White, A. H. (2007). A tool for monitoring the development of written English: T-unit analysis using the SAWL. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 152(1), 29-41. doi:<https://www.jstor.org/stable/26234421>

Biodata

Hamidreza Sheikhi is a Ph.D. Candidate of Linguistics at the English Department of Islamic Azad University, Isfahan Branch, Isfahan, Iran, and a lecturer at the same university. His Ph.D. dissertation is in progress at the time. He is interested in research on semantics and pragmatics.

Email: hamidrezasheikhi2723@yahoo.com

Dr. Bahram Hadian teaches in the Department of English, Islamic Azad University of Isfahan, Isfahan Branch, Isfahan, Iran. He is an Assistant Professor of Linguistics and has taught different courses in linguistics and translation. He has published many articles on discourse, pragmatics, and translation in local and international journals. His research interests are discourse analysis, translation, and critical discourse analysis.

Email: bah_hadian@yahoo.com

Dr. Mehdi Vaez Dalili is an assistant professor in the Department of Linguistics, the English Department of Islamic Azad University, Isfahan Branch, Isfahan, Iran. He holds lectures in Syntax, Linguistic Typology, and Issues in Persian Syntax and Pragmatics. He has published a good number of articles on discourse, pragmatics, and syntax in local and international journals.

Email: mvaezdalili@yahoo.com