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ABSTRACT
IN RECENT YEARS THERE HAS BEEN AN INCREASING INTEREST IN TASK COMPLEXITY ALONG SINGLE TASK DIMENSION ON EFL IRANIAN LEARNERS' WRITTEN PRODUCTION, NAMELY STRUCTURAL COMPLEXITY. GIVEN THE LACK OF RESEARCH ON THE EFFECTS OF TASK-COMPLEXITY ON WRITTEN PRODUCTIONS, THIS STUDY INTENDS TO EXAMINE THE EFFECTS OF MANIPULATING TASK COMPLEXITY ALONG RESOURCES- DIRECTING FACTORS ON L2 LEARNERS' STRUCTURAL COMPLEXITY. TO THIS END, BASED ON THE RESULTS OF THE WRITING TEST OF TOFEL (2004), 48 LEARNERS WERE SELECTED AND ASSIGNED TO TWO GROUPS, SIMPLE TASK GROUP (STG, N = 24) AND COMPLEX TASK GROUP (CTG, N=24) RANDOMLY, IN 2015. THE INTER-RATER RELIABILITY WAS CHECKED VIA CRONBACH'S ALPHA, AND A RELATIVELY HIGH RELIABILITY WAS ACHIEVED (Α=.89). THE NULL HYPOTHESIS WAS NULLIFIED SINCE THE RESULTS INDICATED POSITIVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT OF +/- SINGLE DIMENSION ON STRUCTURAL COMPLEXITY. THE RESULTS HAVE INDICATED THAT THE PARTICIPANTS SIGNIFICANTLY GENERATED MORE NUMBER OF WORDS IN THE COMPLEX TASK. THE RESULTS HAVE ALSO SHOWED THAT THE PARTICIPANTS SIGNIFICANTLY PRODUCED A GREATER NUMBER OF CLAUSES IN T-UNITS WHILE PERFORMING THE COMPLEX TASK. THEREFORE, SINGLE TASK HAD AN OBVIOUS IMPACT ON THE ENHANCEMENT OF THE STRUCTURAL COMPLEXITY. FURTHERMORE, THE OUTCOMES CONVEY CRITICAL AND LIGHTING UP PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR, LANGUAGE TEACHERS, SYLLABUS AND TASK DESIGNERS, SLA RESEARCHERS, AND LANGUAGE TESTERS.

KEY WORDS: SYNTACTICAL COMPLEXITY: +/- SINGLE TASK DIMENSION; TASK COMPLEXITY

1. Introduction
Over the past decades, there was a growing interest in the role of tasks in second language learning and teaching. Structural/syntactic complexity is defined as the ability of the learners to generate more structurally complex language which is “at the upper limits of… [one’s] interlanguage” (Ortega, 1999, p. 130). Researchers tend to identify the variables of the tasks that are important when designing tasks. Robinson (2001a, 2001b, 2003, 2005, 2007a, 2007b) identifies various elements of task complexity which he argues to be the sole basis in sequencing decisions in task-based syllabus design. Recently, the effect of task characteristics on learners’ language production and development is hotly debated. Out of these controversies over the sequence and assessment of tasks (Robinson, 2005; Skehan, 1998), a new area of research (i.e., information processing research) has been arisen, which generally focuses on the role of attention (Skehan, 1996) and the central executive processing (Carroll, 2008) in learning and deals with the manipulation of various features of the tasks and the investigation of its effect on...
linguistic performance, especially different aspects of production. However, the findings of these studies have not been conclusive; they suggest that more complex tasks positively impact linguistic performance in general, yet more specific findings related to both accuracy and syntactic complexity only partially supported the cognition hypothesis (e.g., promoting either complexity or accuracy). In Iran, there is not enough opportunity to be exposed to the English language due to the fact that English is not used outside the classroom; therefore, it is up to teacher, syllabus designers, and materials developers to provide tasks with different conditions and characteristics to fill this gap. However, this purpose required a lot of research. This study might be a good contribution to them in this regard.

The significance of this study is that task conditions and features exert an influence on directing attention towards the formulation processes. This demonstrates the significance of investigating task conditions and their impact on attention while L2 writing being accomplished. Nonetheless, some task conditions, due to various unknown reasons, have not received the attention they deserved, and one of them is + single task from Robinson’s (2005) framework. The main strong claim of this approach is that it can activate the cognitive and acquisition processes while learners are busy performing tasks and accomplishing their goals (Skehan, 2003). Recently, the effect of task characteristics on learners’ language production and development is hotly debated (Bygate, 1999; Ellis, 2003; Robinson, 2003, 2005; Schmidt, 2001; Skehan & Foster, 2001; Tavakoli & Skehan, 2008). Another motivation for conducting this study is theoretically-based. Therefore, the purpose of this paper was to review the recent research into the task complexity on Iranian EFL learners’ L2 structural/syntactic complexity.

2. Review of literature

In recent years, there has been an increasing amount of literature on task-based language teaching. Various studies have been conducted to examine the different dimensions and their effect on the actual performance of L2 learners (such as Iwashita, Elder, & McNamara, 2001; Masrom, Daud, & Alwi, 2015; Ortega, 1999; Rahimpour, 2007; Rimani Nikou, & Eskandarsefat, 2012; Skehan & Foster, 1997; Wigglesworth, 1997; Yuan & Ellis, 2003; Van Waes, & Leijten, 2015). Even some of these studies have been designed to zero in on the synergistic effects of some dimensions together (such as Farahani & Meraji, 2011; Izadpanah & Shajeri, 2014, 2016; Kuiken & Vedder, 2008; Sotoudehnama & Farahanynia, 2014). Tasks are nowadays “the potential building blocks of second language instruction” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 223), and knowing their exact nature is of paramount importance. Various definitions have been proposed by different experts (such as Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Breen, 1989; Bygate, 1999; Bygate, Skehan, & Swain, 2001; Crookes, 1986; Izadpanah & Shajeri, 2016; Lee, 2000; Long, 1985; Nunan, 1989; Richards, Platt, & Weber, 1985; Skehan, 1996, 1998; Swales, 1990).

Investigating the impact of planning time (a resource-directing dimension), Ellis (1987) focused on three forms of past tense, the regular past, the irregular past, and the copula. He observed that the less the planning time, the less accurately these forms were utilized. He declares that the irregular forms are retrieved from the exemplar-based system (item-system) while the regular ones tap into the rule-based system. By limiting the planning time, the accurate retrieval of irregular forms is sustained since they are treated as a whole and do not require any additional time for construction.

Robinson (1995b) designed a study to investigate the role of manipulating task complexity along +/− Here-and-Now aspects on the L2 oral narrative performance of learners. The participants of his study generated more accurate, more lexically complex, and less fluent language in the most complex task. However, the role of task complexity on structural complexity turned out to be insignificant. These results are in consonant with what Berwick (1993) reported in his study. He observed that ‘experiential tasks’ (i.e., Here-and-Now, context embedded) primed the participants to utilize more anaphora and less complex language in comparison with ‘expository tasks’ (i.e., There-and-Then, context reduced).

In their study, Robinson, Ting and Urwin (1996) focused on the effect of no planning time vs. 3-minute planning time on two modes of narrative discourse, namely oral and written ones. No significant difference was found for the written discourse between the two planning conditions. However, in spoken narrative discourse, the fluency of the learners' production was enhanced in the planning condition in comparison with the unplanned condition. No significant effect was found for
accuracy (measured by the accurate use of verb morphology, of tense markers, and of measure words).

In her study, Mehnert (1998) designed four groups: 1) no planning time, 2) one minute planning, 3) five minute planning, and 4) ten minute planning. She reported that the participants in the last group generated more fluent, more accurate, and more lexically complex language. However, the results indicated no significant effect for structural complexity.

Investigating the role of +here-and-now, Skehan and Foster (1999, pp. 104-105) designed four conditions: 1) watch and tell simultaneously, 2) storyline given, then watch and tell simultaneously, 3) watch first, then watch and tell simultaneously and 4) watch first, then tell. They found out that “tasks containing clearer inherent sequential structure” (Skehan & Foster, 1999, p. 112) would draw the learners’ attention towards the fluency and task completion as well as the accuracy of their production.

Investigating “different sources of planning (teacher-led, solitary, and group-based) as well as different foci for planning (toward language or toward content)” (p. 215), Foster and Skehan (1999) formed six groups: 1) teacher-led and focus on language, 2) group-based and focus on language, 3) teacher-led and focus on content, 4) group-based and focus on language, 5) solitary 6) control group. The results of their study revealed that group two and group t significantly generated greater accuracy; however, there was no significant difference between different focuses (language or content). The solitary group produced the most fluent and complex language.

Focusing on testing situations, Iwashita, et al. (2001) explored the effect of planning time and +/-here-and-now dimensions. There were 193 pre-university students who were asked to talk about a set of pictures with or without seeing the pictures at the time of narrating. Rasch methods were used for data analysis. The results indicated no significant increase or decrease in learners’ fluency and complexity from the simpler tasks to the complex ones. However, the accuracy of their performance significantly enhanced. They argue that maybe the inconsistency of findings in SLA research is due to “the differences in testing and pedagogic contexts [which] are so great as to alter the cognitive focus of the tasks” (Iwashita, et al., 2001, p. 429).

Inspecting the role of planning (pre-task and on-line planning) on L2 oral performance, Yuan and Ellis (2003) formed three groups: 1) group with no pre-task planning time, 2) group with 10 minutes planning time, and 3) group with no pre-task planning but ‘on-line’ planning time. The on-line planning group generated greater structural complexity and more error-free clauses. Structural complexity and lexical complexity of the group with pre-task planning augmented. No significant effect was found for accuracy measures. It seemed that the available time before the task directed the participants’ attention towards the fluency and meaning conveyance, while the time available during the task provided opportunities for them to call their attention towards accuracy and monitoring their output.

Investigating the impact of the planning time on the learners’ writing, Ellis and Yuan (2004, p. 59) used three task conditions: “[1] pretask planning, [2] unpressured on-line planning, and [3] no planning]”. Forty two Chinese learners were participated in this study. Participants in the pre-task planning generated the most fluent language. Participants in the pre-task planning and unpressured on-line planning produced greater structural complexity. Following Kellogg’s (1996, as cited in Ellis & Yuan, 2004) writing model, Ellis and Yuan (2004) made an attempt to explain the results based on the three stages of writing: 1) formulating, 2) executing, and 3) monitoring. They came to the conclusion that when more time was available before the task, most probably the learners focused on the formulation process while unpressured on-line planning assisted them to focus more on the monitoring process. Since in the group with no planning, the participants had to devote their limited attentional capacity to all three processes simultaneously in the allocated time, they could not yield any improvement in the three measures, meaning that they generated less accurate, less complex, and less fluent language.

In his study, Kawauchi (2005) asked the learners of three different proficiency levels (advanced, high, and low group) perform the main task (oral narrations) without any planning opportunity; after that, they were asked to do three pre-tasks (composing a draft, rehearsing, and reading an L2 model) and were given 10 minutes as pre-task planning time. Afterwards, they redo the main task. The advanced proficient learners did not significantly gain more on the measures of structural complexity, accuracy, and fluency under the planning condition while under the strategic planning condition (pre-task planning), the high proficient learners’ fluency enhanced.
Focusing on testing situations, Tavakoli and Skehan (2005) designed a study in which four degrees of the task structure was utilized. Two planning conditions were used: no planning and 5 minute planning. Two proficiency levels were investigated: elementary and intermediate levels. The participants in the planning group yielded more fluent, more accurate, and more complex language. The performance on the participants in the intermediate groups was more complex and more error-free. Based on the findings, the effect of the planning time was significant for fluency.

Rouhi and Marefat (2006) conducted a study to investigate the role of planning dimension on thirty seven EFL Iranian learners’ written and oral performance. They devised three tasks: 1) no planning time and oral production, 2) planning time and oral production, and 3) on-line planning and written production. It was found that in comparison with group 1, the fluency and accuracy of group 2 and 3 significantly improved. However, no group gained more on the measures of complexity measures. They also declared that both planning time and modality exerted significant effect on fluency and accuracy but not on complexity.

Inspecting the role of manipulating task complexity along +/-Here-and-Now dimensions, Ishikawa (2007) argues that in There-and-Then condition, the role of short term memory is of paramount importance since the story plot must be sustained in it for future retrieval. This would increase the cognitive load which primes learners for deeper semantic processing, which gives rise to greater lexical and syntactic complexity. In his experimental study, Ishikawa observed significantly less accuracy, less structural complexity, and less lexical variety in the Here-and-Now dimension, while in the There-and-Then condition, the learners produced less words (less fluency), which is in consonant with Robinson’s (2005) cognition hypothesis.

Gilabert (2007) explored the effect of +/-planning time and +/-Here-and-Now dimensions on oral narratives via using four strips. Based on the findings, in terms of +/-Here-and-Now dimensions, higher accuracy, less lexical complexity, less fluency was observed for -Here-and-Now dimensions. Planning opportunity was found to improve the fluency, lexical complexity, and accuracy of the production. However, no significant effect was reported for the measures of structural complexity.

Rahimpour (2007) conducted a study to inspect the impact of Here-and-Now and There-and-Then tasks on oral production. Twenty Iranian learners of English were served as the participants of the study. The results revealed that in the complex task (There-and-Then dimension), the participants generated greater accuracy, less fluency, and less complexity. Rahimpour (2007), like Robinson’s (2001b, 2005) arguments, attributed greater accuracy and complexity to greater pragmatic demands of more complex task.

Kuiken and Vedder (2008) designed a study to explore the role of task complexity and proficiency levels. Ninety one Italian students (from first, second, and third year of university) and seventy six French students (first and second year of university) was adopted as the participants of the study. The simple and complex tasks were performed by the participants twice during the year. In terms of accuracy measures, Italian and French learners gained more on the measures of accuracy in the more complex task; nevertheless, no significant effect was found for structural complexity and lexical complexity. The interaction between task complexity and proficiency levels turned out to be insignificant in all measures.

Delving into impact of immediacy (+/-Here-and-Now dimension) and pre-task planning time, Farahani and Meraji (2011) devised four conditions: 1) Here-and-Now with no pre-planning time, 2) Here-and-Now with 14 minutes as pre-planning time, 3) There-and-Then with no pre-planning time, 4) There-and-Then with 14 minutes as pre-planning time. One hundred and twenty Iranian learners were served as the participant of this study. Their written performance was coded based on the measures of fluency, accuracy, and complexity. The results indicate that the groups with planning time increased their grammatical accuracy and generated more structurally complex language. In +/-Here-and-Now groups, no significant effect of accuracy and structural complexity was found. The manipulation of both dimensions (planning and immediacy) led to no significant difference in the lexical complexity of their written performance, but brought about greater fluency.

In their study, Salimi, Dadaspour, and Asadollahfam (2011) focused on the resource-directing factors on 29 learners’ written performance in terms of accuracy, fluency, and complexity. Accuracy was quantified by the number of error-free T-units per T-units, fluency by number of words per T-units, and complexity by a measure of S-nodes per T-units. The results indicated that the accuracy of the participants’ performance was not significantly changed from the simple to the complex tasks. Manipulating task complexity had a significant positive effect on the fluency and the complexity of
their production. Their findings were in consistent with Cognition Hypothesis (Robinson, 2005, 2007b).

RimaniNikou and Eskandarsafat (2012) designed their study to delve into the effect of both task complexity and task type. They utilized two types of tasks: decision-making and information-gap. Sixty EFL Iranian learners were asked to accomplish simple decision making and information gap tasks and complex decision making and information gap tasks with the interval of two weeks. They reported significant effects of task complexity just on accuracy and fluency but not on syntactic complexity. Regarding information-gap tasks, the learners significantly produced more free-error clauses and greater number of words. The results also indicated that just fluency significantly differs in the two task types.

Abdollahzadeh and Fard Kashani (2012) investigated the role of +/- here-and-now dimension on the written narrative performance with different language proficiency levels. They found that both manipulating task complexity and considering proficiency levels had significant positive effect on the accuracy and complexity of the participants’ production, meaning that the complex task triggered high-proficient learners to generate significantly more complex and accurate language. No significant effect was found for fluency.

Sotoudehnama and Farahanynia (2014) explored the role of cognitive task complexity across writing proficiency levels. Based on the scores of the writing test of TOFEL (2004), the participants were divided into two groups: high- proficient and low-proficient writers. They declared that language proficiency levels may be different from writing proficiency levels (Cooper, 1984), and since in their study, they focused on the written performance of the participants, they chose to focus on writing proficiency levels. Two groups performed the simple task (i.e., narrating a set of pictures) and the complex task (i.e., writing about an argumentative topic) with the interval of one week. Their written performance was coded based on the measures of accuracy, fluency, and complexity taken from Larsen-freeman (2006). Four two-way mixed-design ANOVAs were run. The results indicated that the complex task primed learner to produce less error free clauses, more structurally complex language, and more number of words. No significant interaction between task complexity and writing proficiency was found. They claimed that Skehan’s predictions turned out to be more accurate in the Iranian context.

As mentioned earlier, Within the framework of task-based language learning, the role of task complexity in L2 learners’ performance has attracted studies in the realm of SLA research (Abdullazadeh & Fard Kashani, 2011; Gilabert 2005; Robinson 2001b;Yuan & Ellis 2003); In contrast to the other dimensions of task complexity such as ±planning time (Crookes, 1989; Skehan & Foster, 2001; Ellis 2005) and ±prior knowledge (G. Brown, 1995; Barry & Lazarte, 1998; Urwin , 1999) , few studies have investigated the effects of manipulating ±single task. Whereas the effect of task complexity on oral language production has caught many researchers’ attention in the past twenty years, there is considerably less research on how different complexity levels of task influence written output of FL learners. As is clear, some of the elements in Robinson’s (2005, 2007) framework have been investigated to a great extent, such as +/- planning dimension (e.g., Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Foster & Skehan, 1996, 1999;n Mehner, 1998; Skehan & Foster, 1997Wigglesworth, 2001; Yuan & Ellis, 2003) and +/-Here-and-Now dimension (Berwick, 1993; Ishikawa, 2007; Masrom, Daud, & Alwi, 2015; Mehrinejad, and Aliasin, 2015; Rahimpour, 2007; Skehan & Foster, 1999) or even their synergistic effect (Farahani & Meraji, 2011; Iwashita, Elder, & McNamara 2001). However, one of the dimensions under the resource-depleting feature, namely +/-single task (i.e., the number of tasks that have to be performed simultaneously), has been somehow unnoticed. An elaboration on the design and method of thestudy is presented below.

3. Method
3.1. Design of the Study
In the current study, a pretest (Writing Proficiency section of TOEFL) was used and the participants were randomly assigned to two groups; however, since there was no control group, this study had an experimental comparison group design (a between-subject design). The main independent variable was task complexity with two levels (simple task vs. complex task), and the dependent variable was dimension of language production, namely, structural complexity.
3.2. Participants
Initially, the homogeneity of the participants’ writing proficiency was checked. To this end, the writing section of the TOEFL (2004) was administered to the Iranian EFL learners (N=72) as a pre-writing test. Their written performance was rated based on Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfeil, and Hughey’s (1981) scoring profile, which consists of five sub-parts, i.e., content, vocabulary, language, organization, and mechanics (cited in Weigle, 2002) by two skillful teachers. Based on the results, those participants whose scores were between one SD above and below the mean (i.e., between 66.15 and 75.71) (n=48) were deemed to be roughly at the same level of writing proficiency and took part in this study as the main participants.

The participants of this study were Iranian EFL learners studying at Ayandegra Institute, in Zanjan, 2015. They were both males and females, aged from 16 to 25. The participants were chosen from the learners who had been placed at the upper-intermediate level based on the institute’s placement test. While the data were being gathered, they studied Summ 1A book and attended their English classes three times a week.

Seventy two Iranian learners took Writing Proficiency section of TOFEL (Educational Teaching Service, 2004). The scores of 48 students were located within one standard deviation below and above the mean (+/-1 SD), and consequently, were considered to be roughly at the same writing proficiency level and participated in this study. These selected participants were assigned to two groups, namely, simple task group (STG) (n=24) and complex task group (CTG) (n=24).

3.3. Instruments
Three instruments were used in this study. The Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL, EST, 2004), as a renowned standardized language proficiency test, was the first instrument utilized at the beginning of the study to check the homogeneity of the participants’ writing proficiency level. However, just the writing section was used, since in this study the researcher’s focus was on the writing ability of the students. As Cooper (1984) argued, if the purpose is to explore the learners’ writing abilities, it is required to focus on this skill exclusively, and general proficiency tests are not good indicators of this skill since they are more concerned with recognition and comprehension than production and generation, and comprehension process can be partly detached from the underlying syntactic system and from production (Skehan, 1998, p. 15).

In this pretest, the participants were asked to write about the following topic in 35 minutes.

*Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Use reasons and examples to support your opinion.

“Universities should give the same amount of money to their students’ sports activities as they give to their university libraries.”*

The next instrument was a narrative task-- an eight-frame picture (Appendix A) taken from Yule (1997). It was used in both the simple and complex narrative tasks but in different manners. Narrating stories are tasks “supported by visual material, but which require some degree of organization of material to tell a story effectively” (Skehan & Foster, 1999, p. 98). The task used in this study was a one-way task with no interaction among the participants (Ellis, 2003), and consisted of “a clear time line, a script, a story with a conventional beginning, middle, and end” (Tavakoli & Skehan, 2005, p. 246).

The learners were asked to narrate the picture using at least 150 words. The picture set was available for them at the time of performing the task, hence, both tasks used in the present study were deemed as contextual embedded (Cummins, 1983, cited in Ellis, 2003, p. 92) and immediate (Skehan, 1998), *Here-and-Now* orientation (Robinson, 2005).

The story was as follows: a woman goes to a supermarket. In the supermarket, she runs into her friend who was shopping with her little son. She starts talking with her. They get so engrossed in talking that they overlook the child. The child is very naughty. He stretches out his hand, takes a bottle, and puts it in the other woman’s bag. Two women say good-bye and separate.

The scoring profile (Appendix A) devised by Jacobs et al., (1981, cited in Weigle, 2002). It was used to score the participants’ written output in the pretest. This scoring profile lays emphasis on “the distinguishing characteristic of communicative language use – interaction between the language user, the context, and the discourse” (Bachman, 1990, p.302). It is comprised of five components including content, vocabulary, language, organization, and mechanics. According to the profile, the score ranges from 34 to 100.
3.4. Procedure
At first, they were randomly assigned to two groups: simple-task Group (STG) (n=24) and complex-task Group (CTG) (n=24). The participants in the STG were given the whole picture (Appendix A). The frames of this picture had been arranged in the correct sequence before its administration to the participants of this group (+ single task). The participants in the CTG were given all the frames of the picture; however, the frames were not arranged in their correct order; therefore, these participants were first asked to order the frames in the right sequence, and then to start writing about it (- single task= double task).

The participants in both groups were asked to write a story of at least 150 words based on the picture. In both groups, the participants could see the pictures while writing about it (+ Here-and-Now dimension). The picture was administered by their normal teacher, and he or she did not give any special guidance with respect to formal features, organizational points, or the content.

4. Results
Our research question was concerned to the impact of manipulating task complexity on the structural complexity of the EFL learners’ written production. This dependent variable was gauged by “average number of clause per t-unit” (Larsen-Freeman, 2006, p. 597). Figure 1 and Figure 2 demonstrate the histograms and box plots of the data obtained in the STG and CTG in terms of structural complexity.

![Histograms of the participants’ production in the simple task (A) and the complex task (B) in terms of structural complexity.](image1)

![Box plots of the participants’ production in the simple task (A) and the complex task (B) in terms of structural complexity.](image2)

**Table 1**
Results of one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests and Shapiro-Wilk test for the data obtained for structural complexity.

**Table 1**
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Tests and Shapiro-Wilk tests of the Participants’ Performance on Structural Complexity
As seen in Table 1, statistically speaking, the data was normally distributed since all the levels of significance were more than .05.

Table 2 reported the descriptive statistics participants’ performance in terms of structural complexity.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of Participants’ Performance in Terms of Structural Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC.STG</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.6872</td>
<td>.19077</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC.CTG</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.7924</td>
<td>.86896</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 2, the mean and standard deviation of the data obtained from the simple task group were 1.68 and .190 respectively. The mean and standard deviation of the data obtained from the complex task group were 2.79 and .868 respectively. In order to see whether this difference was statistically significant or not, one independent samples t-test was run. The results are reported in Table 3.

Table 3
The Independent Samples T-Test for Task Complexity along Structural Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>29.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicates that the variance of the groups is equal; therefore, the second line must be reported, i.e., t (25.2) = -6.0, p < 0.05. Since the level of significance is less than .05, it can be stated that the difference between the means of the STG and CTG in terms of structural complexity was statistically significant. Hence, based on the results, our null hypothesis was nullified.

5. Discussion
The main objective of this study was to examine the impact of task complexity in terms of single/dual task on syntactic complexity. It was measured by “average number of clauses per t-unit” (Larsen-Freeman, 2006, p. 597). The results indicated that the participants significantly produced a greater number of clauses in t-units while performing the complex task. Therefore, single task had an obvious impact on the enhancement of the structural complexity. One possible explanation for this finding is the greater processing load imposed by the complex task on the learners who were struggling to find out the relation among the frames of the picture. According to Ishikawa (2007),
“greater memory demands... accompanies the use of embedded and subordinating means” (Ishikawa, 2007, p. 148), and “manipulating task complexity may have motivated a shift from a less to a more advanced mode of planning, where complex representations were formed” (Ishikawa, 2007, p. 149).

The results of some studies were in consistent with the findings of the present study, such as Abdollahzadeh and Fard Kashani (2012), Berwick (1993), Gilabert (2007), Ishikawa (2007), Robinson (1995b), Rouhi and Marefat (2006), Sotoudehnama and Farahanyinia (2014), and Salimi, et al. (2011). Almost all of these studies undertaken on the here-and-now dimension and ascribed the greater syntactic complexity to the greater memory demands of the complex task which propelled the learners to think more deeply about the picture set and to generate larger units of information so as to mitigate the processes of encoding, storing, and retrieving the information from memory.

The findings of this study are also in line with (Hosseini & Rahimpour, 2010) who found that task complexity doesn’t have any significant effect on the accuracy of written narratives of L2 learners. The findings also are in line with the results of the studies done by Mehrang (2009), Skehan & Foster (1999), Robinson (2007). The findings of the study are in line with the prediction of Cognition Hypothesis proposed by Robinson (2005, 2007). This high rate of fluency in the written production can be attributed to the fact that increasing cognitive demand of pedagogic task has an important influence on learning. This cognitive demand imposes extra burden of information processing, memory capacity, and attentional resources on learners’ mental capacity which pushes the L2 learners to go beyond their current level of language proficiency and stretch their interlanguage system (Rahimpour, 1999).

The findings of this aspect of our study is in line with the predictions of Cognition Hypothesis which states that increasing the cognitive load of a task along resource-directing line will lead to more syntactic production of language. This high rate of structural complexity could be attributed to (Givon, 1989; Robinson, 2007; Salimi & Yusefi, 2009). The fact that increasing task complexity will stretch interlanguage system enabling learners to use syntactic mode of language which is characterized by greater use of morphology, greater syntactic subordination, and high noun to verb ratio (lexical complexity).

The findings of the study is in line with Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005) in that tasks with more cognitive demands push L2 learners to perform tasks in certain ways, prioritizing one or another aspect of language. Thus, complex tasks push learners to prioritize complexity over fluency. Tavakoli & Foster (2008) also argue that the more demanding task in terms of its content, the more complex the language a learner will attempt performing a task. The explanation for the enhanced complexity may lie in the fact that complex tasks impose extra burden of information processing to the learners’ mental capacities.

Some studies focusing on the planning dimension demonstrated the opposite results; in other words, the learners performed better in the complex task regarding syntactic complexity. Some of them are), Ellis and Yuan (2004), Farahani and Meraji (2011), Foster and Skehan (1996), Kawauchi (2005), Rahimpour (2007), Tavakoli and Skehan (2005), Skehan and Foster (1997), Rahimpour (2007). However, the results of this study ran against the findings of researchers like (Hosseini, 2009; Ishikawa, 2006) who found no significant difference between task complexity and L2 learners’ written performance. They argue that these results support Skehan & Foster’s (2001, p: 193) preposition that “prioritization or predisposition (or both) seem to orient performance toward one (or two) of the three areas of accuracy, fluency, and complexity”.

Regarding grammatical accuracy, findings have widely diverged in task-based research owing to different measures of grammatical accuracy. The results of this study showed that task complexity did lead to the production of texts which differ from each other from grammatical accuracy perspective. It was likely that, when working on the least complex task (with the more writing assistance), learners were able to put together their memory and cognition resources and paid their full attention to the form of their productions which, on the whole, led to more accurate language. The results of measuring the grammatical accuracy (via the ratio of error-free T-units to total T-units (EFT/T) and the ratio of error-free clauses to total clauses (EFC/C)) are supportive results to both Robinson’s Cognition Hypothesis (2005) and Skehan & Foster’s (2001) Limited Attentional Capacity Model. They believe that increasing cognitive task complexity (along with the resource-

Discussing the reason why pre-task planning led to the production of more complex language, Ellis and Yuan (2004) claimed that pre-task planning diminished the pressure on working memory via providing more time for conceptualization. In fact, based on Levelt’s (1989) Speech Production Model,
the participants “prioritized conceptualization over formulation and articulation” (Yuan & Ellis, 2003, p.20) in the pre-planning time. Therefore, during the task, this reduced load resulted in the greater activation of the rule-based system, which led to the generation of more complex language. Ortega (2005) also contended that the use of more types of strategies during the planning time could be the reason why the structural complexity, i.e., the use of embeddings and subordinations, of their output augmented. Farahani and Meraji (2011) also came to the same conclusion.

To recap, our null hypothesis concerned structural complexity and task complexity. This null hypothesis was disconfirmed due to the fact that there was a main effect for the impact of +/-single dimension on this variable, and the manipulation of the double task brought about the enhancement in the structural complexity.

6. Conclusion

This study attempted to investigate the effects of cognitive task complexity, grammatical accuracy, and syntactic complexity in EFL learners’ argumentative writing. Having identified a gap in task-based research in written discourse, this study attempted to bridge this gap by investigating the effect of cognitive task complexity on learners’ writing performance. The results of the measures of syntactic complexity provided supportive evidence (although partially) for both Robinson’s and Skehan and Foster’s models. In the same vein, the results of grammatical accuracy measures contributed supportive evidence to both above-mentioned models. The present study has a number of theoretical and pedagogical implications for SLA researchers, teachers, syllabus and task designers, and language testing specialists. The first and the most important is that the nature of the different processes and specially information process (involved during completing task) can be clearly established in SLA settings. A valid and crucial criterion for designing, selecting, grading, and sequencing pedagogical tasks is in forefront of teachers’ and task designers’ attention. Therefore, the findings of this study can be regarded as practical basis for above-mentioned purposes. Moreover, the findings of the current study suggested that focusing on cognitive capabilities of the learners as well as the cognitive load of the structure of the task is of more importance in language teaching and learning than in any other settings. In spite of some useful findings which can be considered as explicit basis for writing assessment, some limitations need to be acknowledged.

Our findings showed that the provision of task complexity along +/- single task dimension significantly affected Iranian EFL learners’ written performance qualitatively and quantitatively. The following conclusions can be drawn from the present study: Regarding the quantitative aspect, this dimension led to greater fluency gains, and in terms of qualitative aspects, syntactic complexity increased due to the manipulation of task complexity. However, the measure of accuracy decreased through the use of a more complex task. The major findings of the present study are that the difference between the means of the STG and CTG in terms of structural complexity was statistically significant. Hence, based on the results, our null hypothesis was nullified.

Concerning pedagogical implications, the findings of this study can shed light on the selection and gradation of the tasks in TBLT syllabi. It shows via the manipulation of different degrees of the task complexity, the teachers can selectively direct learners’ attention towards the production dimension in which the learners have problems.

Although many task-based studies have been undertaken so far, there are still numerous baffling challenges waiting to be solved via future research. Regarding task complexity, a longitudinal research can be conducted in order to explore the ability of the learners in transferring their enhanced ability due to the task manipulation to other contexts and tasks. In order to gain rich description, post-task interviews, questionnaires, retrospective and introspective measures can also be utilized. Future research can evolve around other types of tasks being manipulated along different task features. Even individual differences regarding the learners’ learning style, learning strategies can also be taken into account in future research.
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Appendices
Appendix A
Prompt for the simple writing task, taken from Yule (1997)
Begin the story like this: Today, a woman goes to the supermarket…

Appendix B
Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfeil, and Hughey’s (1981) scoring profile
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-27</td>
<td>EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable • substantive • thorough development of thesis • relevant to assigned topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-22</td>
<td>GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject • adequate range • limited development of thesis • mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-17</td>
<td>FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject • little substance • inadequate development of topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-13</td>
<td>VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of subject • non-substantive • not pertinent • OR not enough to evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-18</td>
<td>EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression • ideas clearly stated/ supported • succinct • well-organized • logical sequencing • cohesive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-14</td>
<td>GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy • loosely organized but main ideas stand out • limited support • logical but incomplete sequencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-10</td>
<td>FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent • ideas confused or disconnected • lacks logical sequencing and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-7</td>
<td>VERY POOR: does not communicate • no organization • OR not enough to evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-18</td>
<td>EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range • effective word/ idiom choice and usage • word form mastery • appropriate register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-14</td>
<td>GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range • occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-10</td>
<td>FAIR TO POOR: limited range • frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage • meaning confused or obscured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-7</td>
<td>VERY POOR: essentially translation • little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form • OR not enough to evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-22</td>
<td>EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions • few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-18</td>
<td>GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions • minor problems in complex constructions • several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-11</td>
<td>FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/complex constructions • frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions • meaning confused or obscured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-5</td>
<td>VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules • dominated by errors • does not communicate • OR not enough to evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions • few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • poor handwriting • meaning confused or obscured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VERY POOR: no mastery of conventions • dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • handwriting illegible • OR not enough to evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction
The use of metalanguage – namely, technical or semi-technical terminology employed to analyze or describe language (Crystal, 1997; James & Garrett, 1992) – is a pedagogical topic that is rarely discussed today in the professional literature on L2 teaching and learning (Borg, 1999). This general lack of attention has resulted, in large measure, from the unfortunate, entrenched linkage of metalanguage with explicit and formal instruction in L2 grammar usage (Berry, 1997; Eisenstein, 1987; Francis, 1994). Over the decades, instruction in L2 grammar has fallen from its centrality in traditional pedagogical approaches (e.g. the Grammar-Translation Method) and been relegated to a less important or insignificant position in many classrooms (Elder & Manwaring, 2004). Several sources of influence have contributed to this sidelining of formal grammar instruction.
While there are different versions of CLT, they all set great store on the development of communicative competence (i.e., the ability to use the target language to engage in meaningful and effective communication) rather than just grammatical competence (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Although not all CLT practitioners (especially those adopting a weak version of CLT) are opposed to explicit and systematic teaching of L2 grammar in lessons (see Batstone, 1994a, 1994b; Scheffler & Cinclalia, 2010), many CLT-oriented classrooms (in particular those implementing a strong version of CLT) ‘downplay the importance of explicit grammar instruction (Elder & Manwaring, 2004, p. 145; Carter, 2003). Thus, the CLT movement has provided a pedagogical impetus that has contributed to a growing distrust in and an increasing marginalization of formal grammar instruction in many L2 classrooms.

Because of its long association with explicit and formal grammar instruction, metalanguage in particular has also been marginalized or even rejected as a legitimate component of pedagogical practices in many L2 classrooms (Berry, 2009). Alderson (1997), for example, questions ‘the assumption that teachers need to have metalanguage’ (p.2) and declares ‘I have long suspected that this is why teachers use metalanguage in class, to emphasize their position of knowledge and authority, to reinforce their power’ (p.16). Garrett (1986) claims that the use of metalanguage constitutes a major problem with formal grammar instruction because ‘it cannot of itself invoke understanding of the processing which leads to the production of a structure’ (p.141). In a similar vein, Mohammed (1996) asserts that grammar instruction based on linguistic terms and concepts can hardly achieve the goal of adding to or modifying the rules discovered by learners themselves ‘through the natural process of hypotheses formation and testing’ because ‘such terms and concepts constitute an additional learning burden and remain as a separate body of knowledge that has nothing to do with the way people actually process language’ (p.283).

In recent years, explicit and formal instruction in L2 grammar has fallen from its centrality in traditional pedagogical approaches and been relegated to a peripheral position in many classrooms, due to the joint influences of some popular theoretical claims, findings from early empirical studies about the disassociation between learners’ explicit knowledge of L2 target structures and their ability to use these structures, and communicative language teaching, which, in its application, sometimes sets great store by the development of communicative competence and fluency rather than grammatical competence.

Explicit knowledge is the kind of knowledge that language learners are aware of and can express (Dekeyser, 1998). It could be either explicit declarative knowledge which means conscious knowledge of the rules of the language or explicit procedural knowledge which is the ability to use the learned linguistic terms. Criticisms of the use of metalanguage in the classroom are misguided because they fail to recognize the part that metalanguage can play in facilitating the development of metalinguistic knowledge but, several recent studies have found substantial positive correlations between knowledge of metalanguage and L2 proficiency.

The majority of researchers in the fields of education, applied linguistics and cognitive psychology assume that, in general, explicit or conscious knowledge about a domain to be acquired will facilitate the attainment of proficiency in that domain. Nevertheless, there has been differences among linguistics and researchers whether teacher should teach grammar or not; and also how teachers should teach grammar in the classroom. There are teachers who believe that Consciousness Raising Tasks (CRT) enable learners to develop explicit knowledge of grammar.

Moreover, regarding the importance of Consciousness Raising Tasks in grammar teaching, one of the significant problem of grammar teaching is that the instructors are not aware of this kind of teaching that enable learners to develop explicit knowledge of grammar.

The term explicit or metalinguistic means highly analyzed. Therefore, when teachers/researchers talk about explicit instruction, they mean the process of analyzing the structural part of the language in a way that makes it more available to the conscious introspection (Sharwood Smith, 1994). This means that explicit learning is a conscious and intentional process that requires focus on the linguistic structures of the language. There are teachers who believe that Consciousness Raising Tasks (CRT) enable learners to develop explicit knowledge of grammar. Consciousness-Raising (CR) does not involve the learner in repeated production. This is because the purpose of this kind of grammar teaching is not to help learners to perform structures correctly but to help them to gain some knowledge about it.
The teacher makes students aware of specific grammatical features using tasks (Dickens and Woods, 1988); e.g. students are given a set of examples and asked to figure out for themselves the rule regarding the correct order of direct and indirect objects in English. Metalinguistic awareness is important because it can raise the student’s consciousness of the structure and to facilitate restructuring of the learner’s unconscious system of linguistic knowledge.

Therefore, explicit grammar instruction continues to be a contentious issue in SLA and much attention has been devoted to understanding its effectiveness in developing learners’ grammatical competence and performance. These recent studies have indicated that there are areas where more research could be conducted in order to fill gaps in knowledge about this subject. For instance, Akakura’s (2012) found that explicit instruction can affect implicit knowledge. But teachers have lack of attention to metalinguistic instruction in the classroom and also there is a disassociation between learners’ explicit knowledge of L2 target structure and their ability to use these structures.

Research questions and Research hypotheses
The present study seeks to answer the following questions:
1. Is there any significant difference between metalanguage Awareness of L2 learners who are exposed to more explicit grammar instruction and learners with less explicit grammar instruction?
2. Is there any relationship between metalinguistic knowledge and EFL learners’ performance on writing test in formal instructional settings?

The purpose of the present study is to reveal the effect of grammatical awareness on Iranian Intermediate learners’ performance. The result will, therefore, shed lights on the following hypotheses:
H01. There is no significant difference between metalanguage Awareness of L2 learners who are exposed more explicit grammar instruction and learners with less explicit grammar instruction.
H02. There is no significant relationship between metalinguistic knowledge and EFL learners’ performance on writing test in formal instructional settings.

2. Review of Literature
Metalinguistic knowledge tests are often used to measure explicit knowledge of the target language. Ellis (2008) defines explicit knowledge as conscious and declarative knowledge which is verbalizable with semi-technical or technical metalanguage; and implicit knowledge as intuitive and procedural knowledge which is not verbalizable. Metalinguistic knowledge is considered to be related to learners’ explicit, but not implicit, knowledge (Ellis, 2009).

Green and Hecht (1992) presented 12 sentences containing underlined grammatical errors to 300 German EFL learners and English native speakers, and asked them to correct the errors and state the violated rules. While the English native speakers corrected more errors (96%) than the German EFL learners (78%), the EFL learners were slightly better at explaining errors than the native speakers (46% and 42% respectively). This suggests that, because the EFL learners could correct more errors than they could explain, they relied on implicit knowledge to correct some errors. The results also show extensive reliance on implicit knowledge by the native speakers.

Meschyan and Hernandez (2002), for example, found that L1 decoding skills were transferred to the L2, since good L1 decoders were also good L2 decoders. Moreover, L2 decoding skill was a good predictor of L2 competence in the first quarter of a Spanish course. Dufva and Voeten (1999) in their study of 170 1st graders from Finland who were learning English as an L2 found that the best predictor of English proficiency was 2nd grade L1 word recognition skill with reading comprehension and phonological memory having a smaller impact. Thus, as expected, L1 word recognition skills did predict L2 learning (for them, these results are in accordance with the linguistic coding deficit hypothesis).

Finally, Ranta (2002) also found a connection between metalinguistic awareness and L2 learning. She collected data with 150 children from Canada, L1 speakers of French, who were being instructed intensively in English and, at first, her results seemed disappointing since the participants’ performance in the L1 metalinguistic task18 accounted for 16% or less19 of the variance in L2 measures. Additionally, in a Principal Component Analysis, Ranta found that L1 metalinguistic knowledge and performance on post-instruction L2 proficiency tests did not load on the same factor. However, a link between metalinguistic awareness and L2 learning was established through a cluster analysis where it was possible to observe one cluster with learners who did well in the L1
metalinguistic task and had a good L2 performance and another cluster which contained learners who did poorly in both of these tasks. Thus, for the strongest and weakest learners in this population, metalinguistic awareness did predict their degree of success in L2 learning.

Putting it all together, while there have been studies which have found that literacy acquisition (i.e., alphabetization) will increase one’s metalinguistic abilities (PA, SA, and MA), it is yet unknown whether further experience with print will continue to refine these abilities (even if to a smaller extent than this first impact). It is possible to hypothesize that as one continues dealing with print and with more complex texts (involving more complex syntax and a richer and wider vocabulary), the more his/her metalinguistic abilities will increase and the higher the literacy level of this individual will be. Since metalinguistic abilities have been found to impact L2 learning, one might expect that the learners who have a higher L1 literacy level and/or more metalinguistic awareness also will be the most successful learners of an L2 (if all the other variables involved in the process of L2 development could be held constant, of course).

Rutherford (1987) defined "consciousness-raising(C-R)" as "the drawing of the learner's attention to features of the target language (p.189)." The Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics defines C-R as an approach to the teaching of grammar in which instruction in grammar is seen as a method of raising the learner's awareness of grammatical features of the language (Richards, Platt & Platt, 1992, p.78). C-R attempts to aid second language acquisition by duplicating first language acquisition processes. Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith (1988, p.3), describe consciousness-raising as follows-R is intended to embrace a continuum ranging from intensive promotion of conscious awareness through pedagogical role articulation on the one end, to the mere exposure of the learner to specific grammatical phenomena on the other.

C-R has several recognizable characteristics. First, it emphasizes long-term learning objectives rather than focusing only on the production of the target structure in the short term. Ellis (1993, p.11) believes that C-R focuses more on the awareness of grammatical features rather than on mastery of production. C-R accepts that when the structure is taught to the learner, it may not be immediately learnable. Furthermore, grammar does not have to be taught explicitly as the learner may also be led to grammatical insights. Third, focus on meaning is given some consideration and authentic texts are preferred over concocted examples (Willis & Willis, 1996, p.64). In short, the basis of C-R is to get the learners to notice the difference between themselves and the English spoken or written by native speakers so that learners can form and test this hypothesis to achieve natural language acquisition (Rutherford, 1987).

The earliest research investigating the effects of FFI was 'method' oriented. That is, it consisted of global comparisons of language teaching methods that differed in their conceptualizations of how to teach language. At the time when a number of key studies took place (in the 1960s and 1970s), language pedagogy assumed that the teaching of language necessarily and essentially involved focusing on form (primarily, grammatical form) and the principal debate concerned how form should best be taught. Thus, methods were distinguished in terms of whether form was to be taught deductively (as in the grammar-translation method) or inductively (as in the audio-lingual method). The aim of comparative-method studies is to establish which of two or more methods or general approaches to language teaching is the most effective in terms of the actual learning (the 'product') that is achieved after a given period of time. Many of the earlier studies were 'global' in nature, conducted over weeks, months, and even years. Later ones have tended to examine differences resulting from shorter periods of exposure to different methods.

The ability to manipulate linguistic and semantic units for others' and/or one's own amusement may be considered as a vital component of metalinguistic awareness, with the help of which learners' attention is focused on formal rather than functional aspects of language. This special dimension of language performance or skill, (cf. Cazden 1974) which probably requires more cognitive control than the acquisition of speaking skills, should play a particularly important role in education. Furthermore, Cazden (1974) claims that metalinguistic awareness is a unique construct because endowed with this ability people attend to language forms in and for themselves. Establishing links between metalinguistic awareness and figures of speech, Carter states that “different figures of speech in use require different degrees of conscious processing effort by speakers and listeners” (Carter 2004, p. 126). Mora's definition seems to be the most concise one: it is an ability to objectify language as a process and as a thing. In Birdsong (1989, p. 163) metalinguistic awareness is described as “a perceptual and cognitive trait involving sensitivity to formal aspects of language”, whereas Roth, et
al. (cited in Zipke 2008) emphasize that metalinguistic awareness enables one to deal with the linguistic code.

Contradictory views have been presented with regard to the concept of metalinguistic ability. According to some experts it must be recognizable as a distinct achievement while integrating into other aspects of linguistic and cognitive skills. Metalinguistic ability may be considered to equal knowledge about language, but then “the problem is to separate that knowledge of language from the knowledge that is needed to use the language” (Bialystok 1993, p. 4). However, by giving it a separate label, a knowledge base of its own together with a separate course of development, might result in assuming that metalinguistic ability is independent of linguistic ability that is responsible for using language. The advantage of treating metalinguistic ability as an autonomous skill is that in this case accounts of linguistic development have no relevance for its development. If metalinguistic ability is a mechanism separate from linguistic ability, then there may exist unique explanations for its functions and development.

In contrast, there is another view in which metalinguistic ability forms an integral part of linguistic ability allowing the possibility to be similar to it in certain aspects and different in others. If it is not a different kind of thing from linguistic ability, then presumably it does not need a different kind of label and certainly does not need a different theory to account for its development. It is clear that a proper definition of metalinguistic ability must be a compromise between these two positions. Accepting such an approach to the definition of metalinguistic ability, one should find out how to relate it to linguistic ability, and how to reconcile its development with the facts and theories of linguistic ability. Nonetheless, most accounts of metalinguistic ability tend to treat it distinctly from the notion of linguistic ability.

The research studies carried out in contexts where there is a presence of two or more languages in contact have clearly shown that bilingualism fosters the development of metalinguistic awareness (Klein, 1995; Lasagabaster, 1998a, 2000a; Merriman & Kutlesic, 1993), and not only in elite or privileged language learning situations, but also in disadvantaged contexts (Francis, 1999; Pinto, 1999; Yelland, 1993). What does seem to have been consistently supported is that early exposure to a second language is one of the factors or activities that promote metalinguistic activity. A number of researchers have hypothesized that this effect is due to the fact that early bilingual exposure makes separating the sound of the word from its meaning easier. In other words, it eases the understanding of the arbitrary relationship between the word and the referent, as it does the comparison of different languages. It is certainly true that of the various aspects of metalinguistic awareness which benefit from early bilingualism the word-referent is the most studied, while others have hardly been looked at. In this sense it would be very interesting to analyze whether or not other areas are connected with bilingualism.

Yet it is not so evident whether this knowledge about language exerts the same influence on every language skill. It is worth considering that “metalinguistic awareness lies at the core of the proficiencies that underlie Cummins’s CALP” (Francis, 1999, p. 534), and hence it plays a paramount role in L2 learning in a formal setting like the school (Lasagabaster, 1998c; Sharwood-Smith, 1991). Most studies so far have dealt with the relationship between students’ knowledge about the target language and ultimate achievement in that language. In fact, whether explicit L2 knowledge contributes to the development of implicit L2 knowledge is considered to be a key issue in applied linguistics (Han & Ellis, 1998; Krashen, 1981; Prabhu, 1987; Sharwood-Smith, 1981; VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993). Nevertheless, we intend to analyze the effect of the learners’ knowledge about the L1 on foreign language learning.

The main objective of this paper is therefore to examine the effect that students’ knowledge about their L1 has on the development of foreign language skills and grammar, taking the distinction between academic and conversational proficiency as a basis. As a result of this, the speaking and listening skills will be related to more conversation dimension, whereas reading, writing and grammar exercises will be closer to the academic dimension; as the latter are more decontextualized in nature, they should show a closer relationship to the metalinguistic awareness measures. The degree of planning in the academic and conversational dimensions should similarly be reflected in different ways; the need for greater deliberate attention on language forms in the reading, writing and grammar tests should entail a closer relationship between these tasks and the metalinguistic awareness indices.
Xu, Case, and Wang (2009), in a study examined the influence of length of residence in the target language community and overall L2 proficiency on L2 pragmatic competence with a reference to L2 grammatical competence. A questionnaire consisting of 20 scenarios was administrated to the participants measuring their pragmatic and grammatical competence. Results revealed that both length of residence and overall L2 proficiency influenced L2 pragmatics significantly with overall L2 proficiency demonstrating a stronger influence. Findings also showed that there was a strong and positive correlation between pragmatic and grammatical competence for advanced participants and all participants as a group.

To investigate the relationship between pragmatic competence and organizational competence, and to see the possible effect of the learner’s field of study on this relationship, Abuali (1995) examined two groups of subjects (native speakers of English and non-native speakers) participating in the preliminary phase and six other groups of Farsi speaking university students participating in the main phase of the study. The subjects were from different fields of study. The results of the study supported the idea that the EFL learners’ field of study affects their language competence and also showed a positively moderate correlation between pragmatic competence and organizational competence. The shortcoming of the study was lack of presentation and expression a criterion for teaching Grammatical knowledge as obligatory and optional in L2 leaning. On the other word, in this study the important approaches of consciousness-raising tasks and grammatical judgments tasks were also elaborated.

3. Methodology
3.1. Participants
This study was carried out in Azad University Dezful Branch. The participants of this study were intact groups of second semester EFL learners who were studying a Grammar Course. All participants were Persian speakers, learning English as a foreign language in a formal educational setting. Totally, there were sixty learners aged between 22 to 40. Accordingly, the participants were not advanced learners of English. The participants were 39 female and 21 male learners; these learners were Intermediate in terms of English language proficiency. After the scores of proficiency Test (cloze-test) were obtained, 60 students were selected from the study; their scores were between 12 and 15. The researcher spoke about the purpose of the study and the forms of tests in these classes and asked the students to participate in this research. Through formal testing the researcher made sure that the participants were really at the same language proficiency level.

3.2. Instruments
In this study, three different tests were carried out at three different points: a proficiency test before the pretest, the pretest before the instruction, and the posttest after the instructional treatments. Therefore, three instruments were used for data collection in this study: Initially, a proficiency test was used. The test contained 30 multiple-choice items, and it was a cloze test (Appendix A). After making sure that they were at the same level concerning to proficiency test, the second instrument was used for pretest. In order to decide if the participants were comparable in terms of the target structures a pre-test was run. The materials which were selected from the TOEFL Test, for Grammatical Judgment Test and design to assess their knowledge of L2 structures and grammatical knowledge (Appendix A). It consisted of 30 multiple-choice items. The content of the grammatical Judgment test (GJT) contained 6 English target structures: Articles, Conjunction, Relative clause, Preposition, Agreement, and Infinitive. And the third one was some pictures prompts (writing test) and occasional metalanguage and the two explicit techniques were used to instruct the participant students (Appendix B). In this test, learners should to write some sentences related to target structure.

3.3. Procedure
The first step, in conducting this research students were selected from Azad Dezful University Branch. And then, a proficiency test was taken to ensure their homogeneity. The participants of this study were 60 EFL intermediate learners with an age range of 22 to 40. They were intermediate and low proficiency based on the cloze test. All of the participants have been taking a Grammar Course in second semester. These classes were made up of thirty-nine female and twenty-one male learners. The proficiency test contained 30 multiple-choice items and its content was related to grammar and it was cloze test. After making sure that they were at the same level, a pretest assessed their grammatical
knowledge with grammar test. The content of the grammatical Judgment test (GJT) contained 6 English target structures: Articles, Conjunction, Relative clause, Preposition, Agreement, and Infinitive. And the same time, a writing test (picture prompts) was taken assessed learners’ performance on writing. The learners should write some sentences related to the target structure. The materials during the course were selected 6 English target structure covered during the study: Articles, Conjunction, Relative clause, Preposition, Agreement, and Infinitive. It has three phases each having one point. In phase 1, the participants found the grammatical error in a given sentence and underline it. In phase 2, they were asked to provide the related rule in either L1 or L2. In the third phase, they should write the correct form of the grammatically ill-formed part. The Grammatical Judgment test contained 25 ungrammatical sentences and 5 grammatical sentences. They were instructed through the use of grammatical CR activities and tasks. Finally; another metalinguistic test, was taken at the final semester. The researcher administered the post-test. The scores obtained by the pre-test and post-test were statistically analyzed. Following the scoring phase, means and standard deviations for the pre- and post-tests and the second stage was one in which the obtained statistics were subjected to paired sample t-test determined in the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) 18. A paired-samples t-test was applied to show the degree of improvement from pre to post test. The former was run to see if the difference between the participants’ performances before and after the explicit teaching was statistically significant.

4. Results

4.2. The Results of Grammatical Awareness Test

In this section, the Statistical results are presented. The descriptive analysis of the data is first given and then the results of inferential statistical analyses on the overall performances on the Pre- and post-test and on the performances on the grammar are provided.

As far as the results of descriptive statistics for the pre- and post-test are concerned, a mean Difference of about -4.433 (table 4.2) which showed that the students use the grammar more for learning English as shown in Table 1:

Table 4.1
Paired Samples Statistics of the Grammatical Pre and Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posttest</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A paired- sample-test was conducted to evaluate the probable effect that Grammatical Awareness might have on the participants’ performance on the grammar test that they completed after teaching grammar. In this statistical method of analysis, the whole population of the study was taken as a single group and their scores on the grammar test were compared. The results indicated that the students performed higher in grammar in posttest (M=9.86, SD=1.41) then in pretest (M=5.43, SD=1.45) (see table 4.1).

Table 4.2 also shows that this difference in the participants’ performance on the pre and posttest to be highly significant as, p< .0005. (See the following table).

Table 4.2
Paired Samples Test of the Learners’ Performance on the Grammatical Awareness Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pretest - posttest</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-4.95</td>
<td>-16.86</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table illustrates, a rather remarkable difference between the participants' performances on the pre and posttest was observed in the data. This was supported by the results of performing a paired t-test which revealed that the elicited performances after the treatment differed significantly from the one before the treatment at $P < 0.05$ (Sig. = 0.000). This may reserve a constructive role for enhancing L2 learners' awareness explicit teaching.

Scores from the pre and posttests were analyzed for differences in two times in order to find whether there was any difference between performance of the learners in interpretation and production task of the post-test. The results of interpretation task (Table 4.2) revealed that there were statistically significant differences between time1 (pre-test) and time2 (post-test). This result proposes that $T1 \neq T2$.

Comparing means of the pre-test and posttest verifies that there was difference between the learners’ performance on writing and grammar tests. Figure 4.1 indicates that the post-test scores of the target structures graphically as compared with the corresponding pre-test scores of the same group of learners, and the students’ performance in post-test is better than the pre-test.

![Pre and Post-tests Means](image)

As presented in Figure 4.1, the results of the post-test had the largest portion of the pre-test. It was so because of the treatment during the course. However, the study revealed that they were more activated during the course. For example, the performance of the participants in the present study on the article section of the post-test is indicated to be better than their performance on the same subpart of the pre-test.

### 4.3. The Results of learners’ performance of writing Test

In this section, the Statistical results are presented. The descriptive analysis of the data is first given and then the results of inferential statistical analyses on the overall performances on the Pre- and post-test and on the performances on the writing are provided.

As far as the results of descriptive statistics for the pre- and post-test were concerned, a mean difference of about $-2.766$ (table 4.4) which suggests that the students used the grammar more for learning English as shown in Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Statistics of Writing Pre and Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posttest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the probable effect that Grammatical Awareness might have on the participants’ performance on the writing test that they completed after teaching target structures. In this statistical method of analysis, the whole population of the study was taken as a single group and their scores on writing test were compared.
The results indicated that the students performed higher in writing in posttest (M=6.500, SD=1.49) than in pretest (M=3.733, SD=1.37) (see table 4.3). Table 4.4 also showed that this difference in the participants’ performance on the pre and posttest to be highly significant as, p< .0005. (See the following table).

**Table 4.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td>95% Interval Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 pretest - posttest</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table illustrates, a rather remarkable difference between the participants’ performances on the pre and posttest was observed in the data. This was supported by the results of performing a paired t-test which revealed that the elicited performances after the treatment differed significantly from the one before the treatment at P < 0.05 (Sig. = 0.000). This may reserve a constructive role for enhancing L2 learners’ awareness explicit teaching.

Scores from the pre and posttests were analyzed for differences in two times in order to find whether there was any difference between performance of the learners in interpretation and production task of the post-test. The results of interpretation task (Table 4.4) revealed that there were statistically significant differences between time1 (pre-test) and time2 (post-test). This result proposes that T1 ≠ T2.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

5.3. Discussion

5.3.1. First question: Is there any significant difference between metalanguage Awareness of L2 learners who are exposed to more explicit grammar instruction and learners with less explicit grammar instruction?

The findings obtained in this research led to the conclusion that there was a significant difference between the grammar mean of the two tests allowing the researcher to reject the null hypothesis of no difference between the mean of the two tests.

This study showed that the students were more active in class while they were learning the grammar point because they were asked to extract the grammar point themselves by focusing on the examples in their handout. This finding is in line with Mishans (2005) argument that the rational of the CR approaches is that given sufficient exposure and opportunity, learners will discover elements of L2 grammar. This involves reconciling their new finding with their current interlanguage that is, noticing the gap between their understanding of the use and usage of a particular feature, and examples of its use by native speakers. This leads to revision of the interlanguage towards more a native-like form and eventually towards acquisition of that form. This naturalistic aspect is only one of the advantages of the CR approach. Another is that in the longer term, it nurtures language awareness sensitizing learners to the structure of target language in a way that passively receiving information that language rules does not.

However, as it is pointed out by Larsen-Freeman (2002), grammar is best conceived as encompassing three dimensions: form, meaning and use. While productive practice may be useful for working on form, associative learning may account more for meaning, and awareness of and sensitivity to context may be required for appropriate use. Since grammar is complex, and students’ learning styles vary, learning grammar is not likely to be accomplished through a single means.

5.3.2. Second question: Is there any relationship between metalinguistic knowledge and EFL learners’ performance on writing test in formal instructional settings?
The results of the study indicated that there was a significant difference between the writing mean of the two tests allowing the researcher to reject the second hypothesis of no difference between the mean of the two tests. Therefore, this study supports the effectiveness of CR activities in teaching grammar to EFL learners in intermediate level. This study also suggests that implementing CR activities can help learners to improve their knowledge of grammar.

Applying this approach trains learners in techniques which they can then use to study independently. One crucial benefit of using a CR approach is that by linking the study of grammatical structure firmly to language encountered within text, it checks the tendency to perceive grammatical form as isolated phenomena. In addition, the results of this study suggested that because of their important role in extracting and even explaining the grammar point in front of the class students were all motivated in learning the grammar point which can lead to language acquisition.

The result of this research also corroborates other similar studies. For example, Yip (1994) indicated the effectiveness of CR in teaching ergative construction. Mohamed (2004), also, suggested that CR tasks, both deductive and inductive, are effective learning tools and can therefore be used to raise learners’ awareness of linguistic forms. Sugiharto (2006) contended that CR is effective in helping students develop their explicit knowledge of the simple present tense. Moradkhani and Sohrabian (2009) argued that the use of CR activities could be a very efficient technique in improving the grammatical knowledge of EFL learners. They believed that the combination of explicit and implicit learning can guide students toward language acquisition. The need for explicit rules can be more justified if it is embedded in communicative task.

This study is not going to reject the role of other techniques in teaching grammar. The present research merely aimed to hold up the claim that the use of CR activities in the classroom is a suitable technique in teaching grammar to EFL learners. It seems that it is better for the teacher to be aware of different techniques in teaching grammar and use them based on different circumstances. In Iran, learning grammar is one of the most important parts of learning English in the educational system.

5.4. Conclusions
1. The present research merely aimed to hold up the claim that the use of CR activities in the classroom was a suitable technique in teaching grammar to EFL learners. It seems that it is better for the teacher to be aware of different techniques in teaching grammar and use them based on different circumstances. In Iran, learning grammar is one of the most important parts of learning English in the educational system.
2. The effects of using picture prompts on the acquisition, generalization, and maintenance of complex vocational tasks were evaluated within a multiple baseline design across subjects and tasks. Picture prompts; the teacher shows a picture as a prompt and the students make sentences based on the picture. For example: The picture shows a person who is swimming. The students make sentences: He is swimming. The learners were first trained to use picture prompts to guide their performance on one or more complex tasks. Following training with the picture prompts, Results indicated that picture prompts can be successfully used to promote both acquisition and generalization of performance, and that subsequent training time on a novel task was reduced when the use of picture prompts had been previously trained.
3. The findings of the study suggested the superiority of CR grammar tasks to pattern practice in promoting grammar knowledge on EFL learners. The results of this study and other indicate that helping students to use of grammatical Awareness can be effect on their performance on grammar and writing abilities.

Implications for language teachers
The findings show that Grammatical Awareness can be improved by providing appropriate instructions. Teachers have to re-evaluate their methods and start to recognize that they have to concentrate on the process of teaching grammar and writing rather than the grammar test results.

The second implication of this study is that teaching grammar is an important aspect in Grammatical Awareness. Teaching grammar helps them to perform the writing task more successfully.

Another implication of this study is that teachers must do more than just provide learners with linguistic knowledge. New information that is acquired should be put into practice. Thus, learners should be provided with the opportunity to use language for communication in a meaningful context in the class. This will help the internalization of new input.
The findings of this research are also fruitful for language teachers because this type of study would heighten their understanding of the importance of using grammatical awareness on learners’ performance on grammar and writing abilities. In other words, those language teachers responsible to prepare some metalinguistic materials for their EFL learners. According to the results of the present study, will help EFL learners improve their grammatical knowledge. Language teachers can also guide their EFL learners to write sentences related to target structures out-side the classroom. In other words, language teachers can guide their EFL learners to use these target structures to improve their writing abilities. Moreover, language teachers can also ask their students to, for example, discuss and describe the errors and focus on the meta-linguistic features of the language. This would help EFL learners improve their Grammatical Awareness through using appropriate materials at appropriate situations. Depending on the teacher, other exercises can follow the exposure.
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ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effect of turn-taking and wait-time strategy on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' speaking in conversation quality. Movie clips from the new Interchange course book 1 were chosen and considered as the materials of the study. Ninety participants were selected based on the homogeneity test at the intermediate level and they were non-randomly divided into two control and experimental groups. The participants took a conversation exam as a pre-test and talk in pairs on various subjects. The pre-test scores were recorded at the beginning of treatment. During the treatment period, the experimental group received treatment of conversation strategies through explaining these conversation strategies in the classroom. The control group received traditional method of teaching conversation including role playing, class activities on different topics and the new Interchange students' book 1. The treatment lasted 10 sessions. Finally, they took a post-test on the same subjects they had in the pre-test. Independent and paired samples t-test were used to determine the differences between the two group oral performances in the pre and post-tests. Results showed that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group in terms of using more conversation strategies.
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1. Introduction

English is the most spoken language throughout the world. In modern times it has become the first choice for communicating with people and businesses from different ethnicities and landscapes. It has become important for survival and thriving in education and business that you know how to speak good English. The goal of teaching speaking skills is communicative efficiency. To help students
Develop communicative efficiency in speaking, teachers can use a balanced activities approach that combines language input, structured output, and communicative output. Language input comes in the form of teacher talk, listening activities, reading passages, and language heard and read outside of class. It gives the material for producing language (Burt, 2003–2004).

Speaking is a communication skill that enables a person to verbalize thoughts and ideas (Donato, R., 2000). There are two instances when such a skill is required and these are: interactive and semi-interactive. In the first instance (interactive), this would involve conversations with another person or group of persons whether face-to-face or over the phone, wherein there is an exchange of communication between two or more people. In the second instance, semi-interactive happens when there is a speaker and an audience such as in the case of delivering a speech, wherein the speaker usually does all the talking, while the audience listens and analyzes the message, expressions, and body language of the speaker. Every single day, we are given opportunities to speak (Ansarey, D., 2012).

A conversation is the messaging tool used instead of email to communicate with a course, a group, an individual student, or a group of students. You can communicate with other people in your course at any time. According to (Clifton, J. 2004), conversation is a form of interactive, spontaneous communication between two or more people who are following rules of politeness and ceremonies. It is polite give and take of subjects thought of by people talking with each other for company. A conversation works unpredictably for particular purposes since it is of a spontaneous nature (Walsh, S., 2011).

Turn-taking is considered to play an essential role in structuring people’s social interactions in terms of control and regulation of conversations (Bortfeld, H., Leon, S.D., Bloom, J.E., Schober, M.F., & Brennan, S.E., 2001). Therefore, the system of turn-taking has become object of analyses both for linguists and sociologists. Turn-taking is one of the basic mechanisms in conversation, and the convention strategies vary between cultures and languages (Bakeman, R., & Gnisci, A., 2005). Turn-taking in linguistics can be defined as the process through which the party doing the talk at the moment is changed (Walsh, S., 2011). Thus, turn-taking has to do with the allocation and acquisition of turns i.e. how turns are exchanged in a talk or conversation (Brock, U. & Hopson, R. K., 2008).

Based on (Jack C. Richards; Karim Sadeghi, 2015), the ability to use English for spoken communication is one of the main reasons many people around the world study English, and like people in other countries, Iranian learners often evaluate their success in language learning, as well as the effectiveness of their English course, on the basis of how well they feel they have improved in their spoken-language and conversation proficiency. The way spoken English is used in these different situations is both varied and complicated, and the ability to function well in one situation (for example, buying things in a store) does not necessarily transfer to other situations (for example, taking part in casual conversation). However, in language classrooms the teaching of speaking skills has often misrepresented the nature of spoken English and spoken interaction; and, as a result, speaking classes are most often little more than unstructured discussion sessions, with little real teaching of what oral proficiency in spoken English entails. In addition, success in studying a language is often measured by learners’ ability to speak in the language being learned. More importantly, Harmer (2007) argues that language learners use all language they know when they speak. Therefore, research is always needed and recommended to improve the teaching and learning techniques to improve the speaking skills that enable learners to communicate. The ability to use the language as a means of communication often judges one’s success in a speaking class of language learning. This success is detected when a language learner can use the language to express his ideas, feelings, and thoughts in the form of monologue or dialogue or the success can be simply seen when language learners are able to express their purposes or when language learners are able to make a conversation with others.

2. Statement of the Problem

The present research is considering the use of the turn-taking and wait-time strategy on Iranian intermediate EFL learners Speaking and conversation quality. The main problem within traditional approaches is that sticking to a method or approach in teaching speaking and conversation may make problems such as a teacher doesn’t feel free to be creative and innovative and avoid being flexible in responding unexpected classroom situations. This strategy is an adaptive approach through which it is supposed to affect the speaking and conversation ability level of intermediate EFL learners.
positively. This study examined the impact of turn-taking and wait-time on enhancing the speaking and conversation quality of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. Finding an efficient way or approach which facilitates learners learning and to help them comprehend better seems to be quite necessary. Hence, in the current study attempts will be made to examine resorting to turn-taking and wait-time strategy as a facilitating way of mastering on speaking skill and conversation quality. Therefore, the researcher will measure the influence of turn-taking and wait-time strategy on enhancing conversation qualities and speaking achievement. The present research will consider the influence of a kind of strategy named as turn-taking and wait-time strategy on Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners’ speaking accuracy of grammar and pronunciation which is supposed to affect speaking and conversation ability level of them positively. Put another way, this study will examine the impact of turn-taking and wait-time strategy on the improvement of the level of speaking and conversation of Iranian intermediate EFL learners.

3. Literature Review

Teachers spend a lot of time searching for the best methods since they want to teach their students in the best way. Each time they have tried something new they are disappointed of the result of their teaching. History of language teaching shows how many different approaches to language teaching and learning has been used and how many approaches resulting from different philosophical views have been replaced by the others. The biggest difference can be seen in the new approach moving from traditional teaching to student learning process. In traditional teaching the teacher is an authority and directs all the activities in the classroom, he/she conducts guides and controls the student’s behavior in the target language (Larsen-Freeman, 2001). The ability to use English for spoken communication is one of the main reasons many people around the world study English, and like people in other countries, Iranian learners often evaluate their success in language learning, as well as the effectiveness of their English course, on the basis of how well they feel they have improved in their spoken-language proficiency and conversation quality. However, in language classrooms the teaching of speaking skills and conversation has often misrepresented the nature of spoken English and spoken interaction; and, as a result, speaking classes are most often little more than unfocussed discussion sessions, with little real teaching of what oral proficiency in spoken English entails. This paper explores issues involved in teaching English in the Iranian context, and offers suggestion to improve approaches to the teaching of spoken English and conversation quality. According to Tony and Mark (2014), conversation is a complex and perplexing activity. It embodies rules and etiquette. It requires participants to possess skills that are improved with practice.

Conversation strategies are critical skills needed to develop cooperative play skills. They are required in life including conversation strategies, waiting to get someone’s attention, waiting while someone else is talking, waiting for a turn during play (Goodwin, C., 1981). As boring as it is, taking turns and knowing how to wait goes a long way. A conversation strategy for language refers to the back and forth interaction whether it is with gestures, signs, sounds, or words. Because conversations need to be organized, there are rules or principles for establishing who talks and then who talks next. This process is called turn-taking. Conversation strategies are critical skills needed to develop cooperative play skills (Luu, T. T., 2010).

Turn-taking is usually considered to follow a simple set of rules, enacted through a perhaps more complicated system of signals. The most significant aspect of the turn-taking process is that, in most cases, it proceeds in a very smooth fashion (Auer, P., 1996).

Conversation strategy is one of the basic mechanisms in conversation and the nature of conversation strategies is to promote and maintain talk. For smooth conversation strategy, the knowledge of both the linguistic rules and the conversational rules of the target language is required. According to (Bailey, T. M. Plunkett, K., & Scarpa, E., 1999), during a conversation, turn-taking may involve a cued gaze that prompts the listener that it is their turn or that the speaker is finished talking. There are two gazes that have been identified and associated with turn-taking. The two patterns associated with turn-taking are mutual-break and mutual-hold. Mutual-break is when there is a pause in the conversation and both participants use a momentary break with mutual gaze toward each other and then breaking the gaze, then continuing conversation again. This type is correlated with a perceived smoothness due to a decrease in the taking of turns. Mutual-hold is when the speaker also takes a pause in the conversation with mutual gaze, but then still holds the gaze as he/she starts to speak again (Brown, H. D., 1994).
In the second language class, interactions between teachers and students serve as the main point for learning how to use the language. After the teacher asks a question, students mentally process their answers (Auer, P., 1996). Conversation strategy could be the pause which the speaker thinks after questions and answers refer to the process by which people in a conversation decide who is going to speak next. It depends on both cultural factors and smart cues. In fact, the participants as (Ellis, R., 1997) states look at language learning as an outcome of participating in discourse, particularly face-to-face interaction. This interpersonal interaction is thought of as a fundamental requirement of second language acquisition (SLA) (Bangarter, A., Clark, H. H. & Katz, R. A., 2004).

In recent years, one of the greatest changes in foreign language pedagogy has been the shift from a teacher-centered learning model to a learner-centered model. This shift signals a new era in which English speaking instruction must give a chance for students to express themselves in speaking the language. A promising method to traditional speaking instruction is cooperative learning. It serves as an alternative way of teaching for promoting speaking and social interaction among students (Gomleksiz, 2007; Ning, 2011). Prior research suggests that cooperative learning is of great effect on developing students’ speaking skills (Liao, 2009; Pattanpichet, 2011) and also in improving their attitudes towards learning (Slavin, 1995). However, English speaking and conversation instruction within the framework of turn-taking strategy has not been tried yet at the tertiary level. In this study, turn-taking and wait-time strategy compared to traditional instruction to find out the effect of turn-taking and wait-time strategy instruction on students’ English speaking skills and conversation quality. Many researchers have conducted studies to find out how better to use turn-taking and wait-time strategy in developing students’ speaking skills and conversation in tertiary levels.

4. Research Question
In order to investigate the effects of the EFL teachers’ turn-taking and wait-time strategy in the conversation quality classes as a way to affect learners’ learning positively, the following research question is generated:

RQ. Does teachers’ turn-taking and wait-time strategy affect learners’ speaking in conversation quality?

5. Methodology
5.1. Design
The design of the study is a pre and post-test design which is considered as a quasi-experimental study in which the experimental group receives teachers’ turn-taking and wait-time strategy. Sixty EFL learners took part as the participants in two groups of 30 EFL learners. The treatment period lasted 10 sessions. The post-test was conducted to determine the impact turn-taking and wait-time strategy on speaking in conversation quality of the participants.

5.2. Participants
To fulfill the objectives of this study, 60 male and female Iranian EFL students in an English language institution in Poldokhtar city were chosen among 100 pre university students. Then they were given a teacher made language proficiency as a pre-test. They were in the age ranging from 17 to 19 studying participated in this study. The participants’ selection procedures were done at the beginning of the semester meaning. Then they were non-randomly divided into two equal control experimental groups.

5.3. Instrumentation and Materials
In order to accomplish the objectives of the present study, the following instruments were employed: The Oxford Placement Test for the intermediate learners was used to determine the homogeneity of the participants. This test featured 50 multiple-choice items considering conversation strategies and while the other one were in a traditional way and ordinary conversation in which the above strategies were taught without awareness in an implicit method. In order to teach and investigate on the effect of the conversation strategies in the experimental classes, the following phases were carried out: In the first session, first of all, it was supposed to teach main lesson and then describe and explain about conversation strategies as clarification the point and get the student familiar to conversation strategies and how they should get turn to answer the questions and in their conversations through showing some clips within the book and clarify some signals and cues which showed as conversation
strategies. In each session, after reading the passage, the teacher presented the students with the challenging conversation strategies to ask questions and answers of the students and also in their conversation together. When the teacher is the current speaker, then firstly the teacher can nominate a student to be the next speaker. If the teacher does not nominate the next speaker, then the teacher must continue the turn. If a student is the current speaker then they select the next speaker and the teacher takes the turn. If the student does not select the next speaker then anyone can self-select as next speaker, with the teacher taking the turn if they self-select. If the teacher or another learner does not self-select then the student continues the turn. The students were asked individually to come the board and interact with teacher based on considering the conversation strategies and also in pairs between students as show the point and clarify the conversation strategies by changing the role speaker and hearer directly and tangible as sample to other students until the time let us. The control group received the same strategies implicitly and was taught in traditional and ordinary conversation.

These conversations on the post-test were recorded in each group and rated by two raters to estimate the inter-rater correlation (i.e. Pearson correlation analysis). The pre-test reliability index was \( r = .796 \) and for the post-test, it was \( r = .901 \) which showed appropriate indexes. Both the pre-test and the post-test were performed as part of the classroom evaluation activities under the supervision of the instructor.

The main sources of data collection for this study were the data obtained after the trend with regard to the pre and posttests. Two teacher-made checklists each consisting of ten questions were developed to be used for pretest and posttest.

5.4. Data Analysis

To analyze the data obtained through the pre and the post-test, a Paired and Independent Sample t-test procedure was employed and the results reported. Independent Samples t-test was run to compare the conversation ability of control and experimental groups' pre and post-tests. The Paired Samples t-test was used to compare the pre and post-test results of each group. Therefore, the results of the statistical analysis may provide direct answers to the research questions.

5.5. Results

To answer the research questions sixty EFL learners of either sex with the age range of 17-19 studying in high school in Poldokhtar, Iran selected among ninety students were chosen to take part in a pre-test to be known as homogeneous. The same rooms were used for both groups during the instructional and testing period and while directions were given. The first t-test calculation showed that the two groups were homogeneous. According to the data in table 1 in pretest, for control group, the calculated mean and the standard deviation were respectively 31.68 and 21.56, and for experimental group, they were respectively 32.53 and 21.45.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics (Pre-test, Experimental vs. Control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.68</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.53</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the pre-test calculated means and the standard deviations of the experimental and control groups, they were respectively 21.45 and 21.56. To show the significant difference, independent samples t-test reveals the difference between the experimental and control groups in Table 2.

Table 2: Independent Samples t-test (Pre-test, Experimental vs. Control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test for Equality of Variances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows the observed t (1.425) is less than the critical t (2.000) with df=58. Thus the difference between the groups is not significant at (p<0.05). The results of the post-test descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics (Post-test, Experimental vs. Control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.68</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.93</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the post-test calculated means and the standard deviations of the experimental and control groups, they were respectively 20.86 and 21.56. To show the significant difference, independent samples t-test reveals the difference between the experimental and control groups in Table 4.

Table 4: Independent Samples t-test (Post-test, Experimental vs. Control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-2.303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics (Control and Experimental Groups' Pre and Post-test)
Table 4 shows that the observed $t$ (2.303) is greater than the critical $t$ (2.000) with $df=58$, the difference between the groups is significant at ($p<0.05$). Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics of experimental and control groups' post-test. Table 5 shows the pre and post-test calculated means and the standard deviations of the experimental and control groups. To show the significant difference, paired samples $t$-test reveals the difference between the experimental and control groups' pre and post-tests in table 6.

Table 5 shows the pre and post-test calculated means and the standard deviations of the experimental and control groups. To show the significant difference, paired samples $t$-test reveals the difference between the experimental and control groups' pre and post-tests in table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair 1</th>
<th>Control Pre-test</th>
<th>31.68</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>21.56</th>
<th>3.21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Post-test</td>
<td>31.68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>Experimental Pre-test</td>
<td>32.53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental Post-test</td>
<td>44.93</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Paired Samples $t$-test (Control and Experimental Groups' Pre and Post-test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>Lower 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Upper 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Control Pre- vs. Post-test</td>
<td>6.533</td>
<td>28.467</td>
<td>5.197</td>
<td>-17.163</td>
<td>4.096</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>Experimental Pre- vs. Post-test</td>
<td>-25.466</td>
<td>14.972</td>
<td>2.733</td>
<td>-31.057</td>
<td>-19.875</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that the observed $t$ (1.257) is less than the critical $t$ (2.045) with $df=29$, the difference between the control groups' pre and post-tests is not significant at ($p<0.05$). However, the observed $t$ (9.316) is greater than the critical $t$ (2.045) with $df=29$, the difference between the experimental groups' pre and post-tests is significant at ($p<0.05$).

Since the observed $t$ (1.257) is less than the critical $t$ (2.045) with $df=29$, the difference between the groups is not significant at ($p<0.05$). While the observed $t$ (8.666) is greater than the critical $t$ (2.045) with $df=29$, the difference between the groups is significant at ($p<0.05$).

Throughout the study, two $t$-tests were administrated. According to Hatch and Farhady (1981) if the $t$-observed is higher than $t$-critical, our hypothesis is approved. After there were one dependent variable and one independent variable, a $t$-test was run.

As the above results show, $t$-observed is smaller than the $t$-critical at the $p<0.05$ level of significance for pre-test. Based on these results, it can be concluded that the difference between two groups is not meaningful and both groups are nearly homogeneous (see Table 2). Later, both groups were given a similar post-test. During testing administration, both groups favored the similar conditions. As there were one dependent variable and one independent variable, a $t$-test was run; the results are shown in the Table 2. Table 2 indicates the observed $t$ ($t_{o}=1.425$) is less than the critical $t$ ($t_{c}=2.000$) with $df=58$; therefore, the difference between the two groups has not been significant at the level ($p<0.05$). This shows the groups' homogeneity at the beginning of the experiment.

The $t$-test for post-test (Table 4) indicates that the observed $t$ ($t_{o}=2.023$) is greater than the critical $t$ ($t_{c}=2.000$) with $df=58$, the difference between the two groups is significant at the level ($p<0.05$). In other words, F-move trait has been effective in developing participants' conversational ability. Thus, it indicates that students' knowledge of conversation in experimental group improved significantly.

As Table 5 represents, the calculated mean and the standard deviation for control group were respectively 31.68 and 21.56, and for experimental group, they were respectively 44.93 and 20.86. The means for both groups have been illustrated in Table 5. All in all, according to t-test principles if the calculated t-test exceeded the critical value (2.000) at the (0.05) level of probability for $df=58$, the null hypothesis might be rejected; otherwise, it might be contributed to other factors.
More specifically speaking, descriptive statistics including minimums, maximums, means, and then standard deviations of pre-test and post-test of all groups were computed. Results indicated that the mean score of control group which had been 31.68 in pre-test exam reached to 31.68 in post-test exam. It also indicated that the mean score of experimental group which had been 32.53 in pre-test exam promoted to 44.93 in post-test exam.

6. Discussion
Results of the study showed that the control and experimental groups were almost homogeneous based on the pre-test scores. To answer the research question, an Independent Sample t-test was conducted to find if there were any meaningful differences between the results of the experimental and control groups in the post-test. The analysis of covariance rejected the null hypothesis revealing a significant difference between turn-taking and wait-time users and nonusers. The main aim of learning a language is to use it in communication in its spoken or written forms. Classroom interaction is a key to reach that goal. It is the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings or ideas between two or more people, leading to a mutual effect on each other. Through interaction, students can increase their language store as they listen to or read authentic linguistic material, or even output of their fellow students in discussions, skits, joint problem-solving tasks, or dialogue journals. In interaction, students can use all they possess of the language—all they have learned or casually absorbed-in real life exchanges (Gass & Sellinker, 1994).

The results of this study are matched with Brown (1994) who emphasize the importance of interaction among human beings and using language in various contexts to “negotiate” meaning, or simply stated, to get one idea out of your head and into the head of another person and vice versa.

This study described the participant, setting, instruments, and materials. It contained the research design, procedures to conduct the testing, description of the treatment, and outline of the data collected. The performing of measures to support social validity, internal validity, and external validity were described. The test results, treatment data, and observations of using the pre-reading activities were provided in this study. Quantitative data collected before, during, and after treatment show that this trend was useful and significant improvement learners’ conversation was recorded during the treatment period. Most speakers have difficulties in sharing conversation strategies while speaking to each other. It was supposed that if conversation strategies are into account, the quality of conversation will improve. This investigation aimed at examining how turn-takings enhance the quality of speech and conversation in EFL conversations, with respect to the choice of various conversation strategies. Through conducting the current project, it was revealed the experimental group getting benefits of conversation strategies outperformed the control group.

7. Conclusion
This study proposed new way of teaching conversation through turn-taking and wait-time strategy applied by teachers that facilitate learning conversation in EFL contexts. This is considered as an effective tool for carrying out this teaching process. In this respect, EFL learners can be familiar with such tools in enhancing their learning. Finally, it is vital for instructors to choose appropriate teaching strategies, turn-taking and wait-time, and observation tasks to suit their learners’ needs in specific context.

Bringing strategies such as turn-taking and wait-time might attract students’ attention and enhance the quality of conversations. The students may feel bored with the class environment in traditional way. This may cause greater concentration on the learning materials. This atmosphere is supposed to increase learners’ relaxation much more than where learners receive instructions through traditional approaches. Finally, the learners seemed more motivated in conversation through turn-taking and wait-time strategy. In this way, learning may not be any more a difficult activity for EFL learners.

All in all, resorting to turn-taking and wait-time strategy to teach conversation may improve the speaking skills and conversation quality of EFL students and give them a model of performance not only language through using linguistic expressions, but also the use of pragmatic functions of language.
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ABSTRACT
THE IMPORTANCE OF TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING IS SO INFLUENTIAL IN SLA RESEARCH AND STUDY THAT A LOT EFFORT HAS BEEN MADE IN THIS AREA OF SLA. SEQUENCING PEDAGOGICAL TASKS HAS ALSO RECEIVED QUITE ENOUGH ATTENTION SO AS TO CONVERT RATHER COGNITIVELY COMPLEX TASKS INTO SIMPLER AND MORE MANAGEABLE ONES. THE PRESENT STUDY FOCUSES ON HOW TO SEQUENCE PEDAGOGICAL TASKS TO INVESTIGATE THE RELATIVE EFFECT OF TASKS SEQUENTIAL FACTORS. PARTICIPANTS OF THE STUDY WERE 180 STUDENTS OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDYING AT STATE AND AZAD UNIVERSITIES IN MALAYER, IRAN CATEGORIZED INTO 6 THIRTY-STUDENT GROUPS. ALL PARTICIPANTS WERE NATIVE SPEAKER OF PERSIAN, AND THEIR AGE RANGE WAS 19 TO 25. THEIR LEVEL OF PROFICIENCY WAS PRE-INTERMEDIATE. THE PEDAGOGICAL TASKS WERE SEQUENCED BASED ON CODE COMPLEXITY, COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY, AND COMMUNICATIVE STRESS FACTORS. THE DATA COLLECTED WAS THOROUGHLY LOOKED INTO BY STATISTICAL ANALYSES AND THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS WERE REVEALED: SEQUENCING TASKS BASED ON CODE COMPLEXITY SHOWED THE LEAST AMOUNT OF EFFECT ON PERFORMING THE TASKS. COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY AND COMMUNICATIVE STRESS SEQUENCING CAST NEARLY THE SAME EFFECT. HOWEVER, ALL FACTORS SEQUENCED SIMULTANEOUSLY HAD THE GREATEST EFFECT ON THE TASKS PERFORMANCE.
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Introduction
The importance of paving the learning path or route for second language learners has been emphasized during the past decades of SLA research. This reported issue started with the comprehensible input hypothesis by Krashen, the conversion of input in intake by Van Patten, and output hypothesis by Swain and Izumi 2002, and recently, in the past decade it has manifested in the issue of sequencing tasks in order for learners to tackle the tasks in a more geared teaching units. A number of researchers attribute the issue of task sequencing to the task difficulty and the elements contributing to the difficulty of tasks, all overlapping and influencing each other. Nunan (1989) does an analysis of some elements influencing task difficulty. He maintains these elements are provided by the input. They include: text grammatical complexity, text length, the amount of information in the input, vocabulary, speed of delivery, salience of the information, discourse structure, the genre, and the amount of pictorial support provided. Nunan also discusses learners’ factors; all factors brought to the task performance by learners, such as confidence, motivation, prior experience, learner capability and knowledge, and cultural awareness. Type of information provided, amount of reasoning and cognitive operation needed, precision required, learners’ knowledge and familiarity with the task, and the abstractness of the task concepts are considered by Prabhu (1987).
Other bunch of elements affecting the task difficulty in general, and in particular the sequencing pedagogical tasks are considered by others, such as Candling (1987) focusing on cognitive complexity, communicative difficulty, clarity of task operations, linguistic complexity, continuity between tasks, Brindly (1987) offering learners relevance, complexity of instruction, cognitive demands, provided context, language demand, assistance given, accuracy required, and time available.
Various models and proposals have been offered to sequence or grade pedagogical tasks to deal with the complexity and difficulty involved in task itself and performance. Skehan and Foster (2001) propose that more demanding tasks consume more attentional resources resulting in less attention available for focus on forms; therefore, sequencing tasks from less cognitively demanding to more demanding optimizes opportunity for attention allocation to language form. They argued that this can be done because certain task characteristics predispose learners to channel their attention in predictable way. They maintain that tasks should be sequenced by choosing those characteristics that lead to an appropriate level of difficulty, as determined by three factors: code complexity, cognitive complexity, and communicative stress.

In this vein, Ellis (2005) puts forth a model with three sets of factors: first, the inherent characteristics of the task, second, the task conditions and the processing operations involved in completing the task, and finally, the outcome that is required. Ellis continues with the distinction between intra-learner variability and inter-learner variability. He considers task complexity as a factor accounting for inter-learner variability - the variability seen in the performance of various tasks done by individual learners.

Willis (2007) argues that tasks sequenced form less to more difficult minimize what he argues are the negative effects of increased cognitive and attentional demands on linguistic performance.

Robinson (2005, 2007, and 2007) assumes behaviour descriptions of the target task for populations of learners are starting point for pedagogic task design. Based on behavioural descriptions, task conditions are classified using task characteristics in terms of participation and participant variables. Participation variable include: optional or fixed solution to the task, one-way or two-way information exchange, and with agreement or disagreement. Participant variable includes: familiarity of the interlocutors, share cultural background, etc. Similarly, task complexity is classified using task characteristics in terms of cognitive/conceptual and performative/procedural demands.

In very recent studies on cognitive demands and motivational impact of variously classified task characteristics and their effect on speech production, uptake, and longer term memory for input provided during task performance, the accumulating findings about the effect of task characteristics contributing to their complexity on the accuracy, fluency are beginning to appear (Jackson and Suethanapornkul 2010).

Statement of the problem
Sequencing pedagogical tasks in order for learners to cope with the above-mentioned elements contributing to the complexity and difficulty of tasks is quite highlighted in SLA literature and many educators and teachers regard that as an important issue in designing and performing tasks. However there have been few empirically tested models to present the actual sequencing procedures for sequencing pedagogical tasks. Thus, the present study is to shed more light on the sequencing procedures by scrutinizing Skehan and Foster’s model of sequencing tasks. According to this model tasks can be sequenced based on three factors. Code complexity encompassing linguistic complexity, vocabulary load, and redundancy, cognitive complexity including: topic familiarity, task familiarity, and information clarity, and finally, communicative stress which consists of time limits and pressures, number of participants, and the opportunity to control interaction. The main focus of the study is to investigate the effect of either of these factors and the relative influencing role of each factor on its own. One of which has a more sequential impact of sequencing tasks, or their effect is equally salient.

Method
Participants
Participants are 180 undergraduates studying Teaching English as a Foreign Language and English Literature in Azad University, Malayer Branch and Malayer State University. The chosen subjects are at the second semester of their undergraduate program. All are native speakers of Persian. The age range is between 19 to 25 years old. The subjects are categorized into 6 groups randomly, each comprising 30 members. Groups are entitled as: no-task, task but no-sequencing, sequencing based on all factors, sequencing based on code complexity, sequencing based on cognitive factors, and sequencing based on communicative stress.
Table 1. The names of the six groups of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP A</th>
<th>GROUP B</th>
<th>GROUP C</th>
<th>GROUP D</th>
<th>GROUP E</th>
<th>GROUP F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No-task</td>
<td>No-sequ</td>
<td>Seq-all</td>
<td>Seq-code</td>
<td>Seq-cog</td>
<td>Seq-com</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instruments**
To move toward the purpose the study, a number of educational instruments have been applied. First, a book of grammar “communicate what you mean” by Carrol Washington Pollock, was the main source of grammatical textbook of the study. Second, a number of pedagogical tasks were designed based on the Willis task-based framework involving eight steps of task performance. Preparation, pre-task warmer, task, planning, report, post-task, language focus, and language practice. The Structure Section of the TOEFL test as the pre-test and post-test with sixty sandwiched items on English clauses as the targeted form to learn.

**Procedures**
The first step to run the study was to give 230 candidates to the study the Structure Section of the TOEFL test as the pre-test and homogenising tool to pick out the homogeneous subjects. The second step was to randomly divide the subjects into 6 groups namely: Groups A, B, C, D, E, and F. The third step was to apply the sequencing tasks in each group as follows: Group A received no task-based teaching. This group received an explicit teaching of the structure under study - English Clauses. Group B received a task-based teaching of English Clauses, but without any sequencing of tasks. Subjects in this group received designed tasks with level of difficulty at the level of target tasks without sequencing. Group C was given the sequenced tasks based on all factors. Group D was given the Code Complexity as sequencing factor. Cognitive complexity was checked in Group E, and Communicative Stress was the sequencing element in group F.

Table 2. Sequencing criteria for pedagogical tasks used in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Code Complexity</th>
<th>A. linguistic complexity</th>
<th>B. vocabulary load</th>
<th>C. redundancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Cognitive complexity</td>
<td>A. topic familiarity</td>
<td>B. tsk familiarity</td>
<td>C. information clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicative Stress</td>
<td>A. time limit and pressures</td>
<td>B. number of participant</td>
<td>D. opportunity to control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actual treatment of sequencing was conducted based on the mentioned sequencing factors cited in table 3.2, but with the focus on the targeted sequencing factor via three steps of grading. To sequence tasks grounded on code complexity the following chart was utilized.

Table 3. Code complexity sequencing procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>connector</th>
<th>subject</th>
<th>verb</th>
<th>Noun/adj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather complex</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart is graded from simple to complex according to the linguistic elements that they should provide, for example the task which is linguistically simple requires learners to provide only a noun or an adjective in a blank. However, rather complex one requires learners to add an appropriate verb along with its noun or adjective. And finally a complete clause is required in complex part which is supposed to be the most complex one.
Table 4. Cognitive Complexity sequencing procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher explanation</th>
<th>Familiar topic</th>
<th>Information organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather complex</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As clear in the table, three elements increase or decrease the cognitive load of a task, namely teacher explanation, familiarity with the task, and organization of information in the task. A task is considered simple in terms of cognitive complexity if task performers are provided with all elements and complex if task performers are not provided with all them.

And finally, the devised tasks were sequenced in terms of communicative Stress factors as shown in the following table:

Table 5. Communicative stress sequencing factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>The length of time to do the task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Number of people in groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher controlling</td>
<td>Teacher controlling and presence while the task is being done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communicative stress load increases and decreases based on length of the provided time to do the task, number of participant in groups to perform the task, and teacher’s supervision and presence while students are performing the task.

The more the amount of the time available to do the task, the less complex the task is. In other words, if task performers have enough time to perform the task, they are more likely to have less communicative stress. In addition, number of participants in a group changes the amount of communicative stress available in performing the task. Groups with four or more participants are more likely to have less communicative stress. On the other hand, groups with the teacher’s supervision seem to have more communicative stress. Tasks were sequenced based on the following table:

Table 6. Communicative stress sequencing procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Rather complex</th>
<th>Complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Four performers</td>
<td>Three performers</td>
<td>Two performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s controlling</td>
<td>No teacher controlling</td>
<td>Some teacher controlling</td>
<td>Teacher controlling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

In order to investigate the possible effects of sequencing elements of a task, various statistical and procedural steps were taken. To make sure that the participants of the study possess a homogeneous level of proficiency, a test of TOEFL with 60 sandwiched items on clauses was given to the target population. The results of running a descriptive statistics show the statistical information regarding the homogenized participants on the TOEFL test. The results of the descriptive statistics of all groups are presented in the following table:

Table 7. Descriptive statistics of all homogenized groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>explicit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>63.9333</td>
<td>10.07193</td>
<td>101.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasknosequ</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>61.5667</td>
<td>11.65209</td>
<td>135.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasksequall</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>61.1333</td>
<td>11.78173</td>
<td>138.809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To be sure of homogeneity of the subjects, the researcher ran a one-way ANOVA to show this quality better. The following table demonstrates the homogeneity of the subjects.

The One-way ANOVA to check homogeneity of the subjects on the pre-test explicit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>465.778</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93.156</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25543.133</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>146.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26008.911</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was not a statistically significant difference at the $P < .05$ level in the homogenizing TOEFL test scores for the six groups: $F (6.6350), p = .674$. That means that the subjects of the study were roughly at the same level of ability on the pre-test.

Having had six homogeneous groups, the researcher conducted the study by applying tasks to the groups. The tasks were graded according to the criteria for sequencing tasks. The mean scores of each group were scrutinized via an ANOVA to detect any significant difference among the groups. The outcome of the ANOVA is presented below.

One-way ANOVA of six groups on the post test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>11524.907</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2881.227</td>
<td>40.838</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>10230.033</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>70.552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21754.940</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By taking a look at tables 4.7., one can easily find out that there is a significant difference among the groups. ($F = 40.838, p < 0.05$). Therefore, it can be concluded that there were significant differences among groups performance on the test. In addition, to tap the exact location of difference among the six groups, a post hoc analysis was run. The outcome of the post hoc is shown in the next table.

Multiple Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) VA002</th>
<th>(J) VAR00002</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasknosequ</td>
<td>tasksequall</td>
<td>-18.93333*</td>
<td>2.16875</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-25.7005 to -12.1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
<td>-5.333</td>
<td>2.16875</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-7.3005 to 6.2338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicative</td>
<td></td>
<td>-17.73333*</td>
<td>2.16875</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-24.5005 to -10.9662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasksequall</td>
<td>tasknosequ</td>
<td>18.93333*</td>
<td>2.16875</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>12.1662 to 25.7005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By looking at the multiple comparisons, it can be easily seen that there is a difference among the groups. And it is quite apparent that the amount of the mean difference and the outcome of the post hoc illustrate a pattern for the impact of each sequencing factor on the performance of the tasks.

**Discussion**

The purpose of the present study is to demonstrate the effect of sequencing factors or the elements which, if granted, can decrease the task demand for attentional resources which if not controlled result
in less attention available for focusing on the target form. In performing a pedagogical task, certain factors are important to take into account like linguistic complexity, cognitive complexity, and communicative stress. This study was an attempt to demonstrate the influence of the sequencing factors on sequencing tasks and to tap the relative effect of each factor on the amount of the demand of tasks after sequencing in terms of sequencing factors. The study revealed a significant difference among the sequencing factors. The output of the multiple comparisons among the groups with a sequencing factor focused in performance of a task unravels the significant difference among the groups. The group with linguistic elements to sequence possesses the smallest mean score, 70.56, and the cognitive and communicative stress groups show higher mean scores, 78.76 and 78.76, respectively. The mean scores of the two groups are the same, but their SDs are quite different as 6.71 and 6.39. By looking at the mean difference and the SDs of groups, it is revealed that tasks sequenced in terms of linguistic elements plays the least in reducing the complexity load of a task. Communicative stress and cognitive factors come to the second and the third positions, accordingly. If compared with the group having all sequencing factors, each group with a sequencing factor shows a significant difference. The mean score of all-factor group is 79.96 which is the highest one indicating that all sequencing elements have a relative load reducing role in complexity of a task.

Studies in the same area of sequencing and grating tasks mainly focus on the identification of sequencing elements and the importance of sequencing rather than which element to sequence or on the relative effect of introduced sequencing elements in the performance of a task. Studies conducted by Prabhu (1987), Candling (1987), Brindly (1987), Nunan (1989), Skehan and Foster (2001), Ellis (2005), Willis (2007), Robinson (2007), and Jackson and Suethanapornkul (2010) emphasize on the sequencing factors like task difficulty elements, learners factors, information type, cognitive operation, familiarity with the task, communicative difficulty, clarity of task operations, continuity between tasks, etc. but not on which element to sequence.

Conclusion
The first conclusion that can be drawn from the findings of the present study is the uselessness of sequencing tasks based on code complexity solely. Linguistic elements have their own importance; however, in sequencing tasks it seems that other factors play other important roles to reduce the attention taking factors of the task structure and presentation. In addition, it was revealed that cognitive and communicative stress factors have nearly the same effect on task-sequencing process. There seems to be a kind of correlation or relation between the factors to sequence pedagogical tasks. In this study their influence in the sequencing tasks has turned out to be the same.

The third conclusion which is definitely worth mentioning is the accumulative effect of all three factors of sequencing tasks. All sequencing factors vary in the amount of effect on sequencing process; however, when they are considered altogether, they make a big difference. It means that all factors do their own part, but sequencing factors altogether enjoy the trait of the holistic effect on sequencing which is quite different from its own components.
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ABSTRACT
THE AIM OF THIS STUDY WAS TO INVESTIGATE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTIVATIONAL GOAL ORIENTATIONS AND LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES. TO THIS END, TWO QUESTIONNAIRES WERE ADMINISTERED NAMELY, THE INVENTORY OF SCHOOL MOTIVATION AND STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING. IN TOTAL, 305 STUDENTS OF JAHROM, KAZERUN, AND SHIRAZ UNIVERSITIES PARTICIPATED IN THIS STUDY, 74 MALE STUDENTS AND 231 FEMALE STUDENTS RANGING FROM 18 TO 30 YEARS OF AGE. IN ORDER TO ANSWER THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS, PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION WAS USED. THE DATA WERE ANALYZED USING STATISTICAL PACKAGE FOR SOCIAL SCIENCES VERSION 19. THE RESULT OF THE STUDY INDICATED THAT THERE WAS A WEAK NEGATIVE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTIVATIONAL GOAL ORIENTATIONS AND LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES. THE IMPLICATIONS ARE DISCUSSED AT THE END OF THE STUDY.
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1. Introduction
Motivation has been considered as the most important factor in learning a second language successfully (McInerney & McInerney, 2000). It is a process which begins with a need and leads to a behavior that helps individuals achieve their goals (Melendy, 2008). In SLA, motivation refers to the attempts which are made by individuals in order to learn a language and the positive attitudes that they have towards learning a language (Dornyei, 1994). The issue of achievement goals has recently become the center of attention of many motivation researchers (Uebuchi, 1995) and they are considered as fundamental elements of motivation and learning (Schunk, 2003). Since achievement goal orientation influences students’ learning behavior, achievement goal researchers have carried out studies to understand how these goals are related to students’ scores (Tanaka & Fujita, 2003), learning strategies (Nakano, 2012; Nakayama, 2005; Sato, 2004), learning time (Nakayama et al., 2012), learning beliefs (Nakayama & Heffernan, 2013), and foreign language learning anxiety (Nakayama et al., 2012). Considering the pivotal role of motivational goals in learning foreign languages and their relationships with effective behavioral and affective variables in learning English, this study
investigates the relationship between achievement goal orientations and behavioral factors (i.e., learning strategies and learning time), language learning beliefs, and language learning anxiety in an Iranian EFL setting.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Motivation in Second Language Acquisition (SLA)

Comprehensive studies on second language acquisition theory and research (e.g., Ellis, 2004; Gass & Selinker, 1994; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Spolsky, 1989) list several factors which explain success in learning foreign languages. These factors include the age of exposure to foreign languages, cognitive or learning style, language aptitude, personality, learning strategies, the environment of learning, as well as motivational and attitudinal factors.

As Bley-Vroman (1989) mentioned in the Fundamental Differences Hypothesis, adult second and foreign language learners not only consciously study linguistic features like pronunciation and grammar, but they also think about non-linguistic matters such as their goals, anxiety, learning beliefs, and strategies to learn the language effectively. Among these non-linguistic factors, motivation has been considered as the most important factor in learning a second language successfully which can influence other factors as well (McInerney & McInerney, 2000). On the other hand, the issue of achievement goals has attracted many motivation researchers' attention too (Uebuchi, 1995).

2.2 Achievement Goal Theory

Achievement goal theory states that learners bring different types of goals like performance goals and mastery goals into the classrooms (Elliot, 2005). Students who follow a mastery goal tend to develop academic competence, while learners who seek a performance goal would like to show their competence relative to others. The modified versions of this theory have included the approach-avoidance dimensions (see Elliot, 2005) which led to four kinds of achievement goals: performance approach, mastery approach, avoidance, and performance avoidance.

Although the standards of success might be different, mastery and performance goals focus on the attainment of personal competence. The emphasis on personal competence can be seen in items which are used to utilize these two goals. Learners are asked whether the reason why they would like to study is because the material is interesting to them (mastery approach) or because they want to show that they outperform other students (performance approach) (Dowson & McInerney, 2004). It is agreed upon that the goals of mastery approach are adaptive which lead to deep learning strategies, investment of more effort in school, and motivational engagement (e.g., Wolters, 2004). A recent study has shown that mastery goals are associated with outcomes of beneficial learning across different cultures (Hulleman et al. 2010).

2.3 The role of social goals in school

Studies on achievement goal have provided a vast body of knowledge on how performance and mastery goals influence achievement-related behaviors (Elliot, 2005), but the limitation of achievement goal framework is that it focuses on performance goals and competence-related mastery and ignores other kinds of goals like social goals which can motivate students (King, 2012). Dowson and McInerney (2001) maintain that students' goal orientations are not peripheral to academic performance and achievement; on the contrary, these goal orientations might impact students' psychological processes directly when they try to gain academic achievement.

In the present study, Maehr's Personal Investment Model (PIM) was used as the theoretical framework which assumes a multidimensional conceptualization entailing social goals as well as performance and mastery goals (Maehr & McInerney, 2004). Personal Investment Model will be explained below.

2.4 Maehr’s Personal Investment Model

Maehr’s Personal Investment Model is a comprehensive model of motivation. It states that students’ behaviors are the result of what they perceive of their context, their academic tasks, the events that happen around them, and many other factors. The personal meaning that an individual makes of the context comes from their goals, their sense of self, and what they perceive as action possibilities. In order to depict the present context of study, the components of the model are expanded on. Four contributing factors, namely, the Sociocultural Context, the Teaching-Learning Situation, Personal Experiences, and Information affect these three concepts which determine Personal Investment. Personal incentives refer to four kinds of achievement goals: social solidarity, ego goals, extrinsic
rewards, and task goals. Sense of Self is comprised of: Sense of Purpose, Sense of Competence, and Self-Esteem. This model is used as the theoretical framework for this study in order to identify the variables that were most successful at predicting academic success of Iranian EFL university students. This model examines a wide range of goals across different cultural settings. It offers a more generative framework for investigating the influence of different kinds of goals including social and achievement goals on learning outcomes. It is a cross-culturally relevant theory of achievement motivation presenting a multidimensional model of motivational goals in learning contexts. It is in contrast to achievement goal theory in that achievement goal theory has been criticized for having a narrow and restricted conception of goals since it mainly focuses on performance and mastery goals. Personal investment theory provides distinct advantages in comparison with other theories of achievement motivation, and it has minimized the role of culture in achievement motivation (McInerney & Liem, 2009). Since its conception, personal investment theory has been devised to be culture-sensitive by including several goals which are important to students from different cultures (McInerney & Liem, 2009). This theory characterizes three categories of motivational goals as significant for understanding achievement-related behaviors: performance goal, social goal, and mastery goal (Watkins et al. 2002).

Goal theory had some major shortcomings. Firstly, it assumes a bipolar continuum which has mastery goal at one end and performance goal at the other end whereas research studies suggest that these goals are not incompatible and an individual might have both goals simultaneously (Maehr, 1984). The second limitation of goal theory was that little attention was paid to the group oriented goals and it mainly had an individualistic flavor rather than a collectivist essence. Maehr’s personal investment model is an extension of goal theory aiming at focusing on the limitations mentioned above. This model assumes that motivated behavior is determined by three goal variables: beliefs about self, perceived goals of behavior, and action possibilities.

The first component of the model is beliefs about self or sense-of-self. It refers to perceptions, beliefs, and feelings of an individual. It comprises several components such as sense of purpose, sense of autonomy, and sense of competence each of which plays a role in the motivational orientation of individuals and interacts with the motivational goals. The second component of the model as described by Maehr is perceived goals of behavior which refers to what an individual considers as failure or success in a specific situation. Maehr suggested four universal goal systems: social solidarity, task, ego, and extrinsic rewards. It is assumed that each of these goal structures plays a role in the motivational orientation of an individual. The third component of the model is action possibilities which refers to behaviors that a person considers appropriate in a specific situation.

Based on Maehr’s personal investment model, McInerney and his colleagues (McInerney, Yeung, & McInerney, 2000, 2001) devised a hierarchical and multidimensional model of goal orientations which reflects a wide range of goals. There exist eight goals in this model: competition, social concern, task, praise, effort, social status, affiliation, and extrinsic rewards which can also be classified into four more general goals: performance, mastery, social, and extrinsic goals at the pinnacle of which is general motivation. Therefore, an instrument called the Inventory of School Motivation (ISM) was developed to assess the constructs of this model (McInerney, Roche, McInerney, & Marsh, 1997). This instrument has been used in various studies which have examined the motivational factors in academic achievement in different cultures (McInerney et al., 1997). Table 2.1 provides information on the three types of achievement goals of the Personal Investment Model.

2.5 The Inventory of School Motivation

The Inventory of School Motivation (ISM) was devised by McInerney and Sinclair (1991) in order to measure motivational goal orientations. The ISM was formulated to describe motivational characteristics of individuals and groups to investigate the discrepancies and similarities among groups, explain outcome variables, and predict future behavioral outcomes in terms of individual and group characteristics. It measures the central aspects of Personal Investment in an educational environment. The ISM is not a standardized inventory but an exploratory one which can be adapted to a particular cultural context (McInerney & Sinclair, 1991). This study attempts to answer the following research question:

What is the relationship between motivational goal orientations and language learning strategies?

3. Method

3.1 Participants
In order to collect the required data, three Iranian universities were selected using cluster sampling. The universities included Shiraz, Jahrom, and Salman Farsi Universities in Shiraz, Jahrom and Kazerun, respectively. The participants were female and male students of English language. In total, 305 students participated in this study, 74 male students and 231 female students ranging from 18 to 30 years of age. All of them were native speakers of Persian studying English as a foreign language at university.

3.2 Instruments

3.2.1 Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

The first instrument used in this study was the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) developed by Oxford (1990). There are two versions of SILL first of which is used for learners whose native language is English consisting of eighty items. The second version of SILL is used for learners whose first language is not English comprising fifty items. The second version was used in this study. According to Oxford and Burny-Stock (1995) this questionnaire is a very reliable instrument. They reported a reliability of .86 with 156 students. The content validity of the SILL was found to be very high as calculated by them. The English version of this instrument was used in this study.

The SILL is comprised of six subcategories and each part of it shows one of the six categories of Language Learning Strategies (LLSs). The categories include compensation strategies, memory strategies, social strategies, meta-cognitive strategies, affective strategies, and cognitive strategies. The students were required to respond to the items on a 5-point Likert scale from ‘Never or almost never true of me’ (1) to ‘Always or almost always true of me’ (5). Tahmasebi (1999) calculated the Cronbach’s alpha reliability of this questionnaire to be 0.91. The reliability coefficient of the SILL in this study was 0.95.

3.2.2 Inventory of School Motivation

The first questionnaire was the Inventory of School Motivation (ISM) developed by Ali and McInerney (2004). The ISM was devised in order to measure motivational goal orientations of students. It was designed to describe the motivational characteristics of individuals and groups to investigate the discrepancies and similarities between groups, explain outcome variables like performance, and predict future behavioral outcomes (McInerney & Sinclair, 1991). McInerney and his colleagues (McInerney, Marsh and Yeung, 2003) proposed a hierarchical and multidimensional model of goal orientations based on Maehr’s Personal Investment Model (PIM). The questionnaire consisted of 43 items and had four dimensions each of which had two subscales which are as follows: Mastery: Task, Effort, Performance: Competition, Power, Social Affiliation: Social Concern, Recognition, External Goals: Token/Rewards. They are grouped into three more general goals which are social goals, mastery goals, and performance goals. General motivation is on the top of the hierarchy. According to Azadikhah (2012), the internal consistency of the questionnaire was 0.93; the Cronbach’s alpha for Task was 0.70, Effort 0.72, Competition 0.82, Social Power 0.85 Social Affiliation 0.79, Social Concern 0.78, and Token/Rewards 0.87. In this study, the reliability coefficient of the ISM was calculated by coefficient alpha to be 0.91.

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

First, the students were informed about the objectives of the study. Then, they were given the instructions regarding how to answer the items of the questionnaires. They were also assured about the confidentiality of the information that they were supposed to provide. Having received the questionnaires from the students, the researcher scored, and entered the data into a spread sheet in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 19. Then, descriptive statistics were computed and reported. The data underwent some descriptive statistics such as frequencies, mean, and standard deviation together with correlational analyses. Then, further inferential analyses were performed to find answers to the research questions.

To investigate the relationship between motivational goal orientations and language learning, Pearson Product-Moment correlation was run.

4. Results

4.1 The relationship between motivational goal orientations and language learning strategies
Table 1 shows the results of a correlation analysis using Pearson Product-Moment formula between goal orientations and language learning strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational Orientations</th>
<th>Language Learning Anxiety</th>
<th>Language Learning Belief</th>
<th>Language Learning Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Motivation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.199**</td>
<td>.381**, .054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000, .351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Learning Strategies</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.266**, .025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.667, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 4.1, there was a weak negative relationship between motivational goal orientations and behavioral factors \( r = -.054, \text{Sig.} = .000, p < .01 \). This finding is in contrast to that of Oxford and Nyikos (1989) who found motivation to be the most important factor influencing the use of language learning strategies. It is also in contrast to McIntyre and Noels’s (1997) finding which concluded that highly motivated learners used second language learning strategies more frequently than less motivated individuals. It is also in contrast to the findings of the study done by Chang and Huang (1999) who investigated the relationship between integrative and instrumental motivation and the use of strategies in Taiwanese university students in the United States and found that the number of learning strategies was associated with the level of motivation. However, it is in line with the findings of Ziahosseini and Salehi (2008) who did the same study and reported that there was not a significant relationship between the choice of language learning strategies and the level of motivation.

### 5. Conclusion

Thus far, an overall picture of the study has been presented. Now, it is time to recapitulate briefly on the research questions and the findings derived from the data. The study found that there was a weak negative relationship between motivational goal orientations and language learning strategies meaning that the level of motivation is not related to the use of language learning strategies.

### 6. Implications

Findings of this study can be beneficial for teachers and learners as well as educational psychologists. The findings of this study can prove helpful for teachers to pay more attention to the affective factors of learners. These findings can also help instructors to predict their learners’ anxiety, beliefs, and behaviors. Teachers can adjust their teaching plans according to their students’ characteristics to facilitate their learning.

### 7. Limitations and suggestions for further research

There were some limitations to this study. Inferences drawn from the results of this study cannot be generalized to other contexts because of cultural differences. Another limitation was that the sample was not evenly distributed since there were 74 males and 231 females and this could affect the results of the study. Therefore, generalizing the findings of this study to other contexts and situations should be exercised with caution. Since this study was a quantitative one and just made use of questionnaires, more longitudinal and qualitative studies with in-depth interviews are needed to understand individual differences in greater detail.
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### Appendices

#### Appendix I. The Inventory of School Motivation (ISM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I like being given the chance to do something again to make it better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I try harder when university tasks are more interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I like to see that I am improving in my university tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I need to know that I am getting somewhere with my university tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I don’t mind working a long time at university tasks that I find interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I try hard to make sure that I am good at my university tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>When I am improving in my university tasks I try even harder.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The harder the problem the harder I try.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I try hard at university because I am interested in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I work hard to try to win.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I am always trying to do better in my university tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Winning is important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Coming first is very important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I like to compete with others at university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I work harder if I’m trying to be better than others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I want to do well at university to be better than my classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I am only happy when I am one of the best in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I work hard at university so</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I want to feel important in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>At university I like being in charge of a group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>It is very important for me to be a group leader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22 I work hard at university
23 I often try to be the leader of a group.
24 I do my best at

Appendix II. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)
1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I use new English words in a sentence so that I can remember them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I use rhymes to remember new English words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I use flashcards to remember new English words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I physically act out new English words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I review English lessons often.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I say or write new English words several times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I try to talk like native English speakers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I practice the sounds of English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I use the English words I know in different ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I start conversations in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I read for pleasure in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I first read over an English passage quickly then go back and read carefully.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I try to find patterns in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I try not to translate word for word.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>To understand unfamiliar English words, I make.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT
THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY WAS TO INVESTIGATE THE TYPES OF FEEDBACK EFFECTIVE AND NON-EFFECTIVE TEACHERS EMPLOY IN THEIR EFL CLASSES. THE STUDY ALSO AIMED TO INVESTIGATE WHETHER THERE WAS ANY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TYPES OF FEEDBACK PRESENTED BY THE TEACHER AND THE STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNING ENGLISH. THE DATA WERE ANALYZED QUALITATIVELY. THE STUDY REVEALED THAT EFFECTIVE TEACHERS USED ALL FOUR TYPES OF FEEDBACK I.E. EFFECTIVE, DESCRIPTIVE, EVALUATIVE, AND MOTIVATIONAL (BROOK, 2011), WHEREAS NON-EFFECTIVE TEACHERS EITHER IGNORED DIFFERENT TYPES OF FEEDBACK OR JUST RELIED ON CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK WHICH WAS, IN MOST CASES, EXPLICIT. THE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA INDICATED THAT THERE WAS A STRONG RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TYPES OF FEEDBACK STUDENTS RECEIVED AND THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNING ENGLISH. THE FINDINGS OF THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION ARE BELIEVED TO HAVE PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS, IN RELATION TO: A NEW APPROACH TO RESEARCHING DIFFERENT TYPES OF FEEDBACK, NOT JUST CORRECTIVE ONE; UNDERSTANDING THE HIGH IMPACT AN APPROPRIATE TYPE OF FEEDBACK MIGHT HAVE ON STUDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS ENGLISH AND THEIR TEACHERS.

1. INTRODUCTION
Feedback raises learning achievement of learners and teachers performance. Therefore, feedback is an important factor to create learning inspiration. Cohen (1985) stated that feedback was an important and powerful tool in designing teaching. (Hattie, 2007) defined feedback as an outlined idea of information necessary for understanding and performance of other people such as teachers, executives, friends, books, parents, or oneself. Feedback on what is right or wrong is usually given by teachers to learners, and by administrators and external experts to teachers. Feedback giving useful information and various choices is usually given by teachers to fellow teachers.

Black and William (1998) identified two roles of feedback: giving directions and solutions (directive feedback); and giving directions to help learners improve their learning experiences by themselves (facilitative feedback). In sum, feedback gives learners, teachers and practitioners clear ideas and reasonable thought processes. However, effective feedback depends on various factors such as characteristics of learners, capacity and motivation, and difference of expected learning outcomes such as learning sustainability and burden transfer, etc.

Hattie and Timperley (2007) suggested that feedback reduced the difference between knowledge understanding, and present learning results and expected outcomes. Teachers and learners can reduce the gap with effective feedback. Additionally, three questions must be answered:
1) Where am I going or what are the goals of learning?
2) What am I supposed to do to achieve the goals of learning?
3) Where do I go next or what activities need undertaking to make better progress?
These three questions match three types of feedback: feed-up, feed-back and feed-forward. Answering the three questions comprehensively helps reduce the gap of teachers’ and learners’ learning quality. Levels of feedback also play an important role in improving teachers’ and learners’ quality. Task performance, processes of understanding how to do a task and/or self or personal levels are different levels of feedback giving different learning results. Effective feedback must give two kinds of information to learners (Kulhavy & Stock, 1989): 1) information used to validate the truth and 2) information suggesting that learners find answers by themselves. Good feedback must give both kinds of information (Bangert-Drowns et al., 1991). In the context of teaching and learning languages, various definitions of the term feedback have been proposed. Most of these definitions indicate that feedback refers to informing learners about their work in progress. More specifically, this form of interaction shows learners their errors and guides them to correct their work (Ur, 1996; Lewis, 2002). An important point that needs consideration concerns the purpose of providing feedbacks. According to (Boud , 2002), “A good feedback is given without personal judgment or opinion, given based on the facts, always neutral and objective, constructive and focus on the future” (p. 7). Thus, feedback should be seen as a constructive approach on improving students’ performance.

Feedback is essential for improving both teaching and learning; the feedback teachers receive from students, tests, and observers is an invaluable source of information enabling them to find out to what extent they have been successful in their teaching and what they need to do to make their teaching more effective. Feedback also influences learning in that it provides an opportunity for learners to know what they need to do in order to improve. Chaudron (1988) elaborates feedback from teacher’s and learner’s perspectives. In any communicative exchange, speakers drive from their listeners’ information on the reception and comprehension of their message. From the language teacher’s point of view, provision of feedback is a major means by which to inform learners of the accuracy of both their formal target language production and their other classroom behavior and knowledge. From the learners’ point of view, the use of feedback in repairing their utterances, and involvement in repairing their interlocutors’ utterances may constitute the most potent source of improvement in both target language development and other subject matter knowledge (p. 132-133). Gipps (1994: 129-130) believes that feedback is important for two reasons: “it contributes directly to progress in learning through the process of formative assessment, and indirectly through its effect on pupils’ academic self-esteem”. Having received feedback from teachers, students are encouraged to adopt appropriate strategies to improve their learning. Also by influencing students’ self-concept and self-esteem feedback indirectly impacts learning (Craven et al, 1991). Gipps states that the feedback students receive includes messages about their effectiveness and self-esteem that influences the benefits they might get from feedback. Richards et al. (1992: 137) perceive feedback as “information which provides a report on the result of behavior”. Ur (1996: 242) considers feedback as «information that is given to the learner about his or her performance of a learning task, usually with the objective of improving this performance». Feedback as (Ur (1996)) explains includes two major components: assessment and correction. The assessment component informs learners of the quality of their performance. Grades and general comments are examples of assessment component of feedback. The correction component provides learners with specific information on particular aspects of performance or behavior. Providing explanations, elicitation of correct response from the learners themselves, or elicitation of correct response from other learners constitute examples of this component of feedback.

Feedback that improves learning comes either externally or internally: External feedback comes from teachers and peers. Ellis (1991) 71 maintains that “teachers have a traditional right to supply the learners with feedback regarding the correctness or appropriateness of their responses”. (p.71) Teachers’ feedback seems to be necessary for learners as it helps them to notice the gap in their linguistic performance. According to Carnell (2000), teachers’ feedback clarifies goals, gives a sense of direction, identifies mistakes, and provides advice. However (Nunan ,1989) refers to a number of studies that consider teacher feedback inconsistent and inaccurate. Ellis (1991) reasons that the inconsistency in teachers’ feedback is related to the complex nature of teaching task and the differences in learner proficiency.

The study reported in this article has been conducted in an attempt to meet the need for more research on different types of feedback an effective and a non-effective teacher employs to increase understanding of the following factors:

1. The types of feedback an effective teacher employs
2. The types of feedback a non-effective teacher employs

3. The relationship between the types of feedback employed by the teacher and students' attitudes towards learning English.

Students need to recognize their errors and have a suitable kind of feedback from their teachers. Since there is no fixed type of feedback in English classes, the present study is going to investigate what types of feedback an effective teacher gives to his students in Iranian EFL classes in high schools which are mainly based on Grammar Translation Method and investigate the relationship between the types of feedback and students' attitudes towards learning English.

Research questions
1. What types of feedback are employed by EFL teachers in their first grade of senior high school classes?
2. Which types of feedback are used more frequently by effective teachers in their EFL classes?
3. Is there any relationship between the type of feedback provided by the teacher and the students' attitudes towards learning English?

The research questions gave rise to the following research hypothesis (RH):

There is a positive relationship between the types of feedback and students' attitude towards English as a foreign language.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of language classroom discourse has undergone various interpretations. Nunan (1993) views classroom discourse as "the distinctive type of discourse that occurs in classrooms". Discourse in the language classroom is a matter of the oral use of language in the classrooms. At least 35 years ago, an important direction in applied linguistics and education research sought to understand the nature and implications of classroom interactions, or what is commonly referred to as "classroom discourse". One influential approach to the study of spoken discourse, as acknowledged by (McCarthy, 1991), was carried out by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) at the University of Birmingham. Sinclair and Coulthard suggested a three tier approach, beginning-middle-end, to focus on the distinct «moves» that take place, which can be considered as question-answer-comment in the classroom environment, or command-acknowledgement-polite formality, as occurs in a shop between the client and the shopkeeper. Broadly speaking, classroom studies can be viewed from three different perspectives (Johnson and Johnson, 1998):

1. From the perspective of interaction (between teacher/learners with each other)
2. From the perspective of the effects of instruction on language development.
3 From the perspective of whether different methods of instruction have different effects on language development. According to (Chang, 1999: 2-3), discourse in a classroom can be divided into four structures as follows:

   1. IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback)
   2. Instruction
   3. Probing Questions
   4. Argumentation.

IRF: IRF may have a traditional pattern of discourse, when the teacher asks a question, the student answers and the teacher evaluates. The teacher continues to ask another question and so the sequence continues. «In this typical three-part structure, the teacher initiates a question in order to check a student’s knowledge, a student’s responses, and the student’s response is evaluated with feedback from the teacher» (Richards et al., 1992: 52). The students' answers are usually brief and students are concerned about giving correct answers that are expected by the teacher. The main role of the teacher is asking questions, but only a few students are actively involved.

Instruction: Another type of discourse is giving instructions. The teacher gives directive or informative statements. The students do not answer verbally; however, they understand the statements as instructions by following them physically.

Probing Questions: The probing question is another discourse structure. The teacher asks Referential questions or «thinking questions» (Brown, 2001: 171) and the students are encouraged to give longer answers through their thinking. Their answers may challenge the teacher's position. However, evaluation does not come immediately after the students' responses.

Argumentation: Argumentation can be regarded as probing questions where the teacher involves the students in a challenging situation in order to make them to justify their reasons. The questions
asked are commonly referential questions, which try to elicit predictions, explanations and clarification from the students. The argumentation may be in question or statement forms. Mehán (1979, as cited in Ellis, 1990: 88) offered three structural components of a pedagogic discourse:
1. An opening phase where the participants inform each other that they are in fact going to conduct a lesson as opposed to some other activity.
2. An instructional phase where information is exchanged between teacher and students.
3. A closing phase where participants are reminded of what went on in the core of a lesson.
McTear (1975, as cited in Ellis, 1994: 577) observed four types of language use in EFL classroom discourse:
1. Mechanical (i.e. no exchange of meaning is involved),
2. Meaningful (i.e. meaning is contextualized but there is still no new information to be conveyed),
3. Pseudo-communication (i.e. new information is conveyed but in a manner that would be unlikely to occur outside the Classroom),
4. Real communication (i.e. spontaneous speech resulting from the exchange of opinions, jokes, classroom Management, etc.).
Relevant to McTear’s argument here about the types of language use is (Ellis’s (1990, 86) distinction that «pedagogical discourse is believed to be a product of mechanical and meaningful types of language use, whereas natural discourse is believed to result from real communication type of language use» (Ellis, 1990: 86). However, Kramsch (1985, as cited in Ellis, 1990: 86) considers classroom discourse as composed of “a continuum extending from pedagogic to natural discourse poles”. The interaction between group members in a classroom moves between the two poles of this continuum consisting of instructional options. Pedagogic discourse occurs when the teacher and the students act out institutional roles, the tasks are concerned with the transmission and reception of information controlled by the teacher and there is a focus on knowledge as product and on accuracy. Natural discourse, on the other hand, is characterized by much more fluid roles established through interaction, tasks that encourage equal participation in the negotiation of meaning and a focus on the interactional process itself and on fluency.

2.1 Types of Feedback
2.1.1 Evaluative feedback
Evaluative feedback has been described as forms of ‘judgments made on the learners’ performance (Nunn, 2001). This form of feedback is found to be the most dominant type of feedback used in second and foreign language classrooms (Gattullo, 2000). Teachers employing this form of feedback would express words or phrases to indicate that the learner’s response is acceptable. In most cases, the common signals are ‘Good’, ‘Very Good’, ‘yes’, ‘Correct’ and ‘ok’. From the data analysis, it was commonly found that the teacher’s feedback would follow two patterns: i) the teacher repeating the answers (response) given by the students ii) the teacher praising the students after giving a correct response. The following extracts exemplify these patterns.

2.1.2 Interactive Feedback
Richard and Lockhart (1996) identified ‘interactional feedback’ as a strategy to expand or modify a student’s answer. In the following example, the teacher initiated the exchange followed by praises (yes; very good). However in the following exchange, the student was hesitant to continue by responding with an incomplete answer. Thus to assist as well as encourage the student, the teacher provided extended information to complete the students’ response to the question. Providing such assistance is not considered a negative feedback but rather ensures that the flow of discourse is uninterrupted and promotes communicative language use in the classroom.

2.1.3 Corrective Feedback
According to Ellis (2009), corrective feedback can be considered a type of negative feedback. In this exchange, the teacher provides feedback on a student’s utterance that contains an error. The feedback can consist of several forms: i) to indicate the error, ii) to provide the correct form of error committed, and iii) extended (metalinguistic) information about the error such as the nature of error.
2.2 Brook’s model
Brook (2011) believed that corrective feedback is just one part of all four types of feedback that an English teacher must provide (Brook, p.217). In his model which consists of four types, all feedbacks that an effective teacher should provide are listed:

1. **Effective**
   - Goal is to get the students to internalize the effective feedback to use the suggested strategies independently on future work.
   - Feedback that is intended to be used by the learner to independently move their reasoning to the next level.
   - Criteria-based phrases are used to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the learner’s work.
   - Limits feedback to one or two traits/aspects of quality at a time.
   - Students should have an opportunity to “redo” their work based on the effective feedback.
   - “I agree with the pattern that you have identified in the table. I am not convinced that the rule you wrote works for all the values in the table. How could you prove this?”

2. **Descriptive**
   - Goal is to improve student achievement by telling the learner how to move forward in the learning process.
   - Feedback that is intended to tell the learner what needs to be improved.
   - Feedback isn’t as effective in getting students to move forward in the learning process.
   - “You accurately found the number of students in 4th grade who said chocolate ice-cream was their favorite. You now need to divide this number by the total number of students to get the percent who said chocolate ice-cream was their favorite.”
   - Goal is to correct the students’ mistakes.

3. **Evaluative (corrective)**
   - Goal is to measure student achievement with a score.
   - Feedback that is intended to summarize student achievement.
   - It does not give guidance on how to improve the learner’s reasoning.
   - Since it is not intended to move students forward in the learning process, it can be given on summative assessments.
   - “Your explanation of your work is the best that you have done. Nice use of sequence words in your explanation.”

4. **Motivational**
   - Goal is to make the learner feel good.
   - Feedback that is intended to encourage and support the learner.
   - It does not give guidance on how to improve the learner’s reasoning.
   - Since it is not intended to move students forward in the learning process, it can be given on summative assessments. “I like how you completed the assignment.”

## 3. METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Participants

Two groups of participants namely students and teachers contributed to this study:

#### 3.1.1 Students

There were two groups. The first group was those students whose classes were observed and then completed the questionnaire of the present study and also those who attended the interviews and prepared the questions for the questionnaire. These will be discussed in detail below.

A total of 120 male EFL learners aged 15-17 from three schools in district 2 (Ministry of Education) in Isfahan (Harati, Saremieh, and Eslam) participated in this research. Among 19 senior high schools in District 2, these research sites were chosen because they are the most reputed schools in district 2, Harati and Saremieh are the top state senior high schools where the students have to pass an entrance exam as pre-requisite to be registered. On the other hand there was is a private senior high school selected as an example of lower class school where no entrance exam is needed for enrolment and they have students with lower average scores. To reassure the students were at the same level of educational level, only first grade of senior high school students were selected. Permission to conduct...
the research was obtained from the schools’ authorities and from the teachers for observing their classes.

3.1.2 Teachers
The second group of the individuals who contributed to this study was the EFL teachers of the three schools (Haratti, Saremieh, and Eslam) in district 2, Ministry of Education in Isfahan. There were four teachers, two of them taught in Haratti and Saremieh (teachers A and B) and two of them taught in Eslam (teachers C and D).

3.2 Instruments
In this study, two main instruments were used to collect the data. These are discussed below:

3.2.1 Interview
An interview was done about the general characteristics of effective English teachers and the participants were asked why they liked some of their teachers and not others.

3.2.2 Questionnaire (Effective and non effective EFL Teacher)
Since the aim of this study was to address what types of feedback are provided by effective and non-effective EFL teachers and also the students’ attitudes towards characteristics of an effective English teacher, an attitude questionnaire with five-point Likert scale was administered to student participants in this study. The students were asked to complete a questionnaire about general qualifications of an effective teacher and which types of feedback they preferred. The form of the questionnaire asked for the student participant’s name (optional) and age and provided a very short introduction to the aims of the research. The 30 items in the questionnaire addressed the characteristics of an effective English teacher and also the types of feedback a successful English teacher provides in his/her classes, as represented in Table 3.1 below (see Appendix). According to four expert judges, eleven questions were related to different types of feedback (4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 27, 30) which is cluster 1 and other cluster (1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29) is related to general qualifications of an effective English teacher (see appendix).

Table 3.1: The Specifications of the Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Specification</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Feedback</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 27, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Qualifications</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2.1 Piloting the questionnaire
Prior to administrating the questionnaires to the target participants, it was piloted with a sample of 25 students with similar characteristics as those of the target group of the study. Four questions were to be addressed by the piloting phase of the questionnaire:

Were the questionnaires items clear to the participants?
The piloting of some of the items revealed that they were not clear for the sample population and therefore were revised in the final form.

Were there any words or phrases in the items which needed more explanation or clarification?
The pilot session indicated no problematic word or phrase to the participant.

What were the reliability estimates for the total questionnaire and its different clusters?
There were two clusters in the questionnaire (see Table 3.1) whose reliability was 0.6 for cluster 1 and 0.5 for cluster 2 and the total reliability of 0.55 for the whole questionnaire.

What was the length of time necessary for the participants to complete the questionnaire?
The pilot session indicated that 20 minutes would be adequate for the participants to complete the items in the questionnaire.

3.3 Procedure
The collection of data happened in two phases
In the first phase (class observation), all the interactions between the teacher and the students were video recorded. All four classes were observed and video recorded for three session each.
In the second phase of all four classes, a single-copy of questionnaire was handed out to the participants at the end of each session. The researcher guided them how to answer the questionnaire and the students were asked to complete the questionnaire in 20 minutes. They were required to first read the cover page carefully and then fill out the three page questionnaire.

3.4 Data Analysis
As mentioned above the present study was of qualitative type. It employed whole class observation to indicate the types of feedback provided to the students. Several models on types of feedback have been suggested by teachers in EFL or ESL classes, however most of them focused on corrective feedback. Only a few of such models focus on different types of feedback including corrective. Since the present study aimed to find out what types of feedback EFL teachers used in their classes, a model which included various feedback types was needed for addressing the collected data (Brook’s (2011)).

4.1 Result
To answer the first research question of this study (What types of feedback are employed by EFL teachers in their senior high school classes?), The observation of four classes also showed that the non-effective teachers usually didn’t give different kinds of feedback according to (Brook’s (2011) model) (Effective, Descriptive, Evaluative, or Evaluative a motivational) and the only type of feedback they used was Evaluative (corrective). The result was showed in table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of feedback</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
<th>Teacher D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative (corrective)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Types of feedback non-effective teachers employ (N=66)

4.3. Types of feedback used by Effective Teachers
The second research question (Which type of feedback is used more frequently by effective teachers in their EFL classes?) was formulated in order to examine the types of feedback provided by effective teachers. The full observations of both two classes in Harati and Saremieh senior high schools which were the top schools in District 2 (in which their students' average score was above 19.50) clearly showed that successful teachers used different types of feedback appropriately in their classes. Their feedbacks were completely in harmony with Brook’s (2011) Model in proper using of feedback in their EFL classes. Table 4.2 shows the frequency of types of feedback used by effective teachers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Feedback</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Types of feedback employed by Effective Teachers (N=262)

4.3. The Relationship between Types of Feedback and Students' attitude
To investigate the third question which aimed at knowing the relationship between the types of feedback and students' attitudes towards learning English as a foreign language (Is there any relationship between type of feedback provided by the teacher and the students' attitudes towards learning English as a foreign language) Analyzing the questionnaires showed that there is a positive relationship between the types of effective feedback given to them and their interests in English learning related to types of feedback showed the following results in percent. The table below shows...
the students' attitudes towards learning English based on the types of feedback they received: The number of items related to the types of feedback are explained.

Table 4.3: The students' attitudes towards learning English based on the types of feedback they received in percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Related to the Types of Feedback</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to see the relationship between cluster one which was about the types of feedback and cluster two which was about the general characteristics of an effective teacher, correlation was needed. Table 4.4 shows the mean of the total score of the questionnaire. According to the procedure used to assign numbers to each of the options of the questionnaire, when somebody chooses the option "strongly agree" for all of the items, the total score of that person is 80.

**DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, LIMITATION, and IMPLICATIONS**

Restatement of the problem

Research hypothesis

RH: There is a positive relationship between the types of feedback and students' attitudes towards learning English as a foreign language.

The qualitative phase of the present study (observation and questionnaire) aimed to investigate the following main points:

- What types of feedback effective and non-effective teachers employ in EFL classes, and what are the students' attitudes towards learning English based on the types of feedback they receive.
- The results of the qualitative study were conducted on 120 candidates. Based on the third question the following hypothesis (RH) was outlined.

RH: There is a positive relationship between the types of feedback and students' attitudes towards learning English as a foreign language.

The findings of the research based on analyzing the questionnaire revealed that there is a positive relationship between the types of feedback and students' attitudes towards both the teacher and learning English.

Research on error correction has not provided a clear understanding of the benefits of error correction on learning. The term 'learning' has been used by Krashen (1981), to refer to the development of conscious knowledge. Krashen and Terrell define acquisition as 'developing competence by using language for real communication'. However, this research is concerned with different types of feedback provided by both effective and non-effective teachers. Few studies have been done on different types of feedback but all of them focused on corrective one and no one focused on different types of feedback including corrective.

In summary, this study has examined the types of feedback employed by both an effective and a non-effective teacher in EFL classes as well as the students' attitudes towards learning English based on the types of feedback they received. I have adopted a qualitative approach to gather the data including observation and questionnaire. The qualitative phase of this investigation involved expert judges' identification and categorization of the questions in questionnaire.
The key findings of this research indicated that effective teachers employ all four types of feedback according to Brook's model (see 2.6.7) and there is a strong relationship between these types of feedback and students' attitudes towards learning English. Since most researches were done on corrective types of feedback, this research focused on all types of feedback and I hope in future more research is done with different groups and different participants in a new language center.

The study needs to consider limitations in order to assist better research conducted in the future. If the researcher had a greater amount of time, he could consider the research questions in a more detailed perspective. The findings of the present investigation are believed to have pedagogical implications, in relation to:

- A new approach to researching different types of feedback, not just corrective one;
- Understanding the high impact an appropriate type of feedback has on students' attitude towards English and their teachers.
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Appendix
The following questionnaire has some questions related to the characteristics of an effective teacher. Please answer the questions accurately. There is no right or wrong answer but your opinion about this subject. Please read the questions and mark your answers showing your degree of agreement or disagreement. All the answers will be confidential.
1: Name (optional)
2: Age
3: last year average
4: living place
5: Gender.
1: An effective teacher is energetic and conducts the class activates interestingly
2: Having a clear pronunciation is one feature is an effective teacher.
3: An effective teacher uses pantomime to convey the meaning in a better way
4: An effective teacher gives me another chance self correct if I make a mistake
5: An effective teacher explains the cultural points in the text and expresses the similarities and differences between two cultures.
6: An effective teacher should give the correct answer immediately after a student answered incorrectly.
7: Giving reward by a score is one of the characteristics of effective teachers
8: Setting assignment as homework and checking it in class is a feature an effective teacher does have
9: An effective teacher expresses my weak point in front of the others in order for the others not to repeat that mistake
10: An effective teacher greets with his students at the beginning of the class to make a more friendly atmospheres
11: An effective teacher gives his students another opportunity to correct their mistakes
12: An effective teacher respects all students and never makes fun of a student because of his race.
13: Analyzing the test paper is a feature an effective teachers possesses
14: An effective teacher gives the important strategies for next levels while giving feedback
15: An effective teacher is available even after school
16: An effective teachers classes are happy but with discipline
17: An effective teacher walks among the students and answers his questions while they are doing the exercises
18: An effective teacher gives reward to even weak students when this student is making progress.
19: Giving score causes that the students concentrate more on the next activity
20: A an effective teacher uses pair work and group work a lot.
21: There is a harmony between the level of difficulty of the tests during the course and final test
22: The best indicator of an effective teacher is his manner in class
23: An effective teacher motivates his shy students to talk more
24: An effective teacher remembers his students' names.
25: An effective teacher evaluates the level of his class in the first session and adapts his teaching method to this level
26: An effective teacher covers all parts and doesn’t ignore some sections just because of not being included in the final exams.
27: An effective teacher should correct his students all mistakes
28: Establishing a competitive atmosphere is one of the biggest roles of effective teachers
29: An effective teacher is on time and finishing the class on time
30: An effective teacher gives reward difficulty
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Introduction
By the emergence of the works on learning strategies that was inspired by the studies of Rubin and Stern in the mid-1970s and shaped by the efforts of Omally and Chamot from 1982 to 1990, the areas of language learning and teaching witnessed great changes, and the roles and responsibilities of individuals became more important (Brown, 2000). Ellis (1994) emphasized on the mediating role of strategy between learners and situational factors and learning outcomes. He defined learning strategy as “the particular approaches or techniques that learners employ to try to learn an L2” (p. 76-77). Mainly, strategy was regarded as a tactic or technique by which learners might be devised. Accordingly different classifications of language learning strategies came into existence. Omally and Chamot (1990) attempted to ground the study of learning strategies within the information-processing model of learning by Anderson (as cited in Ellis, 1994. p. 533). Omally (1985), and Omally and Chamot (1990) classified learning strategies into three main groups of metacognitive, cognitive and socio-affective with 25 subcategories. Oxford (1990) classified the general learning strategies into two main categories: direct (cognitive, memory and compensation) and indirect (metacognitive, social, and affective). Each of these subcategories, then, was divided into several subcomponents (see for example Brown, 2007).
In a comprehensive review of learning strategy classifications, Vlckova et al. (2013) presented an overview of the most well-known classifications. Table 1 has been adopted from Vlckova, et al. (2013).
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Strategies classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naiman et al. (1978)</td>
<td>Active task approach, realization of language as a system, realization of language as a mean of communication, management of affective demands, monitoring of L2 performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dansereau (1985)</td>
<td>Primary and support strategies are differentiated and further subdivided according to a language task (reading, writing, vocabulary learning, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Malley et al. (1985)</td>
<td>Metacognitive, cognitive and socioaffective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinstein &amp; Mayer (1986)</td>
<td>Primarily building upon the difference between learning strategies and teaching strategies. The major 6 groups of learning strategies are differentiated according to whether they are suitable for basic or complex learning tasks (rehearsal, elaboration, and organizational strategies). Further 2 groups are comprehension monitoring strategies (e.g., checking for comprehension failures), and affective and motivational strategies (such as being alert and relaxed, to help overcome test anxiety).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern (1992)</td>
<td>Management and planning strategies, cognitive, communication experimental, interpersonal and affective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Much of the work of researchers and teachers on the application of learning strategies to classroom learning has come to be known as strategies-based instruction (SBI) (McDonough, 1999; Cohen, 1998). Cohen (1998) stated that teaching learners how to learn was crucial. Wenden (1985) was among the first to assert that learner strategies were the key to learner autonomy, and that one of the most important goals of language teaching should be the facilitation of that autonomy. From among several strategies of different types, the present study selected from O’malley and Chamot’s (1990) classification, three cognitive strategies of Note taking, Elaboration, and Resourcing. The study attempted to compare the relative effect of training each strategy type on the EFL learners’ reading comprehension.

O’Malley and Chamot (1990) defined note-taking strategy as writing down key words and concepts in abbreviated verbal, graphic, or numerical form while listening or reading. Note-taking strategy is a good reading strategy. As Cambrooke (2010) claimed, “it is a good idea to take notes from textbooks. Note-taking makes students active participants in their learning, helps them organize important concepts, remember information, and become one of their study aids” (p. 26).

In the Iranian EFL context, Hagverdi, Biria, and Karimi (2010) examined the Iranian university professors’ and students’ attitudes towards the effect of teaching note-taking strategies on the students’ academic achievement. The researchers found that respondents including professors and students whether male or female had high positive attitudes towards the effect of note-taking strategy instruction on the students’ learning.
According to Ward and Tatsukawa (2003), note-taking has two functions. First, the notes produced are useful when reviewing. Second, the process of note-taking itself helps students learn the material. This is usually explained in terms of encoding: the student’s mind receives some inputs from the instructor, both verbal and written on the blackboard, and the task is to assimilate them. In the process of taking notes, the student has to re-express those inputs, and while doing so, it is claimed, the ideas get mentally rehearsed and integrated at a deeper level, or even re-encoded mentally in a form that is easier for him to think about, apply, and remember. According to Allen and Reeson (2008), note taking is one of the strategies students can cultivate to increase academic achievement. As students encounter unfamiliar text, they are equipped with the means to extract the most important information while staying engaged with the text.

Documenting some previous studies (e.g., Rowntree, 1976, p.112; kesselman-Turkel & Peterson, 1982, p.6), Department of Lifelong Learning: Study Skills Series (2009), provided a few reasons why note-taking was an important activity: taking notes would help you to 1) extend your attention span, 2) keep you focused on your subject area and the task at hand, 3) remember what you have heard or read, 4) make you an active learner and 5) organize the ideas you are learning about. The notes you produce are your own work and are a visible reminder of the effort you have put into the course. This in itself can be a motivational factor for your study! Note-taking helps you to organize the ideas you are learning about.

Elaboration, according to O’Malley & Chamot (1990), is relating new information to prior knowledge, relating different parts of new information to each other or making meaningful personal associations with the new information. Meanwhile, Gunning (1996) referred to elaboration as an additional processing of the text, by the reader, which might increase comprehension. It involves forming connection between the text and the reader’s background knowledge of the subject. Keshavarz & Mobarra (2003) mentioned that elaboration appeared to serve twin functions of most foreign / second language reading lessons, i.e., improving reading comprehension, and providing learners with the rich linguistic form they need for further language learning as this strategy provides learners with the full form of the language and allows them to encounter, more or less, authentic and native-like material (see also Vandersen et al. in McNamara, 2007).

Resourcing can be defined as using target language reference materials such as dictionaries, encyclopedias, or textbooks (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). This strategy is useful for both reception and production. As Oxford (1990) stated, to better understand what is heard or read, printed resources such as dictionaries, word lists, grammar books, and phrase books might be valuable.

Most models of strategy training involve identifying students’ needs; selecting strategies appropriate to the task; presenting, explaining and modeling the strategies; providing students with practice opportunities; asking students to identify the strategies actually used as a result of strategy instruction and to evaluate their strategies’ usefulness in accomplishing the task; and identifying possibilities for transfer to new situations (Chamot, 2005a, 2005b; Cohen, 1998; Harris & Grenfell, 2004; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990, 2011). Despite the considerable interest in learning styles and strategies, investigations into the effect of learner strategy training on language acquisition are relatively uncommon, and the results are rather mixed (Wong & Nunan, 2011). In the 1980s, when this line of research started to gain attraction, Cohen and Aphel (1980) investigated the effect of strategy training on vocabulary acquisition. They found that certain strategies such as the paired associates’ technique resulted in successful acquisition. At about the same time, Carroll (1981) investigated inductive learning. In this study, the ability to derive rules from samples of language was positively correlated with language aptitude. O’Malley et al. (1985) studied the effect of different types of strategy training (metacognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective) on different language skills. This research found that training had a significant effect on speaking but not on listening. A decade later, in an investigation into the effect of providing opportunities for reflection, self-reporting and self-monitoring among university students, Nunan (1995) found that opportunities to reflect on learning led to greater sensitivity to the learning process over time. Students were also able to make greater connections between their English classes and content courses conducted in English. Finally, opportunities to keep guided journals helped learners to develop skills for articulating what they wanted to learn and how they wanted to learn it. The research did not, however, establish a correlation between strategy training and acquisition.

In the Iranian EFL context, many researchers have attempted to investigate the effects of teaching different learning strategy types on the learners’ achievement in academic settings. Hagverdi, Biria,
and Karimi (2010) conducted a survey study to investigate the Iranian professors’ and students’ attitudes towards the effect of teaching note-taking strategy on the students’ achievement. The results of their survey revealed that the respondents including professors and students whether male or female have had high positive attitudes towards the effect of note-taking strategy instruction on the students’ learning. Their research findings were consistent with the previous research conducted in the field (e.g., Dunkel & Davy, 1989; Mee, 1991; Van Meter, Yokoi, & Pressley, 1994 and Kobayashi, 2005, all cited in Hagverdi, et al., 2010).

In another study, in the Iranian context, regarding the cognitive strategy of Resourcing, Akbari (2014) found a significant relationship between the EFL learners’ use of bilingual dictionaries and their reading comprehension skills. The researcher concluded that, consulting a dictionary is a skill and not all L2 learners, even adult university students, are skilled users. The students need to develop strategies for using a dictionary efficiently and effectively. For example, efficient dictionary use may be enhanced by having students identify the word class of a word prior to consulting and focusing their dictionary search on the entries in that word class only. As well, both the quality of the meaning determined and retention of that meaning may be enhanced by encouraging students after consulting to reread the sentence substituting and fitting in the meaning generated through consulting rather than to just continue to read. (p. 157)

In the Indonesian EFL context, Ratna (2014), in a descriptive study, investigated the most frequently used cognitive strategies among EFL students in Indonesia to enhance their reading comprehension. The aim of the study was to find out which cognitive reading strategy was considered the most helpful to be developed by the EFL students specially in answering reading comprehension tests successfully. This study was descriptive research investigating cognitive reading strategies frequently used among EFL students at one of universities in Garut, Indonesia, to enhance their reading comprehension. This study also aimed to find out which cognitive reading strategies were considered the most helpful to be developed by the EFL students especially in answering questions in reading comprehension tests successfully. The data were obtained from two sources: a self-report questionnaire administered to 76 students and Thinking-Aloud Protocols conducted with 15 students. The data were analyzed using instruments adapted from the content of the text, guessing the meaning of a word from context, using the dictionary for the important words, and considering other sentences in the paragraph to figure out the meaning.

In Canada, Goyette (1995) also found a strong relationship between dictionary use and text comprehension among Canadian students. The researcher investigated whether dictionary support improved text comprehension. The study compared readers’ first-language and second-language text comprehension across three dictionary conditions and two proficiency levels. Recall dictionary usage and reading times were the measures employed. Subjects were anglophone members of the Canadian Armed Forces military personnel with high-intermediate to advanced French second language skills. Procedural texts were used: subjects read both an LI and an L2 text in each of three conditions: (a) no dictionary access; (b) access to hard-copy dictionaries; and (c) access to on-line computerized dictionaries. The number of words looked up varied greatly by language, by proficiency level and by dictionary modality, with a far greater number of words accessed in L2 than in L1, by intermediate-than by advanced-level readers and in the on-line rather than in the hard-copy dictionary condition. The variance in dictionary usage was explained by the two-way interactions between language, proficiency level and dictionary condition. Most readers expressed a preference for on-line dictionaries, reporting that ease of access led to faster and better text comprehension, but this impression was not confirmed by the findings. Analyses of recall protocols indicated that there was no main effect for the type of dictionary consulted. Similar levels of recall were found on all passages read with access to dictionaries, regardless of the language of presentation. Significantly lower recalls were found on passages read with no access to dictionaries, with L2 recall lower than LI recall. This study indicated that the type of dictionary accessed did not significantly influence comprehension. The high number of L2 dictionary look-ups suggested that readers might use dictionaries to compensate for weaker second language vocabulary skills, resulting in similar levels of text comprehension across languages.

In the same line of research, the present study was a further attempt to compare the relative effects of three cognitive strategies of resourcing, elaboration, and note-taking on the Iranian EFL learners’ reading comprehension. The study attempted to answer the following research questions:
1) Does teaching ‘elaboration’ as a cognitive strategy improve the Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners’ reading comprehension?

2) Does teaching ‘note-taking’ as a cognitive strategy improve the Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners’ reading comprehension?

3) Does teaching ‘resourcing’ as a cognitive strategy improve the Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners’ reading comprehension?

4) Are there significant differences among the effects of teaching the three strategies in improving the learners’ reading skill?

Method

Participants
The sampling technique was intact groups sampling since the participants were selected from three available classes at the pre-intermediate English proficiency level in an English language institute in Tabriz. The total number of students in three selected classes was 49 (16, 18, and 15). The classes met three times a week for one and a half hours. The differences among the three classes regarding their reading skill, at the beginning of the research was examined by a standard reading comprehension test adopted from a version of PET (Preliminary English Test). After the results of the test showed that the differences among the three groups were not statistically significant, and the groups were almost equal, the three classes were randomly labeled to three experimental conditions of Elaboration, Note-taking, and Resourcing according to the type of treatment they would take.

Instruments and Materials
The main instrument for data collection in the study was the preliminary English Test (PET) which had four sections of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. However, for practical considerations and since the focus of the study was reading comprehension, only the reading section of the PET was employed to examine the initial equality of the groups and also as the indicator of the participants’ pretest performance. A parallel reading comprehension test adopted from another version of the PET was employed as the posttest to examine the participants’ reading comprehension after the treatments.

Both reading tests included five parts each with 7 scores giving the tests a total score of 35. The purpose of pretest was to examine whether the three groups were homogeneous regarding the reading ability at the beginning of the study. The purpose of post-test was to examine whether the students in three classes who received different treatments in terms of teaching three cognitive strategies were equal or different in reading comprehension after treatment. The main material which students used in their classes was the textbook entitled Top Noch. Each unit of the textbook had a reading section that students in each group performed in a different manner according to the experimental conditions in each group. The researcher himself was the teacher of all three classes to control any probable instructional variation.

Design
The design of the study was quasi-experimental with three experimental groups, pretest and posttest. The dependent variable was the participants’ reading comprehension ability. The independent variable was teaching cognitive strategy under three conditions: note-taking, elaboration, and resourcing. Thus, the independent variable had three levels. The age and gender of the participants were regarded as control variables.

Procedure
The study began with the selection of three classes from the pre-intermediate level of English proficiency in an institute in Tabriz. The participants’ performance and scores in the reading test were used to check the initial differences among the groups regarding their reading ability and also as their pretest scores. The three observed mean scores obtained from three experimental groups were compared statistically to find if the groups were different or almost equal in reading comprehension as the dependent variable of the study. The statistical comparisons showed that the groups were not significantly different in reading ability at the beginning of the study. Then, the three classes were randomly assigned to three experimental groups that received three different types of treatment.
corresponding to three conditions of the independent variable, namely note-taking, elaboration, and resourcing. The students in the note-taking group (Group N) were instructed to take notes and write summaries and paraphrases in their notebooks while reading the comprehension passages in their textbooks. The students in the elaboration group (Group E) were given background information about the content of the passages and they were instructed to relate the content of the texts to their own experiences. The students in the resourcing group (Group R) were required to use dictionaries to pick the new words up and write and practice them both in English and Persian.

The treatment lasted for one term including 20 sessions. After the treatment and in their term-final exam, the students, in all three classes, were given the PET reading comprehension test beside their term-final test papers. The participants’ pretest and posttest scores, in each group, were compared to find out if they had improved significantly in their reading ability because of the treatments that had received during the term. Furthermore the mean scores obtained from the three classes, at the post test, were compared to find out if the groups had any significant differences regarding their reading comprehension after different treatments.

**Results and Discussion**

Since the statistical procedures to answer the four research questions, that is, paired samples t-test and One-way ANOVA were parametric inferential statistics methods, the normality of the score distributions had to be checked as a pre-requisite for their use. For this purpose, the One-sample Kolmogrov-Smirnov (KS) test was used to examine the normality of the pretest and post-test scores. Table 2 and 3 show the results of the KS test for pretest and posttest scores.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre DICT</th>
<th>Pre NOTE</th>
<th>Pre ELAB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Parameters</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>13.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviat</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Extreme</td>
<td>Absolu</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogrov-Smirnov</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
Table 3
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Posttest Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Post DIC</th>
<th>Post NOTE</th>
<th>Post ELAB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Extreme Absolute Differences</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

Table 2 and Table 3 show the mean and standard deviation for each group in the pretest and posttest. The experimental group which received instruction in resourcing strategy was labeled dictionary (DIC) group because the participants in this group were instructed to use dictionaries during their class activities. The note-taking and elaboration groups were abbreviated as NOTE group and ELAB group, respectively. Table 2 and Table 3 also show that the p-values depicted in the last row are all above the alpha level of .05 and this shows that the normality assumption could be made. These results could permit the use of parametric inferential statistics.

The probable differences among the three groups, regarding the dependent variable (i.e., reading comprehension), at the beginning of the study were examined by One-way ANOVA (Table 4).

Table 4
ANOVA to compare the Three Pretest Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.206</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>862.69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>869.01</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 4 shows, the p-value obtained was .843 which was higher than the alpha level of .05. Thus, the null hypothesis of no difference among the means could not be rejected. In other words, the differences among the means were not statistically significant and the three groups were almost equal regarding the reading comprehension at the beginning of the study.

To answer the first research question that asked whether teaching ‘elaboration’ as a cognitive strategy could improve the Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners’ reading comprehension, we extracted the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the two mean scores obtained in the pretest and posttest of reading comprehension in the group that received ‘elaboration’ strategy. For this comparison, the paired-samples t-test was required because the comparison was made between two means from one single group. Table 5 shows the results of the paired-samples t-test for ELAB group.
As Table 5 shows, the p-value observed in the last column was .091 and higher than the alpha level of .05. Thus, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between pretest and posttest mean scores could not be rejected. In other words, the participants who received instruction for ‘elaboration’ strategy did not improve significantly from pretest to posttest. Accordingly, the answer to the first research question was negative. Teaching ‘elaboration’ strategy could not improve the participants’ reading comprehension.

To examine the second research question, which asked whether teaching ‘note-taking’ as a cognitive strategy could improve the Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners’ reading comprehension, we extracted the null hypothesis, stating that there was no statistically significant difference between the participants’ pretest and posttest scores in this group. To examine this hypothesis, the researcher ran the paired-samples t-test. Table 6 shows the results of the t-test.

As Table 6 shows, the p-value observed (.017) was below the alpha level of .05. The null hypothesis was rejected and the difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores was statistically significant. Thus, the answer to the second research question was affirmative. Teaching ‘note-taking’ as a cognitive strategy could improve the participants’ reading comprehension in this group.

The third null hypothesis stated that there was no statistically significant difference between the participants’ pretest and posttest scores in Resourcing group. Another paired-samples t-test was run to test this null hypothesis. Table 7 shows the results of the analysis.

As Table 7 shows, the p-value observed was zero and below the alpha level of .05. The null hypothesis, stated above, was rejected and the answer to the third research question was affirmative. Teaching ‘resourcing’ and the use of dictionaries in class activities could improve the participants’ reading comprehension in this group.

To answer the fourth research question regarding the differences among the effects of the three types of instruction in improving the learners’ reading comprehension, we examined the null hypothesis, through One-way ANOVA. Table 8 shows the results of the ANOVA for the posttest scores.
Table 8
ANOVA to compare the Three Pretest Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>203.391</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101.695</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>829.711</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1033.102</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows that the p-value observed (.006) was below the alpha level of .05. The null hypothesis stating that the differences among the three mean scores, at the posttest, were not significant was rejected. However, in order to find the exact place of the difference, a post-hoc analysis was required. From among several options, Scheffe post-hoc statistics was selected. Table 9 shows the results of the post-hoc analysis.

Table 9
Scheffe Post-hoc Multiple Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I) groups</th>
<th>(J) groups</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.027*</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-4.027*</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-4.65</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows the significance of the pair-wise differences between groups. As it is seen in Table 9, group 1 (DIC group) was significantly different from both group 2 and group 3 (p< .05) while the difference between group 2 and group 3 was not statistically significant because the p-value observed (.916) was higher than the alpha level of .05. (p> .05). This means that the participants under the ‘resourcing’ condition outperformed those in the other two conditions in the posttest of reading comprehension.

These results found support for the hypothesis that teaching strategies could lead to improvement in the learners’ language skills. All three experimental groups under three treatment conditions showed some pretest to posttest gains although the gains were only statistically significant in ‘resourcing’ and ‘note-taking’ groups compared to ‘elaboration’ group. This can be possibly explained for the reason that the treatment labeled as ‘elaboration’ was not so tangible for the students. In other words, in ‘elaboration’ group students only received some extra information regarding the content of the reading passages but they did not perform any additional activities like intensive note taking or using dictionary during their class time.

The findings of the study suggest that some learning strategies are easier to employ in EFL classes by teachers and more profitable for learners. In the present study, the ‘resourcing’ strategy, which was activated by using dictionaries during the class reading activities, was the most effective in improving the learners’ reading comprehension.

Although the learners’ attitude to strategy training was not the concern of the present study, the researcher (the teacher) found that the learners in ‘resourcing’ and ‘note-taking’ groups had positive attitudes towards the class reading activities. This by-side finding was compatible with the findings of Hagverdi, et al. (2011) who had surveyed the Iranian EFL learners’ attitudes towards strategy training and found that the respondents including professors and students, both male or female, had high positive attitudes towards the effect of note-taking strategy instruction on the students’ learning. The finding of the present study regarding the positive effect of using resourcing strategy in improving the learners’ reading skill was in line with the study conducted by Akbari (2014) who found a significant relationship between the EFL learners’ use of bilingual dictionaries and their reading comprehension skills.
The findings were also in support of another recent research in the Indonesian EFL context conducted by Ratna (2014) who investigated the most frequently used cognitive strategies among EFL students in Indonesia to enhance their reading comprehension.

**Conclusion and pedagogical Implications**

Adopting a quasi-experimental research design with three experimental groups that received three types of treatments, the present study compared the participants’ reading comprehension pretest and posttest scores. The statistical comparisons showed that the increase in posttest scores was significant only for the participants under ‘resourcing’ and ‘note-taking’ conditions. The further analysis of the posttest results, through ANOVA and Shefe Post-hoc, revealed that the participants in the ‘resourcing’ group outperformed the participants in the other two groups while the difference between the note-taking and elaboration group was not statistically significant.

The research findings showed the possibility and effectiveness of strategy training for EFL learners. It was also found that employing some strategies like dictionary use was more plausible than implementing other ones like elaboration.

It can be concluded that teaching strategy use, at all levels of foreign language instruction, can prove to be very fruitful if we want to bring up really proficient foreign language teachers, translators, and practitioners. How to teach strategies to EFL learners at various levels of proficiency must be the core of teacher training courses and TEFL programs.

The findings of the present study can offer important pedagogical implications. EFL learners should be encouraged to move towards autonomy and independence from teachers to achieve their goals. This is what modern humanistic approaches have referred to as empowerment. As William and Burden (1996) mentioned, the education should shift away from conveying factual information to the learners to capitalize on the notion of learning process. This is what has come to be known as process-oriented as opposed to traditional product-oriented approaches L2 teaching.

The findings of the present research, particularly regarding the effectiveness of dictionary use and note-taking strategies, in EFL classes, in improving the learners’ reading comprehension has the simple message to the field of L2 learning and teaching in our EFL context to encourage learners, as much as possible, to identify their learning styles and strategies and to employ them in their personal learning. Teachers and syllabus designers also carry the important responsibility of motivating the EFL learners for what Brown (2001) has referred to as strategic investment.

The present study was carried out under some limitations and delimitations. Thus, drawing any generalization to other samples and populations must be done quite cautiously. The small size of the sample was one of the limitations of the study. Further research is required with wider samples from variety of learning contexts before drawing valid conclusions.

Moreover, further research seems necessary to compare and contrast the relative usefulness of training different categories of strategies, such as avoidance, compensatory, interactive, and sociocultural strategies on the learners’ achievement in different L2 skills areas. More research is also needed to investigate the possible relationships between strategy use and learners’ personality types. The inter-relationship between strategic investment and sociocultural factors should be also under scrutiny in the future studies.
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ABSTRACT
THIS STUDY AIMED TO PAINT A PICTURE OF HOW PERSIAN NATIVE SPEAKERS (PNSS) RESPOND TO COMPLIMENTS IN COMPARISON TO ENGLISH NATIVE SPEAKERS (ENSS) AND WHETHER PERSIAN L2 LEARNERS TRANSFER THEIR L1 COMPLIMENT RESPONSE (CR) STRATEGIES INTO ENGLISH OR NOT. DISCOURSE COMPLETION TESTS (DCTS) WERE USED TO STUDY THE STRATEGIES EMPLOYED WHEN RESPONDING TO COMPLIMENTS BY DIFFERENT GROUPS OF PARTICIPANTS. DATA WERE ANALYZED BOTH QUALITATIVELY AND QUANTITATIVELY. RESULTS INDICATED THAT THE ENSS AND PNSS HAD DIFFERENT EXPECTATIONS AND FOLLOWED DIFFERENT LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL PROTOCOLS. COMPARED TO THE ENSS, THE PNSS WERE MORE LIKELY TO SCALE DOWN COMPLIMENTS, DOWNPLAY THEIR TALENTS, AND CREDIT-SHIFT, OR RETURN, THE COMPLIMENTS BECAUSE THEY FELT THAT BEING MODEST HELPED THEM ENHANCE THEIR FACE AND SELF-IMAGE. FINDINGS ALSO INDICATED THAT L1 CR STRATEGIES ARE TRANSFERRED TO L2. DUE TO THE LACK OF SUFFICIENT PRAGMATIC KNOWLEDGE, L2 LEARNERS FREQUENTLY RESORT TO PARALLEL FORMS IN THEIR L1.

KEYWORDS: SPEECH ACT, PRAGMATIC TRANSFER, COMPLIMENT RESPONSES (CRS), DCT

1. Introduction
Successful communication has recently become the predominant objective underlying any L2 teaching and learning endeavor. Achievements tend to be mainly assessed in terms of the ability to appropriately produce and comprehend the L2 in interactional situations. Earlier beliefs, concerning the effectiveness of purely syntactic, phonological, and morphological instructions, are further accompanied by the belief on the effectiveness of teaching the “rules of speaking” (Hymes, 1972, p. 46) to improve L2 ability to sustain communication. The notion of communicative competence (Hymes, 1971) was first sustained in second language acquisition (SLA) to refer to the native speakers’ (NSs) ability to use their language in the way that are not only linguistically accurate but also socially appropriate. Hymes (1971) stated that Chomsky’s (1965) idea of competence did not account for the social and functional use of language. He considered Chomsky’s monolithic, idealized notion of linguistic competence inadequate and introduced a broader, more elaborated, and extensive concept of communicative competence, which includes both linguistic competence and contextual or sociolinguistic knowledge of the rules of L2 use in context. Therefore, a new paradigm began to develop based on which L2 learners not only should have mastery over linguistic rules but also they...
need to master the sociocultural rules of speaking. That is, they need to acquire competence as to when to speak, what to talk about with whom, where, and in what manner in order to use the L2 appropriately. So, pragmatics that studies the relation between language contexts and users as well as the resulting grammatical forms is a central element of communicative competence. Pragmatics claims that there is an association between grammar and context, that is, according to the context in which the speaker is, he or she chooses different structures to mean what he or she wants. Growing interest in L2 learners’ pragmatic knowledge and development has given rise to a new area of research known as interlanguage pragmatics (ILP), which mainly deals with the study of nonnative speakers’ (NNSs) use and acquisition of linguistic action patterns in an L2 (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993) and has expanded its scope to include the study of the emergence of intercultural styles and the use of L2 communication strategies. One of the most frequently addressed issues in ILP (Kasper & Rose, 1999) refers to the impact of pragmatic transfer, which is described as the way am L2 learner’s pragmatic knowledge of his or her own L1 and culture influences his or her understanding, use, and learning of L2 pragmatic information (Kasper, 1992; Thomas, 1983). According to Wolfson (1989), an error in grammar or pronunciation may be easily forgiven by the NSs of a language; yet, a pragmatic one can cause offence. Ostensibly, lack of the necessary pragmatic knowledge in a given situation would leave L2 learners helpless, forcing them to resort to the patterns and norms of their own L1. This sort of pragmatic transfer may result in pragmatic failure, which means not understanding the illocutionary force of an utterance and/or the speaker’s intention (Thomas, 1983). L2 learners may fail to repair the interaction as a result of their inadequate pragmatic knowledge (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986). In fact, pragmatic failure can result in not only NSs’ misinterpretation or misunderstanding of NNSs’ linguistic behavior, but also their disappointment and culture shock in the L2 culture or society. Therefore, as Kasper (1992) remarked, “in the real world, pragmatic transfer matters more, or at least more obviously, than transfer of relative clause or word order” (p. 205). It is also in pragmatics that the influence of the speaker’s cultural and social background largely reflects itself. Moreover, L2 learners’ pragmatic knowledge of the L2 sociocultural and linguistic norms in language use does not automatically increase in accordance with their L2 grammatical competence (Kasper, 2001). It is, thus, necessary to investigate pragmatic transfer and provide L2 learners with knowledge of this phenomenon in order to prevent them from experiencing its possible negative effects.

Speech act studies are the core component of cross-cultural pragmatics. They are verbal actions happening in the world. Austin (1962), in his seminal book How to Do Things With Words, believed that there is a lot more to a language than meaning of its words and phrases. He maintained that when we exploit language to communicate; we do not just say things but do things, that is, we perform actions whether explicitly or implicitly. Some researchers (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969) claim that speech acts are operated by universal pragmatic principles. These principles seem to be governed by the universal principles of cooperation and politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Leech, 1983). Complimenting, as a multifunctional act, is one of the well-studied speech acts in pragmatics literature. Complimenting has the potential to show gratitude, open or close a conversation, or even soften a criticism or request (Billmyer, 1990; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Wolfson, 1983). On the other hand, compliments can have face-threatening acts (FTAs) and people may find them defensive, uneasy, or even doubtful. Face is the positive image or impression of oneself that one shows or intends to show to the other participant in communication. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), in interaction and communication, two types of face exist: positive or negative. The former is the desire of one the individual “to be liked and approved of” (p. 76). The latter refers to as the desire of “one not to be imposed on” (p. 76). The positive or negative face of the speaker or listener is risked when a compliment is called or carried out. Consequently, compliments, as sensitive and high-risk, can provide much insight into one’s pragmatics. Furthermore, the patterns of giving and receiving compliments—like any speech act—vary among different languages and cultures. Lack of the awareness of these patterns can cause problematic intercultural communication, even for advanced L2 learners. The present study, thus, investigates similarities and differences between Persian native speakers (PNSs) and English native speakers (ENSs) to recognize the potential areas for miscommunication in intercultural interactions. The study also investigates the compliment response (CR) strategies used by Persian L2 learners in an attempt to understand their current position of ILP and consider the differences between L2 productions and NSs’ productions and to find out evidences for pragmatic transfer. Therefor this present study is an attempt to particularly address the following questions:
1. Do Persian native speakers and English native speakers respond to compliments differently?
2. Do L2 learners show negative transfer in compliment responses?

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1. Pragmatic Competence

Thomas (1983) divides linguistic competence into two competences: “grammatical competence” and “pragmatic competence” (p. 92). The former is the abstract of decontextualized knowledge of intonation, phonology, syntax, semantics, and so on, and the latter is the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context. Bachman (1990) also suggested that language knowledge consists of two main components (i.e., organizational competence and pragmatic competence) which complement each other in achieving communicatively effective use. Organizational knowledge is composed of grammatical and textual knowledge. Grammatical Knowledge includes several rather independent areas of knowledge such as knowledge of vocabulary, morphology, syntax, phonology, and graphology. Textual knowledge enables comprehension and production of (spoken or written) texts. It covers the knowledge of cohesion and knowledge of rhetorical organization or conversational organization. The second category, pragmatic competence, refers to abilities for creating and interpreting discourse. It includes two areas of knowledge: knowledge of pragmatic conventions for expressing acceptable language functions and for interpreting the illocutionary power of utterances or discourse (functional knowledge) and knowledge of sociolinguistic conventions for creating and interpreting language utterances which are appropriate in a particular context of language use (sociolinguistic knowledge).

Canal and Swain (1980) defined communicative competence as a consistence of four aspects: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence.

2.2. Pragmatics as a Science

Perhaps, one of the most influential definitions of pragmatics was by Leech (1983) in Principles of Pragmatics. He defines pragmatics as “the study of how utterances have meanings in situations” (1983). According to Leech (1974), Morris Charles (1946) introduced the first modern definition of pragmatics, and since then, many other specialists have continued to conceptualize this branch of linguistics. Morris (1946) originally defined pragmatics as “…the discipline that studies the relations of signs to interpreters, while semantics studies the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are acceptable” (as cited in Leech, 1974, p. 172).

Thomas (1995), in a study based on Leech’s research, proposes a definition of pragmatics as meaning in interaction. She claims that making meaning is a dynamic process, involving the negotiation of meaning between speaker and hearer, the context of utterance (physical, social, and linguistic), and the meaning potential of an utterance. She also praises the importance of pragmatics in linguistic description, particularly through its ability to describe what she calls utterance meaning (or what may also be referred to as illocutionary act, or speech acts) and the negotiation of meaning between speaker and hearer. Kasper (1993) defines the term “as the study of people’s comprehension and production of linguistic action in context” (p. 3).

2.3. Pragmatic Failure

Pragmatic failure was first coined by Thomas in her article “Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure” in 1983 to refer to “the inability to understand what is meant by what is said” (p. 91). Thomas prefers the term pragmatic failure to pragmatic error because she thinks that a grammar error can be explained by means of prescriptive rules, while the nature of the pragmatic ambivalence is so, that it is not possible to say that the pragmatic force of a sentence is incorrect, but that has not been able to reach the speaker’s communicative intention. In the same way, Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986) believe that pragmatic failure takes place “…whenever two speakers fail to understand each other’s intentions” (p. 166).

Thomas (1983) categorizes pragmatic failure into two major types: pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic. According to her, the former refers to the grammatical assessment of the pragmatic force of a linguistic token, and the latter refers to the improperly adopted language forms due to speakers not knowing the social protocols, etiquette rules, and social customs in listeners’ culture.
during their communication. Pragmalinguistic failure is usually caused by differences among languages and their reciprocal influences. Sociopragmatic failure results from different cultural norms and pragmatic principles that govern linguistic behaviors in different cultures. The outcomes of the sociopragmatic failure are generally more serious than those of pragmalinguistic failure. This is because one party encountering the pragmalinguistic failure is more likely to believe that the failure results from the defects of the other party’s language skills and abilities and, thus, have a higher degree of tolerance. On the other hand, sociopragmatic failure is more difficult to correct and overcome by the learners as it involves making changes in their own beliefs and value system. To reduce sociopragmatic failure, L2 learners’ metapragmatic awareness should, therefore, be raised.

2.4. Interlanguage Pragmatics
With the advent of the concept of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) and the discussion of its components (Canale & Swain, 1980), the linguistic-dominated focus of interlanguage studies, that was prominent up until the late 1970s, was expanded to cover research on sociolinguistics and discourse aspects of language acquisition, thus leading to the development of a new field called interlanguage pragmatics (ILP; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). This new area of investigation developed as “the branch of second language acquisition (SLA) research which studies how NNSs understand and carry out linguistic action in the target language, and how they acquire L2 pragmatic knowledge” (Kasper, 1992, p. 203). ILP is a second-generation hybrid. As its name betrays, ILP belongs to two different disciplines, both of which are interdisciplinary. As a branch of SAL research, ILP is one of the several specializations in interlanguage studies, contrasting with interlanguage phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. As a subset of pragmatics, ILP figures as a sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, or simply linguistic enterprise, depending on how one defines the scope of pragmatics (Kasper & Blum Kulka, 1993).

2.5. Pragmatic Transfer
Kasper (1992, 1995) defines pragmatic transfer as “the influence exerted by learners’ pragmatic knowledge of languages and cultures other than L2 on their comprehension, production, and acquisition of L2 pragmatic information” (p. 25). To Olshtain and Cohen (1989), pragmatic transfer means an L2 learners’ strategy of incorporating L1-based elements in L2 production. Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) define pragmatic transfer as “transfer of the L1 sociocultural competence in performing L2 speech acts or any other aspects of L2 conversation where the speaker is trying to achieve a particular function of language” (p. 56). Kasper (1992) defines two kinds of pragmatic transfer: positive and negative. According to him, positive pragmatic transfer occurs when an L2 learner succeeds in achieving his or her intended message as a result of transferring a languagesspecific convention of usage shared by L1 and L2. Negative pragmatic transfer, on the other hand, is the inappropriate transfer of native sociolinguistic norms and conventions of speech into L2.

2.6. Speech Acts
Speech acts are indispensable component of everyday communication in any language. Austin (1962), through proposing his speech act theory, believes that there is a lot more to a language than the meaning of its words and phrases. He maintained that when we exploit language to communicate, we do not just say things but do things, which is we perform actions whether explicitly or implicitly. Among various types of speech acts, FTAs such as compliments, refusals, requests, and disagreements are particularly problematic for an L2 learner if speech rules in their L1 are employed (Beebe & Takahashi, 1989; Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1990).

2.7. Compliments and Compliment Responses
Holmes (1988) defines a compliment as “a speech act which explicitly or implicitly attributes credit to someone other than the speaker, usually the person addressed, for some ‘good’ (possession, characteristic, skill, etc.), which is positively valued by the speaker and the hearer” (p. 486). Compliments are, by nature, speech acts that are usually welcomed. As such, they are regarded by many scholars as social lubricants to maintain solidarity (Holmes, 1988; Wolfson, 1981). However, compliments can negatively affect social interactions. Many factors such as the complimenter’s intention, complimentee’s perception, and cultural norms will influence whether the compliments are perceived as an FTA or a face-saving behavior (Farghal & Haggan, 2006). Golato (2005) argues, “it is the position of a compliment turn within the larger interactional and sequential context that
determines its function” (p. 203). She maintains that compliments can be used to perform actions other than complimenting such as—reproaching, criticizing, and interrupting—which cannot be described as appealing to an interlocutor’s positive face. For example, flattery when used insincerely: It is often paid by the speaker for a specific purpose and might be positively valued neither by the speaker nor by the hearer. Compliments may also be used sarcastically to make the hearer feel uncomfortable. For example, a man might comment sarcastically on a newly bought car of a friend who owes money to him, saying Gee, you have a nice new car there! Further, compliments can sometimes be embarrassing due to cultural differences. As Tang and Zhang (2009) exemplify, “while you look lovely today may make an English woman’s day, it may well make a Chinese woman uncomfortable and even somewhat resentful” (p. 326). Further issues affecting whether a compliment might be seen as face-threatening are the concepts of envy or eyeing (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Holmes, 1988). That is, in some cultures, a compliment may be an expression of envy by the complimenter. Yu (2003) also maintains that compliments can be “an act of judgement” and so, people may feel “uneasy defensive or even cynical with regard to the compliments they receive, and thus may have trouble responding to such compliments appropriately” (p. 1687). For all of these reasons, compliments are a multifaceted speech act with various types and features, and the acts can be regarded as either face-saving behavior or face-threatening (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

After a compliment speech act, the next turn (usually) responds to that compliment in some way and thus is called a CR. It is this response that may reveal the main function of the compliment and it is as important as the compliment speech act because a proper response plays a strong role in maintaining solidarity and an inappropriate response can lead to a communication breakdown (Yu, 2003). The compliment responding behavior may also differ depending on the object being complimented. Pomerantz (1978) was the first researcher who discussed CRs from a pragmatic perspective. In her study of compliment responding behaviors of Americans, she proposed that a recipient of a compliment faces a difficult situation in responding to the compliment: to accept the compliment while avoiding self-praise. In any conversational exchange, she suggested, the preferred second part will present an agreement with the previous utterance. There is, thus, pressure on the recipient to agree with the complimenter and accept the compliment. On the other hand, there is strong pressure on speakers to avoid or minimize self-praise. In order to cope with this tight spot, compliment recipients use different strategies to alleviate the situation: acceptance, rejection, and self-praise avoidance (Nelson, Al-Batal, & Echols, 1996).

2.8. Studies on Compliment Responses
In an investigation of pragmatic transfer and the ability to produce target-like CRs, Al Falasi (2007) studied Emirati Arabic and English speakers through DCT tests and interviews. In an attempt to make their responses seem sincerer, the NNs transferred some of their L1 pragmatic norms to L2 through the use of longer responses on the assumption that these are universal among languages rather than being language specific.

Tran (2007) investigated pragmatic and discourse transfer in CRs by Vietnamese speakers of English in cross-cultural interaction with Australians. The data were collected through naturalized role-plays. There were 60 role-play informants, including 20 Australian English NSs, 20 Vietnamese NSs, and 20 Vietnamese EFL learners, each of whom produced four CRs to compliments on skill, possession, appearance, and clothing. The data were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The qualitative analysis of the semantic formulas and the content of the CRs in this investigation resulted in foundation of a new hypothesis (i.e., the CR continuum hypothesis), which can account for cross-cultural differences on the basis of universality. Along this continuum, evidence of pragmatic and discourse transfer was found in the frequency of use of the following CR strategies by the Vietnamese speakers of English: compliment upgrade, agreement, appreciation token, return, compliment downgrade, disagreement, expressing gladness, follow-up question, and opting out. So, out of the 13 CR strategies that accounted for all of the CR data in this study, nine were transferred.

Tang and Zhang (2009) investigated CRs among Australian English and Mandarin Chinese speakers. The data were collected through the use of a written DCT, with four situational settings (appearance, character, ability, and possession). A total 60 university-student informants participated in the study. The findings demonstrated a consistent tendency across the macro, micro, and combination levels for the Chinese participants to use fewer accept strategies and more evade and reject strategies, than their Australian counterparts, that is, the Chinese express appreciation for a compliment less and denigrate themselves more. For the Chinese participants, an implicit and detouring approach is, at least, as
desirable as an explicit CR. This is in line with modesty and collectivism—pillars of Chinese culture. Australians, on the other hand, preferred using explicit CRs. In addition, the Chinese participants used far fewer combination strategies than the Australians, indicating that the Australians made more effort when responding to the compliments. The variant linguistic manipulations of CRs shown in this study indicated that any universal CR model will fail because different cultures have different sets of protocols.

Bu (2010) has reported on pragmatic transfer in the use of the CR strategies by Chinese EFL learners based on the data collected through naturalized role-plays from three groups of ENSs, native Chinese speakers, and Chinese EFL learners. The footprints of pragmatic transfer are grounded in the significant difference, not only in CR strategy use between the native English group and the Chinese EFL group (frequent use of appreciation by the former and compliment downgrade by the latter), but also the similarities in the CR strategy use between the Chinese EFL group and the native Chinese group (use the compliment downgrade).

Collecting role-play data, Cheng (2011) explored the CRs produced by Chinese L2 speakers and the NSs of American English. A total of 45 participants, including 15 NSs, 15 Chinese ESL speakers, and 15 Chinese EFL speakers, were selected for this study. The naturalistic role-play used in this study was an adapted version of the one created by Tran (2007), Holmes’ (1988), Yu’s (2004), as well as Tang and Zhang’s (2009) categories of CR strategies were used as the initial coding schemes. The adapted CR strategy framework consisted of three macrostrategies (i.e., accept, evade, and combination) and 11 microstrategies. The results showed both L2 groups differed from the NSs in multiple ways in their impromptu responses to the compliments, carefully embedded in the role play task. Whereas almost all the L2 speakers knew how to say Thank you/Thanks to others’ compliments, a number of them, especially the EFL speakers, had difficulties in utilizing a variety of response strategies like credit-shifting (e.g., My pleasure/Thanks for having me over). These differences were demonstrated to be affected by not only the learners’ L1 culture but also their limited L2 proficiency, which was reflected by their common difficulties in coming up with more diverse linguistic choices in the CRs.

Allami and Montazeri (2012), in a cross-cultural study, examined the knowledge of the Iranian EFL learners in responding to compliments in English with a focus on the effect of educational background on pragmatic transfer. The data were collected through a 24-item English DCT to 40 EFL learners who were asked to provide short responses. The responses were coded following a modified version of two classification schemes suggested by Boori (1994), with categories derived from Herbert (1990) as well as Chiang and Poehtrager (1993). The classification scheme included a macro and a microlevel. The results showed that three CR categories (i.e., appreciation token, comment acceptance, and return) made up 60% of the corpus. Acceptance and positive elaboration responses also showed a high frequency of occurrence in the data that might be rooted in the attempt to avoid agreement with the compliment and, thus, the risk of self-praise because Iranian cultural assumptions reject the mere acceptance of a compliment as rudeness or impoliteness. Their almost full control over L2 helped the more proficient learners to simply transfer the sociocultural norms of their L1. This study confirmed that the cross-linguistic behavior of the Persian speakers is influenced by their culture-specific behavioral norms; due to lack of sufficient pragmatic knowledge, L2 learners frequently resort to parallel forms in their L1.

In a recent study, Talleraas (2014) investigated how Norwegian EFL learners respond to compliments when communicating in English in comparison to native American English speakers, and whether any potential signs of pragmatic failure due to L1 pragmatic transfer occur. Twenty-six Norwegian EFL learners and five native American English speakers answered to a written DCT with 10 situations. The data were analyzed based on Herbert’s CR categories. The findings revealed that the Norwegian EFL learners tended to use acceptance and nonacceptance strategies with a seemingly similar frequency to the American English control group. However, the choice of other strategies in addition to acceptance differed between the two groups, which indicated pragmatic transfer from the informants’ L1.

Although the literature on compliments and CRs is abundant, most studies have been conducted between English and languages such as Chinese, Vietnamese, Norwegian, and so on. Moreover, few studies have dealt with the use of compliments by EFL learners; yet, some parts of this puzzle have remained unsolved. Furthermore, the investigation of possible pragmatic failure records among Iranian EFL learners is still vague. Therefore, the researchers of this study chose compliments and
CRs to study in order to evaluate the development of the EFL learners’ ILP knowledge status and to hopefully fill this gap in the literature.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

For the purpose of this study, a group of 30 male and female PNSs, studying law at Shahrekord University, Iran, were randomly selected. Also, participating in the study were 30 male and female ENSs (17 students, aged 20-30, studying psychology at the University of South Australia, and 13 technicians, aged 24-33, working at Soft Layer, an IBM company in Quebec, Canada). Because the present study examined the L1 transfer among Persian L2 learners, 60 male and female senior and junior undergraduates in translation from Shahrekord University and 40 M.A. students in TEFL from the University of Isfahan and Shahrekord University, aged 20-30, were asked to take the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) to form a group of 30 homogenized L2 learners.

3.2 Materials

The elicitation instrument used for the data collection was DCT. As Lorenzo-Dus (2001) argues, DCTs can provide a sound template of stereotypically perceived requirements for socially appropriate CRs in the groups studied. They also enable the researcher(s) to obtain sufficient data in a relatively short period of time. In the DCT for present study, eight situational settings relating to four different topics based on Tang and Zhang’s (2009) DCT were developed: appearance, character, ability or achievement, and possession. Each situation presented the respondents with a detailed description of the context. To investigate the differences between the PNSs and the ENSs, the same English DCT was translated into Persian and was administered to the PNSs. It is well worth mentioning that the calculated reliability coefficients, using Cronbach’s alpha (α) for the two English and Persian questionnaires were (.80) and (.79), respectively. Also, regarding the content validity of the questionnaires, they were submitted to experts in the field who unanimously agreed on the content. The OPT (r = 0.85) was administered to the L2 learners to form a homogenized group of learners.

3.3 Procedure

In the first phase, the ENSs and the PNSs were asked to fill out the English and Persian versions of the DCT. After the data were collected, the CRs were coded based on Holmes’ (1988), Yu’s (2004), as well as Tang and Zhang’s (2009) categories of CR strategies. The adapted CR strategy framework consists of three macrostrategies (i.e., accept, evade, and combination) and 11 microstrategies. The final classification was as follows (see Table 1):

Table 1. Compliment Response Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macrolevel CRs</th>
<th>Microlevel CRs</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>Thanks; Thank you; Yeah; Uh Huh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeing</td>
<td>I know; Yeah; I really like it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downgrading</td>
<td>It’s nothing; It’s ok; I tried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualifying</td>
<td>I enjoyed doing it; I worked hard on it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Returning</td>
<td>You’re not too bad yourself; I’m sure you’ll be great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonidiomatic</td>
<td>(the utterance does not fit into the NSs’ norm but has a clear intention of showing acceptance to the compliment.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e.g. A: I really like your outfit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B: I am very happy or you, too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evasion</td>
<td>Credit-shifting</td>
<td>No problem; My pleasure; You’re welcome; I got it from my mom; I learned this from school; It wasn’t hard; I got it from the store; Red is my favorite color; Really?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Commenting</td>
<td>I can let you borrow it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reassuring</td>
<td>(No response; shifting to another topic or giggling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offering</td>
<td>(Refers to a situation in which both acceptance and evasion are adopted in a single CR sequence)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data were coded by the researchers and a trained graduate research assistant. The intercoder reliability \( r = 0.78 \) was calculated to ensure the accuracy of the codification process. In order to investigate the pragmatic transfer among the Persian L2 learners, the CRs by the PNSs and the ENSs needed to be compared separately with the L2 learners’ responses to check differences and similarities. So, the CRs by this group were compared with those of the PNSs and the ENSs to investigate the likelihood of pragmatic transfer.

3.4. Data Analysis
The data were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. In the quantitative analysis, the CR data were coded according to the strategies selected to reply to the compliments. In the quantitative analysis, chi-square was applied to detect whether the differences in the use of the CR strategies between the groups were statistically significant.

To answer the second research question, based on the method proposed by Kasper (1992), the CRs by the ENSs, L2 learners, and the PNSs groups were compared. The purpose of the comparison was to find out whether there were significant differences between them in terms of strategy selection. If there were significant differences in the CRs by the ENSs and by L2 learners and there were significant similarities in the CRs by L2 learners and by the PNSs which could account for the differences between the ENSs and L2 learners’ data, it could be said that there was pragmatic transfer in the communicative act of responding to the compliments in the ILP of the Persian L2 learners. So, to find out quantitatively if there was negative transfer in the communicative act of responding to the compliments in the ILP of L2 Learners, it was necessary to fulfill three conditions:

1. There were statistically significant differences in the frequencies of the CRs by the PNSs and the ENSs.
2. There were statistically significant differences in the frequencies of the CRs by L2 learners and the ENSs.
3. There were no statistically significant differences in the frequencies of the CRs by L2 learners and the PNSs.

4. Results
To answer the first research question as to whether or not there were any significant differences between the PNSs and the ENSs with regard to the CRs, their responses to the different compliment situations in both English and Persian versions of the same DCT were coded and then compared. The obtained frequencies for the different answers by the two groups of participants are displayed in Table 2:

Table 2. Frequencies of CR Strategies Used for PNSs and ENSs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CR Strategies</th>
<th>PNSs</th>
<th>ENSs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downgrading</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonidiomatic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit-shifting</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenting</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassuring</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring/giggling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 2, it could be easily noticed that the differences obtained for some CR strategies by PNSs and ENSs were conspicuous. Except for nonidiomatic that was never happened by the NSs, ignoring/giggling was the least frequently used strategy, whereas returning was the most frequently used strategy among the two groups. The differences among these two groups were most noticeable for the strategy of agreeing, where the PNSs used this strategy far less than the ENSs did. The p value under the Sig. (2-tailed) column in front of Pearson chi-square was less than the specified level of significance (i.e., .000 < .05), indicating that the differences between the PNSs and the ENSs with respect to the frequencies of the different strategies they used were statistically significant. The obtained results are also graphically shown in Figure 1:

Figure 1. Frequencies of CR strategies used for PNSs and ENSs at microlevel.

In Figure 1, it could be seen that the distributions of the frequencies for the different types of the CR strategies between the PNSs and the ENSs were not the same.

To answer the second research question as to whether or not L2 learners showed negative transfer in responses to the compliments, based on the method proposed by Kasper (1992), the L2 responses were compared with the CRs produced by the PNSs and the ENSs.

In the first research question, it was observed that the differences between the PNSs and the ENSs with respect to the frequencies of different strategies they used at microlevel were statistically significant. To fulfill the second and third conditions, first the CRs by L2 learners and the ENSs were compared. Then, in the next step, their responses were compared with those of the PNSs. The obtained frequencies for the different answers by three groups of participants are displayed in Table 3:

Table 3. CR Strategies Used for PNSs, ENSs, and L2 Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CR Strategies</th>
<th>PNSs</th>
<th>ENSs</th>
<th>L2 Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downgrading</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonidiomatic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit-shifting</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenting</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 3, there were differences in nearly all the choices among the ENSs and L2 learners. Sometimes, the differences were very noticeable (as in the case of agreeing, downgrading, or returning) and, sometimes, negligible (in the case of appreciation, credit-shifting, reassuring, or combination). The \( p \) value under the \( \text{Sig. (2-tailed)} \) column in front of Pearson chi-square was less than the specified level of significance (i.e., \( .03 < .05 \)), implying that the differences among the frequencies of the different disagreement strategies used by the ENSs and L2 learners were statistically significant at microlevel. Figure 3 shows exactly where these differences between the two groups of participants were:

![Figure 3: Frequencies of CR strategies for L2 learners and ENSs.](image_url)

In Table 3, it could be noticed that there were differences between the CR strategies employed by L2 learners and the PNSs. The differences between the two groups were most noticeable for the strategy of combination, where L2 learners used this strategy far less than the PNSs did. The difference between appreciation and agreeing strategies were also substantial, where L2 learners used these strategies more often compared to the PNSs. For the other CR strategies, the differences between the two groups of participants were infinitesimal. The \( p \) value under \( \text{Sig. (2-tailed)} \) column was found to be greater than the significance level (i.e., \( .123 < .05 \)), indicating that the difference between L2 learners and the PNSs with regard to the frequencies of the different CR strategies they used did not reach statistical significance at microlevel. These results are also graphically shown in Figure 4:
Figure 4. Frequencies of CR strategies for L2 learners and PNSs.

In Figure 4, it could be seen that L2 learners and the PNSs were different with regard to the CR strategies they used, but the differences were not considerable in most of the cases.

In a nutshell, comparing L2 learners with the ENSs and the PNSs with regard to the CRs they employed, statistically showed that there were significant differences in the CRs by the ENSs and by L2 learners, and there were no significant differences in the CRs by L2 learners and by the PNSs. So, the Persian L2 learners showed negative transfer in responding to the compliments.

5. Discussion

The present study was theoretically grounded in the area of communicative competence, pragmatic, speech act theory, SLA theory, and ILP. Our first research question was concerned with how the PNSs and ENSs performed CRs. The results revealed that the ENSs tended to accept the compliments more often by showing appreciation, agreeing with complimenter, or qualifying, whereas the PNSs tried to accept the compliments by downgrading or returning back the compliments to their interlocutors. Most ENSs accepted the compliments happily with a comment like Oh, yeah it's pretty cool or I'm happy to hear that, or I feel great, showing their agreement with the compliment giver. On the other hand, the PNSs mostly accepted the compliments reluctantly with a comment to show their modesty. This is very comparable with the modesty maximum principle by Leech (1983), and Sharifian (2005) referred to it as Persian cultural schema of shekasteh-nafsi (modesty). This schema motivates the speakers to negate or scale down compliments, downplay their talents, skills, or achievements, and so on (Sharifian, 2005). The results of this study support the idea that the PNSs, downgrading compliments, instantiated the cultural schema of shekasteh-nafsi (modesty) in their responses to the compliments. The PNSs also returned the compliments more often compared to their counterparts, especially the compliments on appearance and achievements. The use of return strategy might be rooted in the attempt to reject the mere acceptance of a compliment as rudeness or impoliteness. The results also indicated that the PNSs evaded compliments more than the ENSs did. This confirms what has been found by a number of researchers based on different sets of data, including Tang and Zhang’s (2009) and Chen’s (1993) works. Tang and Zhang’s comparative study of CRs between Chinese EFL learners and Australian NSs found that the Chinese used less accept and more evade and reject than their counterparts. Comparing the CRs by the PNSs with the ENSs also reveals that the PNSs tended to use more credit-shifting strategy to evade the compliments. They usually shifted the credit to someone not present. This may be due to the PNSs’ discomfort with compliments because of the conflict of not disagreeing while maintaining modesty (Herbert, 1986, Pomerantz, 1978). One other outstanding difference between the two groups was the point that the PNSs used the offering strategy more compared to the ENSs. The PNSs tended to offer the physical object of the compliment to the
complimenter that was due to a Persian culture-specific politeness system called taarof. In line with taarof, Persians use a formulaic expression ghabeli nadareh which means, “it does not have any value in front of someone as nice as you, so you can take or have it.” The findings also suggest that the PNSs combined the CR strategies more than the ENSs did. They may consider that the longer the response to compliments, the sincerer it is. In addition, the PNSs’ compliment recipients are often confronted by, at least, two conflicting constraints. The first constraint is the need to agree with the complimenter’s positive evaluation, which is desirable because it indicates being cooperative with one’s conversational partner. Agreement with one’s conversational partner also upholds what Leech (1983) calls the maxim of agreement, although it also violates the maxim of modesty. The second constraint is to disagree with the positive assessment as a sign of being modest, but this also violates the maxim of agreement. Pomerantz’s (1978) classic study of CRs first drew attention to this dilemma. Disagreement may threaten the face of the complimenter because his or her preposition is received as false. On the other hand, agreement with the complimenter might be interpreted by listeners as being conceited, which makes the recipient lose face. The PNSs’ recipients may combine the CR strategies to avoid the two extremes and maintain in-betweeness because of social norms and social pressure to be modest and avoid praise. On the other hand, due to their culture, the ENSs preferred a more straightforward approach by merely accepting or evading the compliments. So, the present study indicates that any universal CR model will fail because different cultures have different sets of protocols. This coincides with the findings of the study by Tang and Zhang (2009).

The answer to our second research question, whether Persian L2 learners transferred their L1 patterns in responding to the compliments into the L2, is a clear yes. The results revealed a tendency for dissimilarity between L2 learners and the ENSs and similarity between L2 learners and the PNSs in terms of their communicative strategies chosen to respond to the compliments in such situations. Unlike the ENSs, L2 learners tended to accept compliments using downgrading or returning CR strategies rather than agreeing or qualifying. L2 learners also tried to transfer the Persian formulaic responses into their English responses in order to comment, return, or offer the compliments, which is culture-specific. For example, they used formulaic expressions like Your eyes see beautifully (in the case of compliments on appearance), It’s my duty/function (in the case of compliments on characters), or Don’t mention of it (in the case of compliments on possessions). The results support the findings of the study by Al Falasi (2007), in which the Emirati learners of English brought about some L1 expressions and strategies in responding to the compliments in English. For instance, they literally translated Arabic formulaic expressions used in the CRs, and these expressions were not always suitable for the compliments given in English. They intended their responses to be polite, but they were not appropriate. The findings also vividly coincide with the findings of the study by Allami and Montazeri (2012) in which the cross-linguistic behavior of L2 learners was influenced by their culture-specific behavioral norms. Among the transferred CR strategies, the use of appreciation strategy could be partially explained by pragmatic transfer. Comparing L2 learners’ CRs with those of the PNSs reveals that, interestingly, L2 learners used a simple Thank you or Thank you very much more than the PNSs. An interpretation of this result is that L2 learners had adopted the English routine of saying Thank you to the compliments. The routine is also short and relatively easy to pick up compared to other L2 pragmatic norms. This reduced the amount of pragmatic transfer with regard to this strategy. This result is compatible with the results of the study by Tran (2007) and Bu (2010), in which the Vietnamese and Chinese learners of English used a simple Thank you more frequently than the native Vietnamese and Chinese groups.

To sum up, this study confirms that PNSs and ENSs have different expectations and follow different linguistic and cultural protocols. No universal model of CRs would work because different cultures have different sets of protocols, preventing any valid generalization. Due to the lack of sufficient pragmatic knowledge, L2 learners frequently resort to parallel forms in their L1. Certain cultural norms and rituals seem to be unconsciously transferred to the target language context and mismatches may bring about confusions and embarrassment in the foreign culture.

6. Conclusion

The present study aimed to underline the importance of sociopragmatic competence for L2 learners. The importance of this research has practical relevance to the speech communities under study by providing guidelines for the use of CRs. It is useful for pedagogical purposes, helping L2 learners to respond to compliments in a culturally appropriate manner. Depending on L2 learners’ needs and
goals, L2 teachers should come up with a well-thought methodology and practically full-fledged syllabus to teach the miscellaneous recurring speech acts as well as their realizations. Materials developers should look into the ambiguous and potentially problematic areas faced by L2 learners in order to design appropriate and comprehensive enough materials for their pragmatic development. The findings of cross-cultural pragmatic studies have beneficial implications for language testing, too. They can help test writers to have a better understanding of socioculturally appropriate speaking behaviors in a given context and to provide more authentic context; ultimately, it will help them to evaluate the spoken language proficiency of L2 learners more effectively. So, replication with great participation would assist in opportunities for better generalization of the results. Naturalized role-plays, as a different method of data collection, are suggested to elicit more authentic data. More ethnographical studies are also needed in the PNSs’ community on compliment topics, responses, and functions between males and females, as well as between people with different age, social status (high vs. low) of the interlocutors, social distance (friends, acquaintances, or strangers), and situations.
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ABSTRACT
THE PURPOSE OF THE PRESENT STUDY WAS TO DETERMINE THE PREDICTIVE POWER OF LINGUISTIC INTELLIGENCE TOWARD WRITING PERFORMANCE. TO DO SO, 45 INTERMEDIATE ENGLISH LEARNERS WERE SELECTED FROM AMONG THREE COEDUCATIONAL CLASSROOMS IN TEHRAN, THROUGH THE APPLICATION OF THE MICHIGAN TEST OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY. THE MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES DEVELOPMENTAL ASSESSMENT SCALE AND AN ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING TASK WERE USED TO ELICIT THE NECESSARY DATA. THE RESULTS OF THE REGRESSION ANALYSIS REVEALED THAT LINGUISTIC INTELLIGENCE IS A BETTER PREDICTOR OF OVERALL ARGUMENTATION AND ARGUMENTATION VOCABULARY. IT WAS ALSO INDICATED THE INTERPERSONAL INTELLIGENCE COULD ALSO CONTRIBUTE TO THE PREDICTION OF WRITING PERFORMANCE. IN GENERAL, THE RESULTS REVEALED THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES THEORY IN SECOND LANGUAGE EDUCATION IN GENERAL AND WRITING IN PARTICULAR.
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1. Introduction
Gardner (1983) proposed the existence of eight relatively independent, but symbiotic, intelligences rather than just one single construct of intelligence. In Gardner’s (1983) point of view, intelligence is a mixture of different abilities as he defined intelligence as “the ability to solve problems or fashion products that are of consequence in a particular cultural setting or community” (Gardner 1993, p.15). In view of that definition, he classified human intelligence into linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal and naturalistic intelligences; and later, he added existential intelligence to his theory (Gardner, 1999).
Since the introduction of the Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences (henceforward MI) Theory in 1983, it has rapidly been merged into school curricula in educational systems across the United States and other countries (Christine, 2003). Many teachers apply the MI theory to classroom activities and attempt to teach students in the manner to enhance their main intelligences, language abilities and skills as well.
A substantial number of research studies in the area of second language acquisition (SLA) and teaching have been conducted on learners’ individual differences, and the necessity to develop more student-centered learning approaches (see Smith, 2001). This prominence has been frequently confirmed by researchers who have stressed learner-based approaches and have made a noteworthy contribution to language teaching by promoting our awareness of the need to regard individual learner variations and to branch out classroom activities (Ahmadian & Hosseini, 2012). McClaskey (1995) believed that intelligences might be taught. He also suggested that one of the methods of teach intelligence is to provide learners with opportunities to appreciate their own learning process. Syllabus designers propose the MI model as an archetype or standard to adjust language learning tasks and have all the intelligences involved in individuals to improve and enhance the learning process (Price, 2001). Dobbs (2002) asserted that when children have an opportunity to acquire...
language via their strengths, they might attain more accomplishment in learning all skills including writing.

As stated by to Furneaux (1999), writing is basically a social act, a means of communication; “you usually write to communicate with an audience, who has expectations about the text type (or genre) you produce” (p. 56). Harklau (2002) argues, “Writing should play a more prominent role in classroom-based studies of second language acquisition” (p. 329). As such, he argued that not only should learners learn to write but also they should write to learn, and then, he concluded, nowadays, “reading and writing pass from being the object of instruction to media of instruction” (p. 336). Farhady, Jaffarpour and Birjandi (2004) stated that writing at higher levels ought to transfer the intended meanings within the borders of the subject matter via correct and syntactically appropriate sentences. They also believed that free writing in which learners could communicate and consolidate their ideas is the ideal type of writing. Leki (as cited in Harklau, 2002) indicated that it is extremely important to understand L2 writing development in its own right and to consider all the personal traits that influence writing.

For years, teaching writing was not regarded, as it deserves (Furneaux, 1999). Although lately its prominence has been realized much better, it is still viewed to be less common than other skills to be appraised. Nevertheless, writing is one of the productive skills. Together with speaking, it is among the important skills and there might be a host of cognitive or mental factors that could affect writing ability. Even, as Furneaux (1999) claimed, learners might be more creative and inventive in writing than in speaking, since in speaking, the emphasis is on meaning and interlocutors attempt to comprehend each other. Yet in writing the emphasis is simultaneously on both meaning and form and even meanings might be affected by form. Besides, in speaking, such paralinguistic devices as gestures, nodding, and so forth could be applied to have speakers acquire the intended meaning unmistakably, while, writing is entirely based on linguistic criteria (Ahmadian & Hosseini, 2012).

Language teachers should have adequate knowledge about the features of writing and writing assessment, especially those encompassing more mental and cognitive processes (Ahmadian & Hosseini, 2012). One of the key areas of understanding these processes is to study the relationship between MI, particularly linguistic intelligence (LI), and the L2 learners’ writing skill, since, as the name implies, LI is unservingly associated with language abilities, including writing. From among various multidimensional theories of intelligence, the MI theory proposed by Gardner (1983) has been one of the most leading and prominent ones and could be employed to explore whether or not learners’ individual differences in terms of LI are correlated with their writing performance. As such, the major concern of this study is to determine the extent to which LI could predict writing performance.

2. Literature Review

Much of the research studies on the relationship between intelligence and language learning have focused on all domains of intelligence all together or domains other than LI and language-related variables. For instance, Petrides and Furneaux (2004) attempted to determine the effect of emotional intelligence on academic performance as well as deviant behavior of 650 British secondary school students. Their results indicated that emotional intelligence moderated the relationship between cognitive ability and academic performance. Moreover, students with high scores in emotional intelligence reflected less deviant behavior such as numerous absences and being excluded from school. The researchers concluded that implementation of this type of intelligence is useful in the realm of academic performance and measurement of deviant behaviors among deprived adolescents. Ayduk (2006) proposed empirical evidence for the relationship between verbal intelligence and self-regulatory competence. The relationship between verbal intelligence and self-regulation was so significant that high verbal intelligence was associated with lower violence among boys with effective self-regulatory skill than those with ineffective self-regulatory skills.

Shearer (2006) undertook a study, which explored the differences between MI of high school students with their reading skills. The participants filled in the Multiple Intelligences Developmental Assessment Scales (MIDAS) and Ohio Advanced Achievement Test. Certain significant differences were observed regarding reading skills and certain components of MI including linguistic, logical/mathematical, interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences. The participants were divided into three groups of low, moderate and high level readers. The result revealed that high readers are inclined toward personal achievement while moderate readers appeared to be more socially focused and low
readers were more pragmatic, practical and action-oriented. Certain meaningful differences were also observed between boys and girls’ MI at the high and low reading levels.

Hafez (2010) attempted to explore the relationship between MI and reading strategies. The aim was to find out which intelligence could predict learning strategies. The existence of a relationship between the variables was examined through the administration of the MIDAS, Strategy Inventory for Language learners (SILL), and Oxford Quick Placement Test on sixty Iranian senior male and female TEFL undergraduate students from Islamic Azad University of Shiraz. The results of the correlation analysis indicated a significant relationship between the students’ MI and their use of reading strategies. In addition, multiple regressions showed that LI was the best predicator of reading strategies among other types of intelligences proposed by Gardner.

Tahriri (2011) investigated the effectiveness of an MI-inspired instruction among Iranian learners. Particularly, it sought to explore whether MI-based instruction improves English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students’ language proficiency and language achievement compared to the instruction in which verbal-linguistic intelligence is activated. Furthermore, EFL instructors’ views as to the implementation of the MI theory were surveyed. The results indicated that only 40% of those who were already acquainted with the MI theory had employed it in their classes no less than some extent. In relation to the applicability of the MI theory in an EFL context, 66.6 % considered it as pertinent and applicable.

As far as teaching and assessment in general, and writing in particular, are concerned, Gardner’ theory could yield implications. Writing is one of the most thought-provoking skills for L2 learners to master and the significant roles that one could play evolve when we look at how the brain experiences the nature of reading and writing (Qualter, Gardner, Pope, Hutchinson, & Whiteley, 2012). Although Gardner’s (1983) theory has not yet provided an impact on the teaching of writing, it has inspired some innovative research studies like that of Grow (1990), which proposed some activities in the classroom that applied the different intelligences (Ahmadian & Hosseini, 2012). In spite of the increasing number of studies (Arikan & Saricaoglu, 2009; Razmjou, 2008) exploring the relationship between MI and certain aspects of language learning, particularly learning language skills, there are miscellaneous results considering the studies which explored the MI and writing skill (Ahmadian & Hosseini, 2012; Sadeghi & Farzizadeh, 2012).

As stated by Rahimpour (2007), the L2 learner’s performance varies from task to task. Thus, L2 learners’ production will differ when they carry out different task types. There are various ways for classifying task types. For instance, they could be classified according to Prabhu’s cognitive classification of information-gap, opinion-gap, and reasoning-gap types of task. Nunan (2006) presented Prabhu’s information-gap task types containing a mismatch between the information possessed by different learners in a collective-work task. In certain cases, one learner has all the information (a one-way task); in some others, each learner has his or her own information (a two-way task). A typical example is pair work where each member of the pair has a share of total information (for example an incomplete picture) and attempts to express it verbally to the other (Nunan, 2006). In addition, MI has been the theme of enquiry in several studies. Ahmadian and Hosseini (2012) conducted a study to explore the potential relationship between EFL learners’ writing performance and their performance on MI. The instruments used included the MIDAS and the participants’ mean scores on two writing tasks, as a guide to writing products.

The correlation analysis of the results indicated a statistically significant relationship between participants’ MI and their writing performance. In contrast, Sadeghi and Farzizadeh (2012) conducted a study to find the relationship between MI and EFL learners’ writing ability. The participants were provided with Armstrong’s MI questionnaire, which is developed based on a Likert-type scale. In addition, the participants’ writing samples were gathered based on an IELTS writing task. Results of Multiple Regression indicated that the components of MI did not significantly correlate with the writing ability of the participants.

3. Research Question and Hypothesis

The present study was an attempt to answer the following research question:

**RQ1:** Does linguistic intelligence significantly predict EFL learners’ writing performance?

Based on the above-mentioned question, the following null hypothesis was raised:

**H01:** Linguistic intelligence could not predict EFL learners’ writing performance.
4. Method
This study was conducted based on an ex post facto design, the choice of which was determined based on the research questions in which the distinction between the dependent and independent variables appears to be arbitrary rather than rule-governed. The researcher did not have control over the selection and manipulation of the independent variables. Therefore, this type of design was advised. To conduct the study, a dependent variable (writing performance) and eight independent variables (types of intelligences) were selected.

Participants
The population of the present study consisted of 75 EFL learners who were learning English in three coeducational classrooms at two private language institutes in Tehran. Thus, it was advised to select the convenience sampling method in order to save time and energy. The participants of the study were selected by the shortened Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency (MTELP), which is commonly used with university students who did not grow up speaking English, or speak other language rather than English as their L1. The results of the shortened MTELP revealed that 45 EFL learners (male=29 and female=16) were at the intermediate proficiency level and could participate in the study.

Instruments
In order to meet the assessment requirements, four instruments including the shortened MTELP, the LI subscale of MIDAS, Composition Profile (CP), and a composition task were employed. The MTEPT consists of listening, grammar, vocabulary, and reading sections, which contain 20, 30, 30, and 20 items respectively. The listening section includes 20 items. Test-takers should understand the literal meaning of the recorded English sentences and written options. All of the item stems are short and are in the form of basic vocabulary items. The options consist of three to six words; some of them are not even sentences but phrases. The grammar section contains 30 items with four options. Test-takers are asked to read the item stem, which contains one blank, and to fill in the blank with one of the four options. The questions cover a wide range of grammatical structures. The vocabulary section consists of 30 items. The format for the vocabulary section is the same as that of the grammar section. Test-takers are asked to read the stem with one blank and to choose the word from the four options that best completes the sentence. The reading section consists of 20 items. Test-takers read an item prompt, which differs in difficulty and length through items, and includes one question about the information in the sentence. They are asked to choose an appropriate response out of four written alternatives. The average length of the items in the reading section is approximately 20 words. In the present research study, the listening part of the test was removed and only grammar, vocabulary, and reading sections were administered. Therefore, the total score of the test was 80; that is students whose scores were between 40 and 56 were known as intermediate learners.

MIDAS (Shearer, 1996) is a self-report instrument of intellectual dispositions consisting 119 Likert-type items (from a to f, with e being the highest and f being “I do not know”). The original adult version is divided into eight sections corresponding to eight domains of intelligence. Each section contains the items, which are specific to a certain class of intelligence: musical intelligence (14 items), bodily-kinesthetic intelligence (13 items), logical-mathematical (17 items), verbal-linguistic (20 items), interpersonal intelligence (18 items), intrapersonal intelligence (9 items), naturalistic intelligence (13 items) and spatial-visual intelligence (15 items). Items are designed based on three types of cognitive, behavior, and affective domains as essential parts of any intelligence (Smith, 2008). Shearer (1996) calculated the Cronbach alpha coefficient for the MIDAS components as follows: musical: .70, bodily-kinesthetic: .76, logical-mathematical: .73, spatial-visual: .67, verbal-linguistic: .85, interpersonal: .82, intrapersonal: .78 and naturalistic: .82. In the present study, the reliability values of the subscales were as follows: musical: .68, bodily-kinesthetic: .70, logical-mathematical: .67, spatial-visual: .67, verbal-linguistic: .72, interpersonal: .75, intrapersonal: .73 and naturalist: .76.

Composition Profile or CP is mainly used to provide an index of a writer’s communicative ability. CP contains five component scales, including content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. CP is largely used in the analytic method of scoring composition. Here, Jacobs, et al.’s (1981) analytic writing scale was used to grade the participants’ compositions by dividing writing proficiency into 5 sub-skills of content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. Each category was divided into four classes of performance, including 1-Excellent to very good; 2-Good to average; 3-Fair to poor; and 4-Very poor. The range of scores for content is 13-30, vocabulary and...
organization 7-20, language use 5-25, and mechanics is 2-5. Total score of the test is within the range of 34 and 100.

A topic was determined and printed on a paper. The prompt for the essay are presented below:

- **Argumentative task:** Why do we use mobile phones? Give examples and reasons for your answer.

The validity of prompt was checked by an experienced EFL teacher. A time limit of 30 minutes was given to participants. Furthermore, the students were required to write within the content limit of 150-200 words.

5. **Results**

To test the hypothesis, multiple regression analysis was performed. However, first, the assumptions of multiple regression including sample size, multicollinearity and singularity, outliers, normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and independence of residual (Pallant, 2011) were verified. The assumptions were only checked for three independent variables of Linguistic Intelligence, Musical Intelligence and Interpersonal Intelligence and four independent variables of Argumentation vocabulary, and Overall argumentation, since only these data sets were normally distributed. The following tables represent the test of assumptions.

**Normality**

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Normality on Argumentative Task and its Sub-components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation Language use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation Mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall argumentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Instruction: If the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic is non-significant (Sig. value of more than .05) normality is met (Pallant, 2011). As seen in Table 1, the vocabulary and overall scores with probability values of 0.096 and 0.089 respectively are normally distributed. In the following, the result of the normality test on the LI scores is presented.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Normality on LI scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Intelligence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

As seen in Table 2, the sig value is 0.200, which is lower than the cut-off point (0.05). This indicates that the scores are normally distributed.

**Sample Size**

According to Stevens (1996, p. 72) about 15 participants per predictor are needed for a reliable equation. Considering the number of the participants in the present study (N=15), for each regression analysis, in addition to LI, two other independent variables including Musical Intelligence and Interpersonal Intelligence were included so as to make the regression analysis possible, since there should be at least two independent variables (Pallant, 2011). The interpersonal intelligence was proposed by Marefat (2007) as a predictor of writing performance. The musical intelligence was selected based on the results of the previous research conducted by Saricaoglu and Arikan (2009).

**Multicollinearity and Singularity**

According to Pallant (2011), to have a good regression model these two problems must be avoided. “Multicollinearity exists when the independent variables are highly correlated (r=.9 and above)” and “singularity occurs when one independent variable is actually a combination of other independent variables” (Pallant, 2011, p. 151). In the present set of data, the problem of singularity does not occur,
since there was not any overlap between the independent variables. To check for multicollinearity, the correlation between the three independent variables was calculated. However, first the normality of score on the two subscales was tested.

Table 3
Test of Normality on Musical Intelligence and Interpersonal Intelligence subscales scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov*</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musical Intelligence</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is a lower bound of the true significance.
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

As seen in Table 3, the scores on the subscales are normally distributed (Sig =0.200). In the following the correlation analysis between the three variables are presented.

Table 4
Correlation Coefficients of LI, Musical Intelligence and Interpersonal Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Musical Intelligence</th>
<th>Interpersonal Intelligence</th>
<th>Linguistic Intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musical Intelligence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-1.169</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results presented in Table 4 indicate that there is not any relationship between the three variables. Therefore, the problem of multicollinearity does not exist.

Outliers
Outliers refer to very high or very low scores (Pallant, 2011). Checking for outliers could be performed through running scatterplots for each pair of variables. Table 5 revealed that outliers could not influence the model.

Normality, Linearity, Homoscedasticity, and Independence of Residual
All these assumptions refer to various aspects of the distribution of scores and the nature of the underlying relationship between the variables (Pallant, 2001). Since the first three assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were checked in the previous sections, only the independence of residual will be checked along with the regression analysis since this assumption “can be checked from the residuals scatterplots which are generated as part of the multiple regression procedure” (Pallant, 2011, p. 151). In the following, the results of standard regression analysis are presented.

Table 5
Residuals Statistics of the Regression Model (Argumentation vocabulary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Std. Predicted Value</td>
<td>-1.682</td>
<td>1.755</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error of Predicted Value</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Predicted Value</td>
<td>6.0173</td>
<td>19.7558</td>
<td>12.8261</td>
<td>3.96602</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>-1.08128</td>
<td>1.08081</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.54702</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-1.908</td>
<td>1.907</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. Residual</td>
<td>-1.959</td>
<td>2.076</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleted Residual</td>
<td>-1.13964</td>
<td>1.28074</td>
<td>.01830</td>
<td>.60068</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. Deleted Residual</td>
<td>-2.032</td>
<td>2.168</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahal. Distance</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>8.495</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook’s Distance</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in Table 5, the maximum value of Mahl.Distance is 8.495, which is lower than the critical value of 16.27 proposed by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). Therefore, the outliers could not have any significant effect on the regression model. In addition, according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007, p. 75), if the maximum value for Cook's Distance is larger than 1, a potential problem might occur with the model. Since the value here is 0.199, no major problem could occur. In the following, the results of the regression model are discussed.

Table 6
Summary of the Regression Model to Predict Argumentation vocabulary Based on LI, Musical Intelligence and Interpersonal Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.56668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7
ANOVA Statistics to Assess the Statistical Significance of the Result of the Regression Model (Argumentation vocabulary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>688.745</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>229.582</td>
<td>714.920</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>13.166</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>701.911</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
Standardized Coefficients of the Independent Variables to predict Argumentation vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-10.544</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Intelligence</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>42.130</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>3.059</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Intelligence</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Tables 6 to 8, standard regression results indicate that the model as a whole explained 98% of the variance of Argumentation vocabulary. The standardized beta coefficient indicates that if variable LI changes one standard deviation unit, the performance in Argumentation vocabulary changes 0.973 standard deviation unit in the same direction. It was also revealed that LI has a significant unique contribution to the prediction of Argumentation vocabulary (p<0.05). In addition, if Interpersonal Intelligence changes one standard deviation unit, the performance in Argumentation vocabulary changes 0.069 standard deviation unit in the same direction. It was also revealed that Interpersonal Intelligence has a significant unique contribution to the prediction of Argumentation vocabulary (p<0.05). However, if Musical Intelligence changes one standard deviation unit, the performance in Argumentation vocabulary changes 0.02 standard deviation unit in the opposite direction. It does not have any unique significant contribution to the prediction of Argumentation vocabulary (p>0.05). Since the ANOVA statistics indicates a significant probability value (p<0.05), it could be argued that LI is the best predictor of Argumentation vocabulary.

The same procedure was conducted to investigate the predictive power of the independent variables on Overall argumentation.

Table 9
Residuals Statistics of the Regression Model (Overall argumentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Value</td>
<td>34.8787</td>
<td>91.4140</td>
<td>63.2444</td>
<td>15.44763</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Predicted Value</td>
<td>-1.836</td>
<td>1.824</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error of Predicted Value</td>
<td>.000000</td>
<td>2.69101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Predicted Value</td>
<td>33.2639</td>
<td>91.1866</td>
<td>63.1441</td>
<td>15.50114</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>-6.04861</td>
<td>7.12141</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.69101</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-2.170</td>
<td>2.555</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. Residual</td>
<td>-2.251</td>
<td>2.829</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleted Residual</td>
<td>-6.51125</td>
<td>8.73605</td>
<td>.10035</td>
<td>2.99549</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. Deleted Residual</td>
<td>-2.375</td>
<td>3.115</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in Table 9, the maximum value for Cook's Distance is 0.199 which provides no major problem. In the following the results of the regression model are discussed.

### Table 10

Summary of the Regression Model to Predict Overall Argumentation Based on LI, Musical Intelligence and Interpersonal Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>2.78773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11

ANOVA Statistics to Assess the Statistical Significance of the Result of the Regression Model (Overall argumentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>10499.683</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3499.894</td>
<td>450.355</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>318.628</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10818.311</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12

Standardized Coefficients of the Independent Variables to Predict Overall Argumentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-10.544</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Intelligence</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>42.130</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>3.059</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Intelligence</td>
<td>- .085</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Tables 10 to 12, standard regression results indicate that the model as a whole explained 96% of the variance of Overall argumentation. The standardized beta coefficient indicates that if LI changes one standard deviation unit, performance in Overall argumentation changes 0.928 standard deviation unit in the same direction. It was also revealed that LI has a significant unique contribution to the prediction of Overall argumentation (p<0.05). In addition, if Interpersonal Intelligence changes one standard deviation unit, performance in Overall argumentation changes 0.120 standard deviation unit in the same direction. It was also revealed that Interpersonal Intelligence has a significant unique contribution to the prediction of Overall argumentation (p<0.05). In addition, if Musical Intelligence changes one standard deviation unit, performance in Overall argumentation changes 0.02 standard deviation unit in the same direction. However, it does not have any unique significant contribution to the prediction of Overall argumentation (p>0.05). Since the ANOVA statistics indicates a significant probability value (p<0.05), it could be argued that LI is the best predictor of Overall argumentation.

### 6. Discussion and Conclusion

The results revealed that LI is a better predictor of vocabulary. In general, this finding is in partial consistency with a number of previous studies (Naoe, 2010; Nolen, 2003; Eng & Mustapha, 2010; Saricaoglu & Arikan, 2009), which confirmed the existence of relationships between different types of intelligence as predictors of language-related variables. However, the results are contrary to some other studies (Nikolova & Shopova, 2007; Razmjoo, 2008; Smith, 2001; Waterhouse, 2006), which found no relationship between the MI types and language variables. The present study revealed that in addition to LI, interpersonal intelligence could also predict vocabulary to a unique significant level. This is, in general, consistent with Marefat (2007) who concluded that interpersonal intelligence could also contribute to the prediction the language-related issues.

In addition, the musical intelligence was a negative predictor of vocabulary knowledge in the argumentative task. This could also be due to the features of argumentation, which deals with logic, rather than emotions, which much apparently emerge in music and rhythms. However, this assertion might have to do with the underlying constructs of the musical intelligence in which the items are loaded on features, which reflect a dimension of intelligence, which is placed outside the domain of appropriate relationship of ideas manifested in argumentative text but in poetic styles of writing.
It was also revealed that LI is a better predictor of argumentation than interpersonal and musical intelligence. In addition, the interpersonal intelligence more largely contributed to the prediction of argumentative performance in writing than the musical intelligence did. Again, in general, this finding is in partial consistency with a number of previous studies (Naoe, 2010; Nolen, 2003; Eng & Mustapha, 2010; Saricaoglu & Arikan, 2009), which confirmed the existence of relationships between different types of intelligence as predictors of language-related variables in general and writing in particular. However, the results are contrary to some other studies (Smith, 2001; Waterhouse, 2006; Nikolova & Shopova, 2007; Razmjoo, 2008), which found that the MI types could not predict language variables.

As another finding, the present study also revealed that in addition to LI, interpersonal intelligence could predict argumentative performance to a unique significant level. This is consistent with Marefat (2007) who concluded that kinesthetic, existential, and interpersonal intelligences made the biggest contribution to predicting the writing scores. Nevertheless, no specific study was found to show LI could predict argumentation.

Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, intelligence is flexible and prone to improvement or decline. Human beings are born with an established set of genetically predisposed intelligences, which could be developed later in life, conditional on familial, social, cultural, and educational practices and experiences (Stanciu, Orban, & Bocos, 2011). Hence, the teaching-learning process plays a substantial role in developing, cultivating, and optimizing L2 learners’ MI profiles. Every single learner is capable of displaying all the intelligences with different levels, and “the challenge in education is for teachers to create learning environments that foster the development of all the intelligences” (Haley, 2004, p. 163).

In brief, it is of importance to say that teachers could provide English language learners of lower levels of LI with a variety of writing tasks, further assistance, support and motivation to help them perform tap into unknown aspects of linguistic intelligence so as they improve their writing skills vice versa and as a result their academic achievements. Actually, on the one hand the findings of this study could discrepantly contribute to the current body of literature on the MI theory and writing, and on the other it could bold the interrelationships of MI, as psychological constructs, and EFL education. Approaching L2 instruction with MI deliberations paves the way for more fruitful education.

Linguistic intelligence, as one of the intelligence types proposed by Gardner (1983), refers to the psychological ability to distinguish and produce written and spoken language. In Gardner’s (1993) model, the verbal-linguistic intelligence does not have a direct effect on L2 learning. However, it is argued that there seems to be a very believable link as people with high verbal-linguistic intelligence are those that are inclined to think in words (Nolen, 2003), and are able to use language efficiently both orally and in writing (Christison & Kennedy, 1999).

Within this cognitive model, “language is not seen as limited to ‘linguistic’ perspective but encompasses all aspects of communication” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 117). For instance, in role-play where learners might need to express their feelings while being aware of the feeling of others, linguistic, interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences are needed (Arnold & Fonseca, 2004). In addition, According to Gardner (1999), interpersonal intelligence embraces the sensitivity to observe and understand other people’s inner thoughts and outward performance. Besides, it is the ability to live well with others and effectively communicate with people, verbally and nonverbally. Intrapersonal intelligence is the ability to evidently understand the inner working of oneself, such as ideas, moods, intensions, desires, motivations and nature, and then use such knowledge for leading one’s life. Interpersonal intelligence is connected to the ability to match with others, to understand their viewpoints and opinions, but also persuade others to achieve personal objectives.

Dornyai and Murphy (2003) state, “from Vygotskian constructivist point of view, that learning happens inter-mentally first, between minds in interaction, and only later becomes one’s own learning, intra-mentally” (p. 86). However, as the researcher of the present research study claims, these statements together with the claim by Gardner (1993)- that most tasks require the simultaneous use of several intelligences in order to be completed successfully- only provide a falsified justification for the shortcomings of the MI assessment scales. The researcher argues that if such a claim is assumed to be correct, then different types of intelligences do not exist at all and the area of overlaps (or borders) between two, three or more intelligences are not so clear-cut to be measured through distinctive items under a distinctive sub-component. Thus, ultimately, it could be argued that there is
only one unified intelligence, which should be assessed through different classes of intelligences, but those classes could not be separately applied as to represent the intelligence of an individual in a specific field. For example, one whose score on the musical scale is high could not be perceived as being or becoming a good musician.
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Introduction
Taradof (synonym) as one important issue in the area of linguistics was raised and discussed in the different writings of Muslim scholars since the second century AD. During the first decade of AD, classical Islamic scientists in the areas of linguistics, logic, principles and interpretations analyzed the term Taradof (synonym).
In the field of linguistic research, Sibouyeh (d 183 AH), Qatrab (d 206 AH) and Ibn Jenny (d 392 AH) refer to the possibility of the emergence of the semantic phenomenon of Taradof (synonym), and
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some other scholars such as Asmaei (d. 214 AH), Abu Zayd Ansari (d. 215 AH) and Romani (d. 384 AH) collected and presented some synonyms in the form of a dictionary.

On the other hand, a group of Muslim scholars denied Taradof (synonym) phenomenon. Ibn Arabi (d. 231 AH), Jahiz (d. 255 AH), Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276 AH), Saleh (d. 291 AH) and Ibn Faris (d. 390 AH) each separately in their works denied the possibility of the emergence of Taradof (synonym) in Arabic language, and they considered implications of synonyms relative to each other as different and distinct, and did not corroborate the application of Taradof (synonym) in the language.

During the fifth century AD, in the area of Elm al-Osul (Methodological Islamic Jurisprudence) and Tafsir (interpretation), Abu Jaafar Mohammad Ibn Hasan Toosi Shi’ei (d. 480 AH) known as Shaikh Al-Taefeh authored “Al-Tibyan Fi Tafsir al-Quran” with a different interpretative approach.

The selection of literary genre and rationalism in interaction with the Holy Qur’an has caused him to present a special interpretation of the characteristics of the Holy Qur’an language including different associations between the lexicon and meanings.

In his commentary, Tusi analyzed and interpreted the Holy Qur’an’s terminology in a methodical manner, and considered Taradof (synonym) phenomenon in Arabic language as one of the tertiary forms of the singular noun versus meaning.

Based on the research performed by the researcher on the commentary and interpretation presented by Tusi, it could be said that introducing Tusi’s view on Taradof (synonym) due to his possession of a proper and accurate linguistic perspective is of importance.

**Corroboration of Taradof (synonym)**

Semantic phenomenon of Taradof (synonym) is one of important issues relevant to the concepts of lafz (utterance) and meaning, and since the oldest time, the analysis of lexicon and meaning has been of interest to the classic rational science scholars, and also analyzed by researchers practicing in the area of language in a specialized manner.

In ancient Greece, in the introduction to their works, the scholars practicing in the area of Logic analyzed and discussed the issues relevant to utterances (alfaaz) such as delalat (signification) and its tertiary types, types of delalat lafzbar maena (association between utterance and meaning), types of lafz (utterance), and division of noun based on meaning (see: Khansari, 1994, PP. 30-46). They also interpreted the issue of tasavorat (conceptions) in order to analyze the issue of mental conception as a result of Taradof (synonym) as one type of taerif (definition), and this is an issue that corroborates the rational nature of Taradof (synonym).

It should be noted that Definition Nominal has provided context for authoring Lexicography (ibid, pp. 92-93, Al-Ziadi, 61).

Aristotle in his well-known treatise “Ars Poetica” refers to the possible accomplishment of linguistic phenomenon Taradof (synonym) and has presented some applied examples of Taradof (synonym).

In ancient India, Buddhist linguistic Amara Sinha examined the linguistic phenomenon of Taradof (synonym), and collected synonymic lexicon in the form of a dictionary.

Sinha’s Dictionary is one of the most ancient dictionaries that its longevity dates back to the sixth century AD or older than the date (Al-Ziadi, 276).

**Muslim scholars’ opinion on the phenomenon of Taradof (synonym) in Arabic language**

The term “Taradof (synonym)” in Arabic language is derived from “Radefa” (رَدِف), and means “sitting and standing behind someone or something” (Ibn Manzour, 2003, Vol. 9, 138).

There are different idiomatic definitions of the term “Taradof (synonym)” in different writings of classic Islamic sciences.

In the area of pure linguistics, some scholars such as Sibouyeh as distinguished Iranian linguistic, Ibn Faris and Ibn Jani have defined Taradof (synonym) in their well-known linguistic works.

Sibouyeh states that: Taradof (synonym) is “difference between two terms that benefit from a similar signification” (see: n.d; 24.1).

Ibn Faris says: Taradof (synonym) means “naming one thing with multiple meanings” (see: 1910; 65).

In the book “Al-Khasaes” that revolves around linguistic issues in the area of Arabic language, Ibn Jenny has presented two different definitions on Taradof (synonym).
In his first definition, he says: “if there were multiple terms for a single meaning [Taradof (synonym) come into being]” (see: 1952, 1/373).

In his second definition, Ibn Jenny recites that: “Taradof (synonym) is sameness of meaning despite difference in lexicon” (ibid: 113/2).

In the book “Al-Mozhar fi Olum al-Loghat va Anvaoha” that discusses linguistic issues in the area of Arabic language, Jalal al-Din Saiouty (d 911 AH) as a distinguished Muslim scholar and interpreter states that: “Taradof (synonym) is implication of different terms on a single meaning” (1998, 316/1).

In the area of Logic, and under the influence of ancient Greece scholars, Ibn Sina (d 428 AH) allocated the first chapter of his influential work entitled “Shafa” to the subject of utterance (lafz) and signification (maena), and then analyzed association between utterances and meanings. In the part “division of nouns based on signification”, Avicena discusses Taradof (synonym) as one type of utterance versus meaning, and defines semiotic phenomenon of Taradof (synonym).

In his first chapter of “Al-Kitab” analyzed different types of utterance (lafz) and signification, and introduced Taradof (synonym) as one of tertiary types of utterance versus meaning.

In the first chapter of “Al-Kitab” Sibayeh states that: “some multiple Arabic terms are tantamount to multiple meanings, while some multiple terms are tantamount to one single meaning, and some terms are tantamount to different meanings (N.D.: Vol. 1, 24).

Qatrab refers to Taradof (synonym) in Arabic language and recites that “In Arabic language, two terms are tantamount to one single meaning to show that terms are rich for Arabs...” (Al-Ziadi, 196).

Some other lexicologists in the area of their lexical works have used multiple terms for a single meaning.

Asmaei, Abu Zaíd Ansari, Abu Obaid Ghasem Ibn Salam (d 223 AH) and Abu Hatam Sajestani (d 250 AH) are some of distinguished linguistics that have collected some synonyms in a single-subject dictionary, and Ali Ibn Isa al-Romani authored a dictionary entitled “الكلام والبديع” (Al-Alfaz al-Motaradefa”) (Jurji Zaydan, 1996, vol. 2, 109-110; Shoughi Zaif, 4, 143; Al-Zamin, 2006, 83).
Ibn Jani also in the book “Al-Khasaes” discusses his opinion on the possibility of emergence of Taradof (synonym) and also analyzes the underlying reasons and backgrounds.

He repudiates the opponents’ opinions on Taradof (synonym). Shayesteh refers to the fact that Ibn Jani does not regard difference in the area of synonyms as the reason for denying the realization of Taradof (synonym) (see: 1952, Vol. 1, 373; ibid, vol. 2, 113).

In Al-Khasaes, Ibn Jani says: “if there were multiple terms for a single signification in a specific language, the implication of one of the terms is more or a part of another implication…” (Vol. 1, 373).

Regarding Arab’s need to the Taradof (synonym) and the relevant emergence, Ibn Jani says: “when two terms had a single meaning in Arabic language and both were commonly applied by the public, this was due to the fact that Arabs consciously and willingly had assigned two terms to a single concept. This is because, to organize poetical meters and to add more richness to language, Arabs required Taradof (synonym), and there is the possibility that one of the two terms had originally been relevant to one tribe, and Arabs may had applied another term [for the same meaning] relevant to another tribe and had long applied it, and the term with the synonymous term gradually found wide applications. Under this condition, and due to the same popularity and sameness of meaning, the relevant term was probably added to the treasure of lexicons possessed by the [first] tribe (ibid, 372).

In the area of other Islamic sciences, the scholars practicing in Elm al-Osul have performed some research on terms and significations, and analyzed and discussed Taradof (synonym).

Imam Mohammad Qazali, Fakhreddin Razi (b 696 AH) and Allameh Amedi (b 631 AH) each have separately acknowledged the semiology of Taradof (synonym), while Ghazali have enumerated some conditions for the realization of Taradof (synonym) (1991, 256, 1981, 25).

**Denial of Taradof (synonym)**

Semantic phenomenon of Taradof (synonym) is one linguistic issue that has aroused attention of many linguists and researchers practicing in the field of lexicology.

Some of them have referred to the possibility of emergence of Taradof (synonym) in Arabic language, and have regarded it as one type of trifold categorization of term versus significiation (see: Sibouyeh, N.D., Vol. 1, 24), and another group have denied the philosophy underlying the emergence of Taradof (synonym) in the language, especially Arabic language.

In the third century AH, Ibn Aerabi repudiated Taradof (synonym). Quoting from him, Saelab states that: “there is a difference between two terms that Arab people have determined them for a single meaning, and sometimes a meaning is hidden in one out of two synonymous terms. However, the question is this why Arab people neglect such difference?”

He also says: “there is a reason behind specifying any noun, which based on it, Arab people have specified the lexicons, we know some of the reasons and some are not known by us” (Al-Ziadi, 198).

Jahez is also one opponent to Taradof (synonym), and he rejects the presence of different terms with a single meaning, and believes that use of such terms by people is a type of inaccuracy in applying the terms.

In the book Al-Bayan va Tab’ein (البيان و التبیین) as one classic literary Arabic encyclopedia, Jahez regarding Taradof (synonym) says: “People have misapplied some terms, while it is better for them to apply another term for their own selected application. God in the Holy Qur’an has referred to “الجوع” (Al-Jou’e) (in the meaning of hunger) only in the time of extreme poverty and physical inability, while people use it for normal conditions and health, and they avoid using the term “المطر” (Al-Saqab) (in the meaning of weakness along with hunger). The same mistake happens regarding the term “المطر” (Al-matar) that means rain. In the Holy Qur’an, the term is only used in the sense of revenge, while people and also most of educated people do not consider a difference between “المطر” (Al-matar) and "المغیث" (Al-Qais) (in the meaning of rain)” (1998, vol. 1, 21). [Jahez seeks to convey the fact that "المطر" must be used for normal raining, while "المغیث" is applied].

Ibn Qotayba in the book entitled أدب الكاتب (Adab al-Kitab) as another classic Arabic literary encyclopedia has referred to the semantic difference between some synonyms.

Three chapters of the book revolves around an analysis and interpretation of implication of multiple terms on a single meaning (see: 30-31, 170-171, 238). In this regard, some scholars basically rejected the philosophy underlying Taradof (synonym) in the language. Abubakr Mohammad Ibn Ghasem al-Anbari (d 328 AH) considered the realization of Taradof (synonym) in the language as impossible, and underlined the fact that Arabs have specified
only different terms for different significations, and it is not possible that Arabs use different terms for a single meaning (Al-Ziadi, 1999).

In its famous work 
المناصح في فقه اللغة (Al-Sahbi fi Fiqh al-Loqat) possibly as one of the first specialized
works in the area of Arabic linguistics, Ibn Faris has accepted implicitly the linguistic phenomenon of
Taradof (synonym), yet like other contemporary scholars or its predecessors, he has referred to the
differences relevant to the signification of synonyms, and with the proposition of new arguments, he
negates possibility of a single meaning among the synonyms.

In his new outlook, he considers the signification of some synonyms as descriptive, and underlines
the fact that multiple terms that have been specified for a single meaning, are considered as adjective, and
the descriptive meaning of each synonymous adjective is different from another adjective. Some
examples are the terms
المهيد والخصام (Al-Mohand and AL-Hosam) that are tantamount to the
term
لاپت (Al-Saif), while their signification is descriptive and are considered to be adjectives. On the other
hand, the descriptive meaning of the term
Be'aineh, that of
الخصام (1910, 65).

Abu Hilal Askari (d 395 AH) in a book entitled
الفروق اللغوية (Al-Forough al-Loghavia) does not believe
in the possible implication of multiple terms on a single meaning, and while referring to the presence
of semantic differences between synonyms, he disapproves the application of such synonyms instead
of each other.

Askari in his book says: “… as it is not proper that one term implies two meanings, it is not proper
that two terms imply one meaning, because in this phenomenon, the literal extension happens and
this is of no use (2000, 21).

Shaykh Tusi’s opinion on Taradof (synonym) in Al-Tibyan Fi Tafsir al-Quran

In Al-Tibyan Fi Tafsir al-Quran, to decode the terminology of Holy Qur’an more clearly and
erpressively, Shaykh Tusi presented the signification of the terms and synonyms in this sacred text
and exemplified different derivative instances.

Semantic outlook adopted by Shaykh Tusi in exploring the meaning of the terms has been nowadays
popularized in the modern linguistics and is known as Lexical Field. The theory underlines that fact
that, to understand lexical meaning, the implication of terminology that are semantically associated
with each other must be analyzed (see: Hamideh, 1997, 105; 387).

After exploring the meanings of the terms applied in the Holy Quran, Shaykh Tusi analyzed the
associations between the terms and meanings in terms of significations as well. Thus, in many cases,
Tusi referred to the similarity of the range of literal significations of the Holy Quran and other
Arabic terms, and there is total similarity and synonymy in the area of the signification of some of the
terms under analysis, and there are some differences in terms of implication.

It should be noted that the presence of differences and scant implicative difference in the area of
synonymous and similar terms has not motivated Shaykh Tusi to repudiate Taradof (synonym), yet
based on his implications, it could be inferred that he believed in Taradof (synonym), and has
presented several examples in this regard. However, some synonymous terms that have presented by
him take privilege of total semantic unity, and some others are somehow different from each other.

In Al-Tibyan Fi Tafsir al-Quran, in referring to multiple terms with the same meaning, Shaykh Tusi
uses the terms
مقتراب المعني (Motahareb al-Maenii),
 anda
بمعنى واحد في اللغة (be maeni vahid fi
loghat),
ملت (misli),
(بي‘aineh) (in the sense of exactly the same) and
تكرار المعني (be‘aineh) (in the sense of exactly the same) and
(الخصام Vahid),
be maeni vahid fi
loghat).

It seems that the application of the term Taradof (synonym) in his era was not commonplace among
scholars, and prominent Shia scholar Al-Sharid Al-Radi (d. 406 AH) that lived before Shaykh Tusi
used
be maeni vahed) in most of his works, especially in the interpretation of
حقائق التاویل فی
حقائق التاویل فی
ماهیت النزول (Haghaegh al-Taevil fi Motashabehe al-Tanzil) to refer to the words with the same meaning
(See: al-Khafaji, 85).

In the following, some examples of the terms that Tusi in Al-Tibyan Fi Tafsir al-Quran has considered
and defined as synonyms are presented:

Using idiom
مقتراب المعني في اللغة (motahareba al-maena felloghat) in Al-Tibyan Fi Tafsir al-Quran, Tusi
has considered the following terms applied in the Holy Qur’an as synonyms:

A- In interpreting the Ayah 26 of Al-Baqarah Surah, Tusi analyzes the term
المكذبة (Al-Istehia) and states that: “the term originally [means] avoid and refrain from anything from fear of the
evil”, and after interpreting the term, he has considered some terms such as
الانكذال (Al-Enkhezal),
الانقاذ (Al-Enghema) and
الانزهداد (Al-Eredae) as synonyms to
In analyzing the derivation of the term *Adam*, Tusi presented two different quotations from Abu Al-Abbas, and states that: “there are two views regarding the derivation of the term Adam: Firstly, the term is driven from the compound *Adim* (Adim Al-Arzu) and secondly, it is driven from *Adim* (Adim Al-Adam A) due to the fact that the term conveys the sense of color and property”. Based on the second semantic perspective, Sheikh Tusi has used the terms *Al-Israf* (الإِسراف) and *Al-Ifrat* (الافراط) as synonyms to *Al-Ghorb* (Ibid, 64).

In interpreting the term “لا تقربا” that is mentioned in Ayah 35 of Surah Al-Baqarah, Sheikh Tusi used the terms اورودَ (Al-Donouw) and الجعارة (Al-Mojavara) as the synonyms to أقرب (Al-Ghorb) (Ibid, 99).

In interpreting the term مات (Matae) in the Ayah 36 of Surah Al-Baqarah, Tusi regarded the terms المنع (Al-Tamatoe) and المثعب (Al-Talazzoz) andautop (Al-Mot’ah) as synonyms (Ibid, 111).

In interpreting the Ayah 131 of Surah Al-Imran, Sheikh Tusi refers to the synonyms (الإِعداد, (Al-Aedad), (ألفا) (Al-Ijlad), (التهيية, (Al-Taheye’a), and (الابداج, (Al-Taghdema) (Ibid, Vol. 4, 224).

In Al-Tibyan Fi Tafsir al-Quran, applying two terms مُثل (mesl) and (بمعنى واحد في اللغة) (Ibid, Vol. 2, 9).

In analyzing the signification of the terms applied in the Holy Quran, applying the term مات (Matae) and (العفو, (Al-Qofran) in interpreting the terms applied in Ayah 66 of Surah Al-Tawbah, and the terms المثل (Al-Zahtil) and المثل (Al-Kanin) in the Ayah 31 Surah Al-Mursalat, and the terms (مُثل, (Al-Nad) and (مُثل, (Al-Adl) and (مُثل, (Al-Mesl) in the Ayah 22 of Surah Al-Baqarah are introduced by Sheikh Toosi as synonyms with the application of the term مات (Mesl) (See; ibid, vol. 7, 218; ibid, vo. 11, 471; ibid, vol. 2, 9).

In interpreting Surah Az-Zumar, Toosi uses the terms الحد (Al-Tahzir) and التربيب (Al-Tarhib) as the synonyms for the term التخويف (Al-Takhvif).

In interpreting the term التخويف (Al-Takhvif) and referring to the synonymy of the relevant terms, Toosi states that: “العفو, (Al-Qofran) as equivalents to (مُثل, (Al-Nad), while (العفو, (Al-Qofran) is the hidden voice…” Applying the term التخويف (Al-Takhvif) and referring to the synonymy of the relevant terms, Toosi regards the terms (مثله, (Al-Mesl) and مات (Matae) as synonyms (Ibid, Vol. 4, 224).

In interpreting Ayah 22 of Surah Al-Qiyamah, Toosi uses the terms (النủ (Al-Behjat) and (الاعتدال (Al-Nazrah), and by applying the term التخويف (Al-Takhvif) in Surah Al-Layl assynonyms to (التأمل, (Mesl), Toosi regards the terms التخويف (Al-Tashil and Al-Takhvif) in Surah Al-Layl as synonyms to التخويف (Al-Taysir) (see; ibid, vol. 11, 623 & 434).

In interpreting Ayah 14 of Surah At-Tariq, Toosi considers (الله (Allah), (اللعب (Al-la’ab) and (الفلق (Al-Hazl) (See; ibid, vol. 1, 580).

In analyzing the signification of the terms applied in the Holy Quran, applying the term (بمعنى واحد في اللغة) (Ibid, Vol. 4, 249).
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F- In interpreting the Surahs Al-Baqarah, An-Nisa, Ar-Ra’ad and Al-Ibrahim, Tusi regards multiple terms such as (Al-fina), (Sadedana), (Vajadana), (Al-Ibtela), (Al-Ikhtebar), and the term (Al-Qovah) and (Al-Intehan) and (Al-Mitbahat), (Al-Tames), (Taba'a and Khatama), (Aldares), and the term (Al-Daser), among others, for describing the area of Holy Qur’an’s lexicon that are semantically associated with each other. In his discussion of the semantic differences in the area of signification of such lexicon, Tusi referred to the opinions held by some scholars and lexicologists such as Abu Obaideh Moemar Ibn Mosana (d 209 AH), Kasaei (d 189) and Romani (See: ibid, Vol. 1, 409; ibid, Vol. 2, 147-148; Ibid, Vol. 3, 71 & 324). It should be noted that Shaykh Tusi’s linguistic thinking benefits from sufficient recognition and balance in the area of semantics. Tusi neither denies Taradof (synonym) principle nor repudiates it due to the presence of small semantic differences in some synonyms.


In Al-Tibyan Fi Tafsir al-Quran, to refer to synonyms, Shaykh Tusi applies also the term (Be-Aynah).

A- In interpreting Ayah 140 of Surah Ali-Imran, Tusi regarded the term (Al-Lams) as synonym to the term (Al-Mas) with the application of the term “(Be’a’ina)” (Ibid, Vol. 4, 237).

In Tafsir Al-Tabyan, the term (Al-Mas) (Nazaer fel-loghat) was applied by Shaykh Tusi to refer to the synonymous terms.

A- The terms (Al-Sokun, Al-Sobut, and Al-Hadou); (Al-Hobut, Al-Nozul, and Al-Voghu’e); (Al-Shamekh, Al-Shahq, and Al-Bazekh) in interpreting Ayahs 35-38, 40 and 58 of Surah Al-Bagharaah are defined by Tusi as the synonyms (see: Ibid, Vol. 2, 94; 109, 119, 126, 140, Vol. 2).

B- In interpreting the Ayahs 87, 89, and 72 of Surah Yonus, Ayah 21 Surah Ar-Ra’ad, Ayah 13 of Surah An-Nahl, the terms (Al-Tawala), (Al-E’eraz), (Al-Ighteda), (Al-Ighteda), (Al-Makhatat), (Al-Makhatat), (Al-Ghoroan), (Al-Afw), and (Al-Safh) in interpreting Ayahs 38 of Surah Al-Bagharaah are defined by Tusi as the synonyms (see: Ibid, Vol. 2, 94; 109, 119, 126, 140, Vol. 2).

In interpreting Ayahs 87, 89, and 72 of Surah Yonus, Ayah 21 Surah Ar-Ra’ad, Ayah 13 of Surah An-Nahl, the terms (Al-Tawala), (Al-E’eraz), (Al-Ighteda), and (Al-Ighteda) are defined by Tusi as the synonyms (see: Ibid, Vol. 2, 94; 109, 119, 126, 140, Vol. 2).

It should be noted that, in Al-Tibyan Fi Tafsir al-Quran, Shaykh Tusi introduced some synonymous terms with the application of two different terms. For example, he considered the terms (Al-Faza’e, Al-Jazaee, and Al-Khawf) once under the interpretation of Surah Al-Bagharaah as synonyms and applied the term (Nazair) for them, and he applied the term (Vaahid) for describing their synonymy in Surah Al-Saba’e (see: Ibid, Vol. 7, 395, Ibid, Vol. 10, 38).

In addition, the terms (Al-Ghoroan, Al-Afw, and Al-Safh) in interpreting the Surah Al-Bagharaah were expressed as synonyms twice and with the two different terms (Be’aina) and (Nazair), and the same terms were considered synonyms in interpreting the Surah At-Tawbah with the application of the term (Be’aina) (Ibid, Vol. 2, 109 & 264, and Ibid, Vol. 7; 218).

Semantic differences among lexicons

As it was said earlier, aside from Tusi’s acknowledgement of the presence of Taradof (synonym) in Arabic language, and mentioning multiple instances for it, he discussed semantic differences in the area of Holy Qur’an’s lexicon that are semantically associated with each other. In his discussion of the semantic differences in the area of signification of such lexicon, Tusi referred to the opinions held by some scholars and lexicologists such as Abu Obaideh Moemar Ibn Mosana (d 209 AH), Kasaei (d 189) and Romani (See: ibid, Vol. 1, 409; ibid, Vol. 2, 147-148; Ibid, Vol. 3, 71 & 324). It should be noted that Shaykh Tusi’s linguistic thinking benefits from sufficient recognition and balance in the area of semantics. Tusi neither denies Taradof (synonym) principle nor repudiates it due to the presence of small semantic differences in some synonyms.
He believes in the semantic differences in the area of synonyms, and regards it as the main cause of denial of Taradof (synonym) in the language, and he acknowledges fundamentally the linguistic basis for Taradof (synonym) in Arabic language.

This proper and rational perspective can be also traced in linguistic insight of Ibn Jani and other Muslim scholars. Based on the research performed by the author, it could be said that Ibn Jenny, Shirf Razi and Shaykh Tusi are among the scholars that both have recognized Taradof (synonym) and accepted semantic differences in some synonymous terms. However, this group of scholars has not considered the presence of semantic differences as the reason for denying and rejecting Taradof (synonym), and they have not considered the nature of each one to be distinct from another.

It should be noted that, by taking semantic evolution in the language into consideration, semantic differences between some synonyms are gradually disappeared, and a fertile ground is provided for attaching it to total synonyms.

In the following, some of Shaykh Tusi’s indications of semantic differences in the area of the signification of the terms with semantic similarity are presented:

A- In analyzing the terms of the Ayah 146 of Surah Al-Baqarah, Shaykh Tusi interprets the term (Aelam) and states that: “the term المعرفة ’المعرفة’ (Al-Ill va Al-Marefa) are the same, and Romani differentiates between the term المعرفة ’المعرفة’ (Al-Ill va Al-Marefa) Romani says that: the term المعرفة ’المعرفة’ means: “specifying something by that in a detailed manner” and the term المعرفة ’المعرفة’ means “making something evident through it in a concise manner” (see: ibid, Vol. 3, 71).

B- In interpreting Ayah 14 of Surah Al-Bagharah, Shaykh Tusi interprets the term الاجتماع and adds that “Romani states that the difference between الاجتماع and the term الاجتماع is that [realization of meaning] of الاجتماع is only associated with the presence, and [realization of meaning] of الاجتماع is performed with the decision and determination of prior intention at a particular place (See: ibid, Vol. 1, 409).

C- In interpreting Ayah 31 of Surah Al-Baqarah, Shaykh Tusi interprets the term الابن and uses two terms الابن (Ilm va Al-Marefa) and regards them as synonyms, yet he adds that there is a difference between الابن and the term الابن. Shaykh Tusi states that: semantic difference between الابن (Al-Akhabar) and الابن (Al-Aelam) is that [meaning] of the term “Al-Aelam” is associated with the essential knowledge in the mind [human] by the reason and vision [faculty], and God has created [such informative tools] and it can be accompanied by providing evidence for something, and الابن (Al-Akhabar) means revelation of news, no matter audience knows it or not (see: ibid, Vol. 2, 65).

Conclusion
In his linguistic approach in Al-Tibyan Fi Tafsir al-Quran, Shaykh Tusi regarded the Taradof (synonym) as one of the tertiary categorizations of the term versus meaning, and he has presented different instances of it with the application of different terms. Tusi does not regard the difference in the wide scope of synonyms as evidence to the weakness in the phenomenon of Taradof (synonym), and he not only does not deny the emergence of Taradof (synonym) in Arabic language, but also he acknowledges the linguistic basis for Taradof (synonym) in Arabic language. According to Tusi’s indications in Al-Tibyan Fi Tafsir al-Quran, it appears that he distinguishes the nature of Taradof (synonym) from the subject of the difference between synonyms. Shaykh Tusi considers some synonymous terms as the ones with total unity of meaning, and regards some other as the ones with difference in terms of signification. This linguistic and rational insight that is reflected by Shaykh Tusi in Al-Tibyan Fi Tafsir al-Quran was earlier presented and discussed in the fields of classical epistemology in ancient Greece and India, and it was then reflected in the scientific community of Muslim scholars, particularly in the fields of linguistics and hermeneutics. Shaykh Tusi is among the scholars that in its approach to the field of semantics of lexicons paid attention to the associations between words and meanings, and his confession to the phenomenon of Taradof (synonym) is one of the achievements of his rational and logical consideration of the issues raised in the area of words and meaning. Rationality is considered to be a trend in interaction with classical Islamic sciences, especially hermeneutics and linguistic issues including common intellectual characteristics in Islamic civilization during the second to fifth centuries AD, and it was emerged in the light of scientific movement of Iranian Muslim scholars. This movement came into the scene under the influence of ancient civilizations of Persia, Greece, India, and Islamic thought, and was flourished and reached its peak in the fourth and fifth centuries AD, an era when Sheikh Tusi lived.
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