2.1. PRELIMINARIES

During the past decades researchers in the area of second language learning have directed an increasing amount of attention to separate particular characteristics of learner and cognitive strategies that elevate or impede improvement in learning another language. Despite of efforts made therein, to develop second language instruction, the fact persists that some adults are stronger at learning another language. In the past studies sought to describe this difference among learners in terms of teaching approaches, intelligence, analytic language skills referred to as "second language talent", social factors and cognitive variables. Such studies have been performed in hopes of rectifying a model of second language instruction that would raise more successful learning among numerous students.

However these features have made significant contributions to our overall comprehension of the process of Foreign/Second Language Learning, much work still exists to be done before a clear idea can be achieved which integration of factors is eventually essential to second/foreign language learning in a special situation. The characteristic of learner that has gained scholarly attention is the “cognitive style construct" identified as Field independence/Field dependence. Cognitive style FI, as opposed to FD seemed to play a useful role in the progress of foreign/second language achievement in classroom context. While the outcomes of these studies propose that FI is related, even in a modest fashion, with foreign/second language success, it is important to note several questions when assessing the role of FI/FD cognitive style in foreign/second language learning. First, what is the importance, educational and statistical, of the performance differences between field independent and field dependent students? Second, does the learner's cognitive style connect with other elements in the learning situation, such as the teaching approach, to influence
achievement in a different way? There is a growing body of literature that considers FI/FD cognitive style as an important factor to progress in foreign/second language learning. At the beginning, although it is required to review background information on the FI/FD cognitive style; construct the link between cognitive styles and education in general and between foreign/second language learning in particular.

2.2. COGNITIVE STYLE

There is a vast theoretical and experimental attention in cognitive styles. As a result, so many perceptions and words are introduced in theory and research. Some of authors name it learning styles (e.g., Honey & Mumford, 1982; Kolb, 1976; Schmeck, 1988), others call it as cognitive styles (e.g., Allinson & Hayes, 1996; Riding & Cheema, 1991), thinking styles (e.g., Al-Sabaty & Davis, 1989; Grigorenko & Sternberg, 1995; Leonard & Straus, 1997), or styles of thought (e.g., Sternberg, 1988). Consequently, several scholars call for explanation in ‘style’ terminology (e.g., Rayner & Riding, 1997). Both terms cognitive style and learning style have been employed much. Although, what they mean still depends so much on the author (Riding & Cheema, 1991). Some scholars (e.g., Entwistle, 1981) presume that the concepts of two terms are same and they can be used interchangeable, others (e.g., Das, 1988) suppose them to be different concepts and try to define them as separate terms. Some scholars consider a learning style as a subcategory of cognitive style (e.g., Hayes & Allinson, 1994, 1998). According to Hayes and Allinson (1998) a learning style, like a cognitive style, “reflects the way in which individuals process information when interpreting situations, assess the consequences of actions in those situations, and use this understanding to refine (or redefine) their theories-in-use” (p. 850). The major variance between cognitive and learning styles is according to Riding and Cheema (1991) the number of style elements that is considered; a cognitive style
is usually a bipolar dimension, while a learning style involves many factors that are usually not ‘either-or’ extremes.

Irrespective of the particular definition, the word ‘style’ usually deals with a habitual pattern or preferred mode of performing something. Cognitive psychologists who studied on problem solving and perceptual and sensory functions created the term cognitive style (Grigorenko & Sternberg, 1995). Allport (1937) was possibly the first scholar who intentionally used the style construct in relation with cognition (Grigorenko & Sternberg, 1995; Riding & Cheema, 1991). Witkin, Moore, Goodenough, and Cox (1977) outlined cognitive styles as individual differences in the way people comprehend, think, clear up the problems, learn, and connect to others. Messick (1984) explains cognitive styles as constant personal differences in ways of arranging and processing data and knowledge. Tennant (1988) describes a cognitive style as an individual’s feature and constant approach to arranging and processing data. Hunt, Krzystofik, Meindl, and Yousry (1989) define cognitive style as the way in which individual procedure and organize data, and come to judgments or realization according to their observations. Sadler-Smith and Badger (1998) assert that a style may be known as a qualitatively distinct way of arranging and processing information, with the ‘best’ style being determined by the needs of each special task, problem, or circumstance. Based on these definitions, we describe a cognitive style as the way a person comprehends environmental stimuli, and arranges and employs information. A cognitive style affects how individual search in their environment for information, how they arrange and analyze this information, and how they employ these analysis for guiding their performances (Hayes & Allinson, 1998).

A chronic variance in literature on cognitive styles is the one between style and ability. As both style and ability may influence performance on a specific task,
this difference is significant and essential. Riding (2000) states that style and ability are the two main factors that are investigated with respect to individual differences in cognitive processing. Several distinct characteristics can be discovered in the literature. Guilford (1980) declares that ability concentrates on the level of performance, while style is more related to the mode of performance. Witkin et al. (1977) also suggest that cognitive style is related to the form rather than the content of performance. Messick (1984) defines abilities as being unique constructs (i.e., more of it is ‘better’), while styles are usually supposed to be bipolar (i.e., both poles may be equally benefited, but in different conditions). This means that having more or less of ability can be related to possible levels of realization in a certain area. Cognitive styles on the contrary range from utmost to a contrasting extreme and each pole of the aspect has different intimation for cognitive functioning. Research supports the idea that cognitive style may be thought of as describing different, rather than better, ways of thinking (e.g., Kirton, 1989; Riding & Pearson, 1994; Sadler-Smith, 1997; Tinajero & Paramo, 1997).

Connected to this features is the finding that abilities are considered to be value directional (i.e., having more of an ability is better than having less), whereas cognitive styles are examined to be value differentiated. Witkin et al. (1977) declare that each pole of a cognitive style has adjusted value under specified conditions and in this view may be judged in a positive way regarding to those conditions. Therefore, the main difference between style and ability is according to Riding (2000) that efficiency on all tasks will improve as ability enhances, whereas the impact of style on individual performance will either be positive or negative based on the nature of the task. Hayes and Allinson (1998) found from their study on cognitive styles that “this suggests the possibility that people will learn and perform best in those situations
where the information-processing requirements of the situation match their cognitive style or preferred approach to processing information” (p. 851). In the other words, researchers detected that it is possible for individuals to process information and behave in ways that are not consistent with their habitual approach (Streufert & Nogami, 1989). This leads us to the discourse whether cognitive styles can change over conditions and time or not. Riding and Cheema (1991) point out in this regard to three views concerning cognitive styles.

Cognitive style can be viewed as a structure (content), as a procedure, or as both. If cognitive style is viewed as a structure, the focus is on its consistence over time. However, if cognitive style is viewed as a process, then the focus is on how it changes. In this way, style is seen as dynamic and not fixed forever. Finally, cognitive style can be known as both procedure and structure. This means it may be respectively constant, but meantime always on the move. In this way, style constitution is recurrently adapted as new events affect it. Most definitions of cognitive style propose that it is comprehensive and necessarily constant across fields of cognitive functioning. Hayes and Allinson (1998), although, realize the contingency that cognitive style may be pliable, particularly over the longer term. Leonard and Straus (1997) also identify that cognitive styles are not stiff and can be affected by life experiences. They claimed that “We often stretch outside the borders of our preferred operating modes if the conditions are right and the stakes are high enough” (Leonard & Straus, 1997, p. 112). In other words, they also point out to researches which concluded that cognitive styles tend to be respectively constant. Study proposes that “people retain their dominant preferences throughout a variety of work and social circumstances” (Leonard & Straus, 1997, p. 121). A solution for this evident refusing result is the difference that is made between style and strategy or affording manner
A style is known as a justly fixed feature of a person, while strategies are assumed as ways that may be employed to cope with environments and tasks. Strategies can change from time to time and may be acquired and improved, while styles are more stable and are respectively in-built characteristics of the individual.

“While styles may produce consistent behavior across a variety of situations over the short and medium term, strategies are much more specific and essentially represent the result of the conscious decisions an individual makes to cope with immediate cognitive tasks” (Hayes & Allinson, 1998, p. 853).

Hayes and Allinson (1994) propose that cognitive styles may not be easily changed through teaching or experience, while strategies have a rather potential flexibility. Witkin (1976) also state that many of the behaviors originating from cognitive styles might be more pliable, whereas cognitive style may be consistent over time. According to Sadler-Smith and Badger (1998) a style can be known as mainly a performance of the individual (and more particularly the personality), while a strategy rather is a performance of the interplay of the individual and the circumstance. Kogan (1980) and Robertson (1985) also propose that cognitive styles produce stable behaviors across different situations, whereas strategies are more particular and demonstrate the conscious decisions individual make in dealing with cognitive tasks. Both notions might be confused in study which causes apparently contrasting results relating to the flexibility versus consistency of cognitive style. Cognitive style has a tendency according to us towards consistency across time and condition (e.g., Goldstein & Blackman, 1978; Messick et al., 1976) and therefore remains mainly inattentive to particular training (Kagan & Kogan, 1970).
2.2.1. ISSUES WITH THE CONCEPT OF COGNITIVE STYLE

However the theoretical foundation of cognitive styles is stronger than that of learning styles, nevertheless cognitive styles have been exposed to many critiques that never let the notion to have a real position in standard cognitive psychology. Accordingly Richard Riding (2000b), one of the primary promoters of cognitive style study, overtly confessed: previously, the research about cognitive style has been logically censures for being ambiguous and sketchy. It has been involved in several of critical issues, especially with respect to situation being a lot of titles pretending to be various styles, the utilization of useless evaluation approaches, and the deficiency of an obvious difference between style and other elements like personality and intelligence. The main point of the problem is that previously, style study has not been capable of indicating effectively that the concept of cognitive style is a theoretical ideology in its own right, and therefore the notion has become too ‘instrument-bound’, in accordance with Sternberg and Grigorenko’s (2001) statement. As a result, a style was that a special style questionnaire assessed. As most of scholars created their own individualistic tools, developing from own individualistic style perceptions, such overlapping notions could not be close together effectively; therefore they create a sort of complex puzzle. It was connected with the truth that a lot of real recognized and assessed style aspects were not completely apart from some skills and personality features, an issue that causes the descent of even the most popular cognitive style category, field dependence–independence as it was discovered to be connected significantly with spatial intelligence. Consequently, a lot of scholars in this area (e.g., Carroll, 1993) finally refused the notion of cognitive style as a misdirected impression (cf. Riding, 2000b; Yates, 2000).
In an investigation of the causes for the premature collapse of styles study, Sternberg (2001) asserted that the major issue has been that the styles literature doesn’t succeed to supply a typical perceptual background for researchers that would have created strong interaction among them. Actually, the variety of metaphors employed in the literature is different that has leaded in a “kind of balkanization of research groups, and balkanization always has led to division and, arguably, deaths of a thousand cuts” (Sternberg, 2001, p. 250). In the field of second language researches, Griffiths and Sheen (1992) as well claimed in an interesting paper that the truth, that after three decades of study regarding cognitive styles there are yet challenges if such styles really exist, demonstrates the maximum faint of the notion and thus its study should be given up. It is a reliable matter, but Carol Chapelle (1992) believed that it is not possible to simply neglect this potentially beneficial notion as cognitive style and states “some of our intuitions about students” and which facilitates “appreciation for the divergent approaches to thinking and learning” (p. 381).

**2.2.2. LEARNING/COGNITIVE STYLES AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENTS**

There have been a lot of efforts done to increase learners’ educational success. It has always been the major goal of most dedicated instructors and parents that their students and children be successful as much as possible. Regarding this matter, most of the teachers agreed that learners require the positive perspectives to increase academic achievements. Usually an individual’s learning style is recognized to create strengths for educational success. According to Dunn, Beaudry and Klavas (1989) via several investigations, it has been demonstrated that both average and low achievers gain higher marks on standardized attitude and achievement tests at the time they are instructed through the realm of their learning styles. Chuah Chong-Cheng (1988) explains the significance of learning styles as being not only essential, but also one of
the vital elements for students in educational environments. Most learners tend to learn in specific modes with every style of learning assisting to the achievement in memorizing what they have acquired. Accordingly, Chong-Cheng (1988) found in his researches that learners memorize 26% of whatever they hear, 30% of whatever they observe, 10% of whatever they read, 70% of whatever they say, 90% of whatever they say while they do something and 50% of whatever they observe and hear. Such results indicate that every learning style has its own weak points and strengths. Some learners learn in various styles, while other students may only make use of one or two. Dunn, Beaudry & Klavas (1989) claim that, those learners with several learning modes like to achieve more and gain higher marks rather than students depend only on one style. In addition, the varieties in learning styles have also been observed between the learning debilitated and average achievers; between gifted and the underachievers; among secondary learners in comprehensive schools and their peers in industrial arts and vocational training and among different kinds of special academic learners (Dunn & Dunn 1986). Some special learners have tendency towards kinesthetic method, like experimental, hands-on and active approaches, on the other hand, many students favor auditory and visually directed methods (Dunn 1991).

According to Dunn and Dunn’s (1986) statement, less successful students have feeble auditory memory. Although occasionally they are fond of performing perfect in educational circumstances, their disability to keep data in mind through lecture, discussion, or reading leads to low achievement specially in traditional classroom environment that it is teacher-oriented and students mostly listen or read. It is not only weak students learn in different methods in contrast with the successful students, they also vary among themselves. For instance, impulsive students, comparing with reflective students, have less academic success (Kagan and Kogan, 1970). The other
investigations demonstrate that Field-Independent learners gain more than Field-Dependent individuals (Chapelle 1995). Many researches also indicate that coordinating learning styles with teaching strategies can prominently increase educational success at the primary and secondary school levels (Smith & Renzulli 1984). Felder (1995) believes that, learners learn more if data is accessible in a various methods rather than only a single method is used. Many experimental studies demonstrate that learning styles can either weaken or enhance educational achievements due to many factors despite the fact that not so many studies have been carried out on the correlation between learning styles and training design of learning materials (Riding & Cheema 1991). Generally, strong findings have been gained via investigations on learning styles; although, the findings have rarely been applied by instructional materials planner therewith more comprehension of students’ methods for learning can be achieved.

2.2.3. FIELD DEPENDENCE-INDEPENDENCE COGNITIVE STYLES

Field independence-dependence, a cognitive variable, is described as “the extent to which a person perceives part of a field as discrete from the surrounding field as a whole, rather than embedded, or…the extent to which a person perceives analytically” (Witkin, Moore, Goodenough & Cox, 1977, p.7). Based on Ramirez and Castañeda (1974), the terms “field-independent” and “field-dependent” stemmed from psychological study on comprehension and were first defined by Witkin et al. (1962). The study on perception was to evaluate subjects’ performance in a particular conceptual task regarding the upright in space. These scholars differentiated field independent individual from field dependent individual by if they “reflect preferred modes of relating to, classifying, assimilating and organizing the environment” (Witkin et al., 1962, p.71). Witkin et al.’s (1971) bipolar development of field
independence and field dependence assessed the degree to which learners depended upon interior or exterior referents as they process data and interplay with the surrounding field. Generally, field independent people observed objects away from the background, but field dependent people were confused by the surrounding field. On the other hand, field independent people could easily disregard unrelated parts, whereas field dependent people were easily influenced by irrelevant elements. To make the features of field independence-dependence more obvious and more specific, Jonassen and Grabowski (1993) supplied advantageous outlines to compare the two cognitive styles (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1. Differences between Field-Dependents and Field-Independents
(From Jonassen & Grabowski, 1993, p.88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Independence</th>
<th>Field Dependence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Analytic</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Generates Structure</td>
<td>Accepts Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Internally Directed</td>
<td>Externally Directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Inattentive to Social Cues</td>
<td>Attentive to Social Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Philosophical, Cognitive</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Individualistic</td>
<td>Social and Gregarious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Distant in Social Relations</td>
<td>Affiliation Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Intrapersonal</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Reserved, Aloof</td>
<td>Needs Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Experimental</td>
<td>Conventional, Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Generates own hypotheses</td>
<td>Influenced by the Salient Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Conceptually Oriented</td>
<td>Factually Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Acquires Information to fit Conceptual Scheme</td>
<td>Acquires Unrelated Facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Represents Concepts through Analysis</td>
<td>Accepts Ideas as Presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Less Affected by Format/Structure</td>
<td>Influenced by Format/Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Impersonal Orientation</td>
<td>Gets Feelings/Decisions from Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Insensitive to Social Undercurrents</td>
<td>Sensitive to Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Ignores External Stress</td>
<td>Affected by Stress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As stated by Witkin (1973), Field dependence and field independence is a cognitive style that is subsequently described as a characteristic self-consistent style of performance found extensively all over the individual's conceptual and mental activities. In mode of experiencing and at level of mental activity, a field-dependent individual has a tendency to be impressionistic and global, while a field-independent individual had tendency to be structured, analytical and articulated. It indicates that in the situation where correlation with the surrounding field is mattered, a field dependent individual prefer to mix things together into a blended and impressionistic collection, whereas a field-independent individual has capability to figure out items as separate from their contexts or to identify a field when it is structured and, when there is slightly small intrinsic structure in the field, to inflict structure on it and so recognize it as formed. A learner with a field independent (FI) cognitive style has tendency to make his/her own solutions in problem solving and thus is an individualist rather than a person who participates in interpersonal relationships. As it has been observed in previous researches, this field-independent student has tendency to achieve the best success in language learning classroom.

The field dependent (FD) student is in contrast with field independent FI student: he/she prefers to receive the solution and help given by others and solves a problem in a more collaborative or social mode (Jonassen & Grabowski, 1993). So many proofs overcome, although, that field-dependence- independence expands above cognition into other psychological areas. For example, Witkin (1973) claims that, in social circumstances, somewhat field-dependent individuals are probably to pursue the dominant social structure of reference in explaining their perspectives, ideas, emotions, and even moment to moment self-concept, consequently field-dependent individuals are basically conscious about the human content of their surroundings.
Additionally, recent outcomes propel him to confirm that field-dependent individuals are also better than field-independent individuals in prepending to, and so recalling, oral messages which are more social in nature, and that the field-dependent individuals’ special sensibility and attendance to the social circumstance result in a collection of extremely advanced social competences. Many instruments have been formulated to evaluate field independence-dependence. The perception tasks that are largely used to evaluate one’s field tendency contain the Body Adjustment Test (BAT), the Rod-and-Frame Test (RFT), the Rotating-Room Test (RRT) and the Group Embedded Figures Test (GEFT) (Witkin & Goodenough, 1981).

In the BAT, the subject is seated on a chair in a small, particularly constructed room. Both the chair and the room can be sloped clockwise or counterclockwise independently of each other, and the subject’s task is to change the chair to a position where he/she encounters it as vertical. Individual who experience their own bodies as vertical when they are completely placed with the surrounding tilted room are described as field dependence whereas individual who, regardless of the location of the surrounding room, bring the body more or less to the vertical are specified as field independence.

In the RFT, the alternative visible framework is a shiny square frame given to the subject in a fully darkened room. The frame can be turned to its center clockwise or counterclockwise. Rotated at the same center is a shiny rod which can also be tilted clockwise or counterclockwise separately from the frame. The frame and the rod, existed in tilted locations, are all the things that the subject can see in the dark room. Again, the task is to place the rod in true vertical orientation. Subjects who have a tendency to set the rod with the orientation of the frame are defined as field
dependence whereas subjects who, neglecting the slope of the frame, tend to approximate the true vertical are known as field-independence.

In the RRT, it is the orientation of the strain on the body that is changed while the visual field remained vertical. This correlation is gained by seating the subject on a chair that can be turned through 360 degrees, within a small vertical room driven throughout a rounded direction. The subject has to set his/her position to true vertical. It is determined that the subject who is affected by the identical information, i.e. the visual field, in any of these tasks is also likely to be so affected in the other two tasks.

Apart from the above three instruments which are related to the external visual field or the body itself as a main referent for comprehension of the vertical, the GEFT does not include body-field perception of the vertical, and the performance of it is revealed to be connected to that of the perceptual tasks (Crozier, 1997). Subjects are given a number of papers and pencil problems, each of which contains a simple geometrical image and a complicated design which is so patterned that each part of the simple image is made part of a clear-cut sub-whole of the pattern; the simple image is therewith effectively concealed. Field independent individual are able to identify the simple image quickly from the complicated design whereas field dependent individual are not able to recognize the simple image in the time assigned for search.

As well as the instruments described above, preschool (for ages 3-5) and children’s (for ages 5-9) forms of the group embedded figures test and also a group form of the group embedded figures test for teenagers and adults are also created to evaluate one’s degree of field dependency (see Coates, 1972; French, Ekstrom & Price, 1963; Messick, 1962; Witkin, Oltman, Raskin & Karp, 1971). Witkin asserted that efficient performance in all these tests needed the individual to ‘disembed’, to
analyze and isolate the simple image from the complex figure, and he described field independence as an ‘articulated field approach’ and compared it with a ‘global field approach’ (Witkin & Goodenough, 1981). These different tendencies are supposed to influence both cognitive and social behaviors and skills. Field independence is connected with higher articulation and proficiency in cognitive analysis and restructuring, and field dependence with a greater global method and higher social and interpersonal competency. Either style may have benefits or drawbacks for a specific task (Witkin & Goodenough, 1981).

2.2.3.1. WITKIN’S THEORY OF FIELD-DEPENDENCE VS. FIELD-INDEPENDENCE

Field dependence-independence theory is one of four cognitive style theories. The other theories consist of hemispherical lateralization or left versus right brain, sequential or parallel processing, and spatial visualization theories (Hansen, 1995). Cognitive style is about the way in which people obtain and process data. Hansen (1995) claimed that “Cognitive style measures do not indicate the content of the information but simply how the brain perceives and processes the information” (p. 2). “Extensive research (Witkin, Lewis, Hertzman, Machover, Meissner and Wapner, 1954; Witkin et al., 1962) has shown that a tendency toward more global or more articulated functioning is a consistent feature of a given individual’s manner of dealing with a wide array of perceptual and intellectual tasks. Because it represents the characteristic approach which the person brings to situations with him, we consider more global or more articulated functioning to be an individual’s cognitive style” (cited in Witkin, 1967, p. 235).

“Among the cognitive styles identified to date, the field-dependence-independence dimension has been the most extensively studied and has had the widest
application to educational problems (Witkin, Dyk, Faterson, Goodenough, & Karp, 1962/1974; Witkin, Lewis, Hertzman, Machover, Meissner, & Wapner, 1954/1972; Witkin, 1976)” (as cited in Witkin, Moore, Goodenough & Cox, 1977, p. 1). Witkin et al., (1974) stated “individual differences in cognitive style are affected by child rearing practices, interplay with ecology and social structure” (p. 14). Furthermore, Witkin et al., (1974) found “a field-dependent cognitive style is likely to be predominant in social settings characterized by insistence upon adherence to family and social authority and the use of severe or even harsh socialization practices to enforce this conformance” (p. 16).

Witkin et al., (1974) discovered “children from social settings showing less emphasis on conformity would tend to be more field-independent and show other signs of more developed differentiation than children from settings emphasizing conformity” (p. 25). Witkin (1967) and Witkin et al., (1974) argued individual differences in cognitive styles are connected with contrasts in family knowledge while growing up. In nature, cognitive styles are the end-products of particular socialization processes. Witkin (1967) also believed “performance of relatively field-dependent or field-independent fashion was a highly stable feature of an individual’s cognitive functioning over time” (pp. 236-237). Witkin (1967) considered the contrasting differences between field dependent (global) and field independent (articulated) cognitive styles. He asserted “the field-dependence-independence dimension is a continuous one, most persons falling between these two extremes” (p. 236). Witkin (1967) also claimed “In a field-dependent mode of perception, the organization of the field as a whole dominates perception of its parts; an item within a field is experienced as fused with organized ground. In a field-independent mode of
perception, the person is able to perceive items as discrete from the organized field of which they are a part” (p. 236).

Witkin, Moore, Goodenough and Cox (1977) observed many specifications between individuals with field dependent-independent cognitive styles. The field dependent person’s perception was highly controlled by the dominant field. They are disposed to connect to the formation of the field as given. They were likely to use the organization or formation of the presented field. Field dependent individuals were also higher in tune with social elements and the surroundings. They were sensitive to social signs and were interested in what others state and perform. Field dependent people were attracted to people and interested to be with others. As opposed, field independent people see the items as more or less apart from the surrounding field. They were more probably to conquer the formation of the field or reorganize it, when offered with a field having a prevailing formation. Additionally field independent people were more inclined to inflict their own organization and configuration. They were considered as more analytical and concerned with the impractical and theoretical. They were observed as more independent in that they were not affected by their experts, teachers or authority physiques. They were considered to have a more social tendency and not as sensitive to impersonal undertones as field dependent people.

2.2.3.2. FIELD-DEPENDENCE/INDEPENDENCE IN THE FIELD OF LANGUAGE LEARNING

Among the cognitive styles, field dependence/independence attracted more attention from scholars. Witkin (1973) defines field-independence as “an analytical, in contrast to global, way of perceiving which entails a tendency to experience items as discrete from their backgrounds and reflects ability to overcome the influence of an
embedding context”. On the other hand, while facing with difficulties, some students are good at reducing things from the context and are typically free from the situations and people, more generally they tend to solve it in more analytically. Conversely, individuals are recognized as field dependent if they cannot extract an object from its background field, or context. As for language learning, Skehan (1998) asserts that field-dependent people are more expected to be naturally extracted through their personal orientation and their convenience in communication condition to maximize interactions in that they are expected to gain good characteristics, appropriate feedback, and have chances to employ language to convey the concepts. Field-dependent people, although feel comfy and being sensitive in interaction environments, are not supposed to be successful data analyzers, and so, however supplied with more information to deal with, will extract it less. They may surpass in more interactive environments in that, what is evaluated is language employment rather than language-like employment. Field-independent students, in opposite, are expected to analyze the presented linguistic material, recognizing its elements, and probably probe correlations between these elements. They have vast attentional valence and consider significant features of language. They might then be reflective upon the approaches in that they have extracted their awareness system. The field-independent people profit from the approaches he/she analyze data but is observed to keep away from environments in which language is in fact supposed to be employed for interaction. They may outperform in unsocial circumstances and more intellectual tests.

There are pros and cons for field-dependent and field-independent cognitive styles to be employed for language learning environments. The field-independent learners surpass in learning situation that entails analysis, considerations to
components, and being proficient in practices, exercises, and other concentrated tasks. The field-dependent learners, conversely, appear to gain a higher level of success in daily language circumstances outside of the classroom limitations and are able to do the exercises which demand interpersonal interaction competences.

2.2.3.3. CORRELATING FIELD-DEPENDENCE/INDEPENDENCE WITH LEARNING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Diversity in cognitive style may also cause variation into success in language learning (Cook, 2008). Field-independent students that are more autonomous prefer analyzing and learning by themselves. Additionally they outperform in detecting difficulties and comprehending the information, that are presented by their instructors or gained from books, by reorganizing them. Whereas field-dependent students are connected with others and the external environment, thus instructor or partner’s responses are momentous for them. They tend to the holistic, general, and unanalytical approaches. Subsequently, while confronting with equivocal terms, a field-dependent learner is not able to identify the multiple concepts, whereas filed-independent students can solve the ambiguity. Field-independent learners outperform in grammar, lexical, writing and reading in SLA rather than field-dependent ones. But, field-dependent students have a stronger ability in interaction when the learning procedure occurs in normal situation.

2.2.3.4. IMPORTANCE OF STUDENTS’ COGNITIVE STYLE PREFERENCE IN LEARNING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Witkin (quoted by Junxia, 2011) asserted the field-dependent learners are disposed to connect with environments, are strongly interested in interacting with other students, are eager in social activities, as well they prefer to talk explicitly. All such elements make the field-dependent learners capable of learning a language better
in natural conditions. Accordingly, field-dependent learners outperform outside the classroom. Thus, it is usual that field-dependent learners intentionally probe more chances to make more cordial interaction with foreign instructors, and their partners, and that they are interested in activities that can create the opportunities for them to represent their aptitude in spoken statements. Actually, this type of learners can improve their learning outcomes by dealing with the learning environment completely. In English learning procedure, field-dependent learners usually interested in chances of participating in English parts, English speaking competition and etc. They are often absorbed by dialogues. Although, in learning a second language, the significant deficiency of field-dependent learners is that they are not proficient at learning on their own; syllabus organized by instructors is their interesting learning mode. Therefore, field-dependent learners consistently do fine in spoken English, emulating and listening, but do not perform well at reading comprehension, or translation and sentence analysis. Conversely, field-independent learners prefer to be detached from other people and the surroundings, thus they are unaware of achieving social knowledge and as well, not influenced by these knowledge. In the process of learning English, they perform better than field-dependent learners in analytical language instructions, for instance, in translation. Because field-independent learners perform well in conceptual thinking and analytical activities, they are premier in learning methodically, sequentially and slowly but surely. To be autonomous from the outside world and other people is their usual learning mode. Thus, in the field of learning English, field-independent learners always demonstrate their talent in analyzing the terms and sentences, performing lexical tasks according to semantics, and etc.
2.2.3.5. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF INSTRUCTOR AND ESL STUDENTS’ COGNITIVE STYLES ADAPTATION

Instructors’ role in being match with dependent/independent students in teaching English as a second language is affected by several main elements. Foremost, instructors have their own field cognitive styles like students that mean instructors’ field dependence/independence cognitive style will impact on their teaching style in classrooms. In English classes at university, observed by Junxia (2011), two various kinds of instructors are disposed to utilize various teaching approaches. Field-dependent instructors tend to have debates in class, and they prefer to create student-oriented situation in English class and let learners undertake the liability of managing the classroom. Whereas, filed-independent instructors prefer to speak and find out and they are not interested in student-centered situation in the classroom. The teaching/learning environment with interaction between instructors and learners is the main purpose of field-dependent instructors; conversely, field-independent instructors prefer to make their teaching/learning environment in accordance with cognitive features of teaching. Next, as stated by James (quoted by Kheirzadeh, 2011), field-dependent learners perform better in field-dependent instructor classroom, and contrariwise. Since instructors own particular responsibility in language learning, they should not make their field cognitive styles stable that will be disadvantageous for learners’ language learning; conversely, they should be able to change or improve their field cognitive styles based on various teaching demands.

Probably some teachers will consider this as a tough work, since “cognitive styles are typically discussed as if they were polarities” (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, p.89), and many teachers think it is not feasible to modify a person cognitive styles. Although, in fact, people more possibly represent proneness towards one side
or the other one, with their marks on cognitive style tests organized within a continuum between the sides. Since individuals experience progress continuously in their entire lifetime, it is feasible for them to change from one trend to other one. As a result, people’s cognitive styles are not in a stable position. Therefore, it creates chances for instructors to guide learners to employ appropriate field cognitive styles to cope with different learning activities in English learning environments. Final factor is associated with classroom space. If the space is too big, instructors face so many problems in fulfilling the field cognitive requirements of all learners. Due to this fact, mainly the field cognitive style of the majority of the classroom can be satisfied, whereas some learners’ cognitive style cannot be managed by instructors. As suggested by Witkin & Goodenough, (1981), for these learners, instructors can plan appropriate after-class activities to change learners’ cognitive styles because individuals’ cognitive styles have the “mobility of functions” that means individuals who usually have tendency toward specific cognitive style may change to other one in some situations. For instance, instructor can purposely motivate field-independent learners to have more interaction with other people after class, like participating in English corners or attending in English speaking discussions and so forth, so that assist field-independent learners to construct the feeling of field-dependence to improve the English learning outcomes. On the other hand, for field-dependent learners, instructors can ask them to complete test-related home assignments after class like English translation or writing, so that he/she can modify their field-dependency to field-independency. Consequently, instructors would be a leader in the learners’ English learning procedure.
2.2.3.6. REVIEWS AND RESEARCHES ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FIELD-DEPENDENCE/INDEPENDENCE COGNITIVE STYLES AND LEARNING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

According to Witkin et al. (1962, 1971, 1977, 1979), second language acquisition scholars (Chapelle and Roberts, 1986) have tended to describe field independence-dependence (FI/FD) as a cognitive style, a bipolar, constant feature impacting how one thinks, feels or perceives and treats. FI/FD cognitive styles have been supposed as being concerned with second language acquisition (Bialystok & Froehlich, 1978; Chapelle & Green, 1992; Dreyer, 1998; Naiman, Frohlich, Stern & Todesco, 1996; Seliger, 1977). FI/FD cognitive styles deal with whether people have tendency to trust in internal or external referents as they process and perceive data and as they interface with their surroundings. The difference between FI and FD is intimately concerned with analytic and global performance; the two poles of the cognitive style can be predicted to do well in various types of language learning conditions (Jamieson, 1992).

Success in various kinds of language learning conditions has been offered by scholars. FI people are supposed to be independent and aware of details; so, FI people might represent greater proficiency in language learning activities such as finding models, arranging data to make generalizations and learning regulations (Krashen, 1977). In other words, FD people are viewed to have an social tendency; they are supposed to be impersonally oriented and would be disposed to talk and interact (Brown, 1987); therefore FD individuals might perform well in second language acquisition when acquiring the language by interfacing with native speakers (Krashen, 1977). As regard to the application of acquiring strategies, FI individuals have tendency to use a hypothesis-testing method to problem-solving. In contrast, FD
individuals are apt to set out passive, spectator-like method to acquire data (Nebelkopf & Dreyer, 1973; Witkin et al., 1977). Thus, FI and FD persons are suitably classified as what Hatch (1974) named “rule-formers” and “data-gatherers.”

Moreover, FI learners are interested in matters that are more abstract, concrete, neutral and actual. When arranging material, FI individuals may employ internalized rules obtained from experience to analyze or reorganize the data. Conversely, FD individuals are interested in material that has a personal, social content or that contains fun, fancy, art and music. When arranging the material, FD individuals are likely to trust in the certain external organization of the material to provide formation and intuitions (Carter, 1988; Kinsella, 1995). Therefore, FI learners are intimately concerned with better implementation in classroom activities, e.g., analysis, attention to details, understanding and ability in exercises and practices whereas FD, with accordance to their social progress and understanding of others, are more successful in learning a second language from communicative perspective (Dreyer, 1992; Dreyer, Wissing & Wissing, 1996; Naiman et al. 1978). Thus, learners are supposed to represent different methods to second/foreign language learning based on their FI/FD tendency.

Successful learning may occur by either FI or FD orientation; nevertheless, the learning method of FI learners correlates with many of the strategies employed by “good language learners”, as recognized by Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975): successful learners use an active method, are eager guessers, test and practice, pay attention to form, and continuously analyze, classify, and synthesize (Brown, 1978; Gayle, 1981). Although, Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975) have also concluded that good language learners have a strong desire to interact, attempt to use the language with others, observe how well their speech is being perceived by others, and attend to social signs
to concept. The interpersonal tendency of FD individuals, then, may also be effective for language learning. Researchers of effective variables in second language learning have stated that empathy, socialization and other FD features are the clues to language learning success (Brown, 1978; Gayle, 1981). Therefore questions have been made whether FI/FD might be connected with success on language skills in a different way. For answering these questions, many studies have been carried out to investigate the impact of field-dependence/independence cognitive style on second language learning. In a research in 1990, Bean (quoted in Salmani-Nodoushan, 2007) discovered that a field dependent cognitive style could make difficulties for learners of English as a Second Language (ESL). He investigated English language performance and cognitive styles field-dependence (FD), and field-independence (FI). The participants in his study consisted of 157 adult Korean and Japanese ESL learners in university and community-sponsored classes. The outcomes showed that (72.5%) of the Koreans were FD than were the Japanese (20.8%); (73.6%) of the community learners demonstrated field-dependent than did the university learners (33.3%); and more of those who had stayed in the United States for a longer time, mostly Korean immigrants, had tendency to be field dependent. Additionally, the outcomes of Bean's research (1990) demonstrated that field independence related positively with English language performance and the duration of education.

In addition, Blanton (quoted by Khodadady, 2012), studied the effect of cognitive style on standardized reading tests. She realized that cognitive style had more effects on learners’ performance on a reading comprehension standardized test than did gender or ethnicity. Kind of the exercises included in the test had a significant influence on the performance of the field-dependent learners. The results in her study represented that field-dependent learners outperformed if the reading tests
were multiple-choice un-timed than the other types of tests and actually this kind of reading test resulted in more precise assessment of their reading comprehension abilities and reduced contrasts in test performance between field-dependent and independent learners.

Many researches have proposed that FI is a powerful predictor of successful second or foreign language learning. Naiman et al. (1975, 1978), studying English-speaking Canadian students of secondary school studying French, discovered that FI was a considerable predictor of L2 performance. They found that FI/FD learners thought to process and create linguistic structures in different ways. FI was obviously connected with higher success on emulation and listening comprehension tasks. In the same situation as that in the investigation of Naiman et al. (1975, 1978), Bialystok and Frohlich (1978) also recognized that FI represent a significant relationship with success in French reading, listening, writing and grammar tests. Chen (1991), who has done an investigation on the relationship of FI and English proficiency of Taiwanese college students, also verified the significant relationship between FI and listening comprehension skill relevant to both phonological and conversational aspects. In a research of adult ESL learners by Seliger (1977), a relationship was also observed between FI and a sentence disambiguation test, therefore supporting the hypothesis that FI was linked to successful L2 proficiency learning. Another survey by Lieu (2000) investigated the relationship between students’ cognitive styles and tasks of English sentences among junior high school students in Taiwan; Lieu found that a significant correlation between FI and performance in recognizing English clauses tasks. Abraham (1981) explored the relationship between FI/FD cognitive styles of Spanish-speaking ESL students and the performance in grammatical rules. She also concluded that FI was a significant predictor of performance in a fill-in-the-blank
grammar test and compositions for adult ESL students. Moreover in another research, Abraham (1983) found significant relationship between FI and the employment of the monitoring strategy by ESL learners in each of three tasks—fill-in-the-blank, proofreading and writing.

However FI supposed to be a positive predictor of successful language performance, some contradictory and opposite outcomes about the correlation between FI and language performance have been found. For example, based on Carter’s (1988) research, FI was distinguished effective for performance in both aspects of formal linguistic attainment and in functional oral proficiency tasks. The same result was also revealed by Chapelle and Roberts (1986) who concluded that FI was related to linguistic and communicative ability in the TOEFL test. The outcomes of the two investigations are in contrast with the hypothesis presented by Naiman et al. (1978), Dreyer, (1992) and Dreyer et al. (1996) that FI/FD might be linked to the different language tasks distinctively. In contrast to Carter’s (1988) as well as Chapelle and Roberts’ (1986) researches, Day (1984) came up with a different conclusion by investigating ESL students, mentioning a significant correlation between FI and performance in a cloze test but not in a communicative competence test. This outcome is slightly close to Hansen and Stansfield’s (1981, 1982) and Stansfield and Hansen’s (1983) surveys. In studying the linguistic, communicative and integrative ability of Anglo college students studying Spanish, Hansen and Stansfield (1981, 1982) discovered that FI was related to linguistic performance and integrative attainment but not so much with communicative ability, concluding that speaking performance might be more intimately associated with FD manners than FI ones.
Still, some other surveys proposed that FI was not a significant predictor of second or foreign language learning. Bialystok and Frohlich (1977,1978), who investigated high school students studying French in Toronto, mentioned that however a strong, positive relationship between FI and reading, writing and grammar tests was discovered, FI was not a strong predictor when synthesized with other experimental issues. These studies found that FI/FD was a very weak role in second language learning and was not significantly predictive of progress and achievement in the second language learning. Another research carried out by Tucker et al. (1976) studied secondary school students learning French as a second language in Canada. The research detected no significant correlation between FI and performance in listening comprehension task, reading comprehension or oral production skills. Chapelle and Roberts (1986) investigated adult international students registered in the Intensive English Institute at the University of Illinois, evaluating their English proficiency by TOEFL containing a multiple-choice grammar test, cloze test, dictation test and an oral test. They discovered little proof for the correlation between FI and the cloze test, which is in contradictory with the outcomes of Day’s (1984), and Stansfield and Hansen’s (1983) studies. In the same situation as Chapell and Roberts’ (1986), Jamieson (1992) also investigated ESL students employing TOEFL as a measurement tool which included a listening test, a grammar test, and a reading test. She described second language achievement in two manners: proficiency and improvement in a whole semester. She realized that however FI was significantly associated with performance in English as a second language, it was not predictive of progress over the course of a semester. Furthermore, the same result was revealed in Elliott’s (1995) research on the impacts of FI/FD on the pronunciation accuracy of adult Spanish learners at Indiana University. That is to say, FI was slightly related to
pronunciation correctness; it was not a strong predictor of progress in pronunciation performance.

Nevertheless, some surveys, but not many, supported the hypothesis suggested by Naiman et al. (1978), Dreyer (1992) and Dreyer et al. (1996) mentioning that FI/FD was associated with the success of various language tasks. Abraham (1985) investigated the advantages of two ESL lessons on participle formation of grammar. One of the lessons was based on a traditional deductive method; another lesson including no rules but propelled attention to many instances in context. A significant correlation was revealed between FI/FD and lessons, with FI individuals performed better in the deductive lesson and FD individuals better in the example lesson. Johnson, Prior, and Artuso (2000) studied the hypothesis that a more FD cognitive style might be adaptive to given elements of second language performance. The study represented that a more FD style was related to better performance in second language communicative evaluation.

Nilforoshan and Afghari (2007) studied the impact of field in/dependency on second language writing performance. Eighty nine sophomore students (14 males and 75 females) who had registered in essay writing course participated in this study. They were studying English Translation at Khorasghan University. A TOEFL test was conducted in order to recognize the level of the students’ English language proficiency. The standard Group Embedded Figures Test was employed to measure field dependency. The participants were requested to write essays on the two modes of narration and argumentation. The collected essays were assessed based on ESL Holistic Scoring Guide. The collected data were put through the statistical process of MANOVA, T-Test and Scheffé test. The results detected a strong difference between the two groups of field dependence and field independence in writing task generally
and narrative writing particularly. Field independent students performed better that field dependents (p<0.05). Although, no significant contrast was revealed between field dependents and field independents in argumentative writing.

Berent (1974) studied about Field Dependence and performance on a writing task. Timed writing samples were collected from 50 female psychiatric inpatients. Patients were allocated based on their scores on the rod-and-frame test to extreme field-dependent and field-independent groups. In contrast with field-independent individuals, the field-dependent patients took significantly more times to finish the writing task. Despite the greater times, three independent valuators recognized the field-dependent writing less readable, less well oriented on the page, less well ordered, and in general weaker in total quality than the field-independent writing.

Yarahmadi (2011) explored differences between field dependent and field independent students ‘writing with a special focus on ownership. Totally 46 sophomores English Translation from Islamic Azad University, Arak Branch participated in this study. They were both male and female students that the age range was between 22 and 26. The Portable Rod and Frame Test (PRFT) and the Embedded Figures Test (EFT) were employed to measure cognitive style. Pearson correlations have shown a relationship between field dependency and ownership in writing. Field dependent students were more likely than field independent students to use first person singular pronouns and possessive adjectives representing ownership, in their essays.

Salmani-Nodoushan (2007) has investigated whether Field Dependence or Independence is a predictor of EFL Reading Performance or not. One thousand, seven hundred, forty-three freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior students, all studying English at different Iranian universities and colleges, subjected to the Group
Embedded Figures Test (GEFT). According to the GEFT test results, 582 field-independent (FI) and field-dependent (FD) students then conducted the 1990 version of the IELTS. Employing SPSS program for subsiding attached variables into groups and participants’ IELTS scores (according to 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles), four proficiency groups were recognized for each cognitive style. From each proficiency group, 36 FD and 36 FI students were chosen via a matching process. The resulting sample of 288 participants conducted the Task-Based Reading Test (TBRT) created for the survey. Data analysis detected that student’s cognitive styles led to a significant contrast in their overall test performance in the proficient, semi-proficient, and fairly proficient groups, but not in the low-proficient group. The results also mentioned that cognitive style caused a significant difference in participants’ performance on true-false, sentence completion, outlining, scanning, and elicitation skills in all proficiency groups.

Also a study carried out by Vahabi (quoted by Kheirzadeh, 2011), in an investigation of the relationship between ESL learners FD/FI cognitive style, proficiency, and communication strategies in writing revealed that there is not any correlation between ESL students, FD/FI cognitive styles and the number and the kinds of perceptual strategies they employ in writing. Another research concerning the impact of “cognitive style of field-dependence/independence on learners’ performance in recognition and text-based tests of metaphor” also has been conducted by Hashemian et. al. (2012) in which the participants consisted of 80 senior undergraduate students studying English Translation at university. The researchers used Nelson English Language Proficiency test, GEFT and test of Metaphor for data collection and the results of their study revealed that there is a significance difference...
between field-dependents, field-independents and performance in all types of metaphor tests.

Finding the interesting correlation between field-independence and tutored second language learning, Brown (1987) argued that field-independence may be a benefit in second language learning classroom. On the other hand, he suggested, field-dependence may be appropriate in uninstructed natural second language acquisition from the circumstances in that language is being discoursed about the subject. This may be due to the fact that natural language acquisition entails natural interaction in that field-dependent individual may be more successful by ability of cooperation, social development, and understanding other people. However the above investigations on the correlation between FI/FD learners and second or foreign language performance supposed to represent that FI learners with the reorganizing skills are successful in acquiring second language in the classroom settings, ineffective and varied outcomes have also been discovered in associating with FI/FD cognitive styles and second/foreign language learning (Carter, 1988). As was pointed out by Chapelle (1995), FI/FD cognitive styles supplied new intuitions into learner contrasts in terms of how students moved towards learning, but they did not forecast success in second or foreign language learning.

The purpose of reviewed literature study which explained in this section is to survey the notion of field-dependence and field-independence and its different effects on learning English as a Second Language. Several researches in second language learning have also been studied, that appear to propose a feasible connection between field-dependence, field-independence and learning English as a second language. Researches conducted by prior scholars represented some useful issues regarding field-dependent/independent learners and their difference in learning activities and
language skills. In accordance with previous studies it looks that field-independence cognitive style has a positive and significant relationship with achievement in second language learning. However, field-dependence cognitive style may not be always a negative aspect because field-dependent individuals surpass in social dimension of language, as Cook (2008) mentioned no standard explanation exists regarding why field-dependent individuals should perform generally better or worse at cognitive activities than field-independent students to achieve in second language learning.

2.2.3.7. CRITIQUES ABOUT FD/FI AND GEFT

In spite of the prior studies, the construct of field independence and field dependence is not without arguments. In 1992, Griffiths and Sheen brought up a series of theoretical and practical objections to the employment of field independence in investigation including second language learning and came to “the inescapable conclusion that FD/FI has not, and never has had, any relevance to second-language acquisition” (p.133). They mentioned that there is a very strong relationship between the GEFT and other evaluations of spatial ability such as the Wechler Block Design subtest (Cronbach 1984, p.267) and made a number of serious complaints to FI research in EFL containing (1) that it is not a bipolar construct but that the employment of the GEFT to evaluate it makes it a uni-polar evaluation of an ability (2) that the construct is no longer considered seriously by scholars in popular psychology, (3) that it is a kind of intelligence, a Visio-Spatial skill, which is a component of general or fluid intelligence, and (4) that there is no correlation, and never was between FD/FI and lingual data processing (Griffiths & Sheen, 1992).

Another investigation since Griffiths and Sheen’s (1992) assault have joined to the debate that FI may actually be a visual or pattern recognition skill intimately connected with intelligence (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2001; Dörnyei & Skehan,
2003). In most of the studies, the strong positive relationship has tendency to be in favor of the FI pole rather than FD, proposing that FI may in fact be ability and FD, actually, is clearly the lack of that ability. As regards FI relates mildly well with other evaluations of academic performance, IQ, and verbal intelligence, it can be claimed that FI is a kind of fluid intelligence (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2001). Fluid intelligence is an intrinsic argumentative ability that some individuals are born with but is autonomous of knowledge that is obtained from experience (Cronbach, 1984). Moreover, when intelligence has been statistically partialed out of prior research outcomes, the relationships with FI have tendency to diminish (e.g., J. Hansen & Stansfield, 1981). This makes the conclusion that FI has insufficient discriminate reliability as a construct and so is “tantamount to fluid intelligence” (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2001, p.7).

Some scholars have asserted that research into field independence has been fatally defected from the starting point. Riding and Rayner (1998) mentioned that the construct of FI developed from some of tests including visual orientation to recognize a single, distinct object against a distracting history and supposed that FI people will do this faster and easier than FDs. Although, there are no subtests in which FD people may be more probably to do well on. They mention that FI scholars generally assert that FI correlates with (1) analytic versus global method to their surrounding (2) a more social versus individualistic perspective and (3) psychological discrimination (Witkins & Goodenough, 1981). Although, there are no authentic, reliable psychological tests capable of assessing all of the social and psychological aspects relevant to FI and FD. Thus, if the style dimension of FI cannot be supported or proved, the study outcomes related to the Group Embedded Figures Test (GEFT) may in fact be due to the research plan permitting the intelligence parts to perform and
affect the results (Skehan, 1989). Therefore, it is to be thought that most of the researches have certified the conclusion found by Griffiths and Sheen (1992) that FI and FD “is a wasteland, bereft of meaningful hypotheses for L2 researchers. Moreover it has never been more than this” (Griffiths & Sheen, 1992, p. 145).

2.2.3.7.1. RESPONDS TO FD/FI CRITIQUES

In response to the status of Griffiths and Sheen (1992), Chapelle (1992) presented a rebuttal indicating that FD/FI does have a rational foundation and that valuable perspectives can be achieved from its usage in second language acquisition studies. Chapelle mentioned that the creation of field independence depends upon a large amount of experimental studies collected through several decades explaining the logics behind characterizing FI and FD as being value neutral. The rationale of this matter why there is a few written in recent psychological studies about FD/FI may in fact be because there has already been such a vast number of research released on it, estimated to be well over 3,000 references (Goodenough, 1986).

Chapelle agrees with Griffiths and Sheens statements that there is so mush of confusion about how the construct of FD/FI should be explained and that much of this would be relieved by starting point with a relevant definition of it. She asserts that the proof regarding FD/FI and the GEFT should be described as an indicator of “cognitive restructuring skills” (Chapelle & Green, 1992, p. 377). She proceeds to state that FD/FI may not only be a cognitive style, but it is in charge of variance on language learning tests. She mentions that “ultimately the researchers will have to weigh the evidence and decide for themselves how to evaluate its worth” (p. 377).

2.3. WRITING

When we discuss regarding the instruction of writing skill, what do we mean to? the composing , or the composition? the passage or the task practice? Or both of
them (Arndt, 1987)? What is our answer if somebody asks what feature you could be focusing on? Actually, the word writing can convey both the procedures and final products situated under their output reflections rather perfectly the selection of center of attention obtainable to people who deal with the instruction of this greatly specific kind of communicational competence. During the past 20 years or possibly longer, the change of focus on writing investigation from product to process has led attentions towards the writing activities via which primary opinions and concept develop into written passages. However, it may be ill-advised and probably even infeasible to separate the processes and products from each other, either in instruction or in investigation. Because, at the center of efficient composition lie the strategies for successful induction of language and idea. It cannot be disclaimed that composition is a communicative skill and a professional component in the procedure of language learning. But, writing skill had been accepted ignorantly with the minimum consideration because of its complicacy. With reference to the past events, individuals involved in teaching English as a second language have paid little steady attention to the advancement of writing skill in pupils as student writers.

The most broadly popular definition of writing was offered by Aristotle. When he started to present some fundamental descriptions about, things, meanings and signs, and before explaining nouns and verbs as components of sentences that can be true or false, Aristotle argued how these linguistic entities connect with ideas and elements of the material world:

"Words spoken are symbols of affections or impressions of the soul; written words are symbols of words spoken. And just as letters are not the same for all men, sounds are not the same either, although the affections directly expressed by these indications are the same for everyone, as are the things of which these impressions are images" (Coulumas, 2003, p.2).

Whereas, Lamb and Jonson (2000) described writing in English functionally as:
"Writing is the expression of language in the form of letters, symbols, or words. The primary purpose of writing is communication. People have used many tools for writing including paint, pencils, pens, typewriters, and computers. The writing can be formed on the wall of a cave, a piece of paper, or a computer screen" (Lamb & Johnson, 2000).

It is clear that Aristotle emphasizes the role of writing as transferring the spoken words in written symbols for indicating feelings or affections. In the same manner, Lamb and Johnson went beyond Aristotle; they explained that language in general is represented in the form of written symbols. Therefore, all of them assume the function of writing as a means of interaction between individuals.

2.3.1. WRITING AS A SKILL

Archibald (2001) states that "writing is a skill that needs knowledge and proficiency in many areas. It is a multidimensional skill. It is a complex skill that results from the interaction of the writer's knowledge, experience, skills and the cognitive demands of the task" (pp.153-160). Orwig (1999) defines writing as a skill pointing out that "It is a productive skill that is more complicated than it seems at first, and often seems to be the most difficult of the skills since it has a number of micro skills such as: using orthography correctly, spelling and punctuation conventions, using vocabulary in a correct way and using the appropriate style" (p.2). Bello (1997) says that "writing is a continuous process of discovering how to find the most effective language for communicating one's feelings and thoughts" (p.5). He continues to state that "Writing is challenging, whether it in one's native language or in a second language" (p.5). The researcher proposes that writing is a process that requires scheme, instruments, plan or strategies and cognitive demands. These elements support the sub-skills of writing such as structures of writing and organizers of the text. Hence, the writer will be capable of writing in a productive mode.
2.3.2. WHY TEACHING WRITING

As writing is considered a lifetime skill, it works for four critical, tenacious aims for the learner interaction, critical thinking and problem solving, and self-actualization.

2.3.2.1. WRITING, THE KEY TO COMMUNICATION

As a way of communication writing is employed to represent ideas - thoughts, suggestions, values and dedication. For students, writing is a basic tool through which they indicate their perception and interpretation of meanings and theories learned for many weeks or months. For the advocate, writing considered as briefs and position papers provided for clients. Virtually all these tasks, anyhow different in purpose, consistently need use of the composing skills learned in the writing class.

2.3.2.2. WRITING FOR CRITICAL THINKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING

Words are the tools to state our ideas, which we then assess against our experience and that of other people. In this case, writing helps us think crucially, a critical ability in our team, media-oriented society which always bombards us with a lot of data (Hughey et al 1983). This information can be amusing, sometimes upsetting, some advantageous, some useless and so on. Some data extracts respond or action; some does not. The mind is compelled to transfer through a kaleidoscope of conceptions and ideas to assign a pattern of what is meaningful and to help us create some concepts of our lives and the world around us. Writing assists to concur through this kaleidoscope of ideas, as Irmscher (1979) points out, "to bring thought into consciousness, making it available both for us and for others to see" (p.243). Via writing we can survey our deepest ideas and feelings, reveal and survey our tendencies and meet our values. Writing can assist to detect gaps in our comprehension and faults in our thinking. It can help us to realize when we require
collecting additional information or perspectives, when we require rethinking a question, or when we require rejecting a belief or idea. Writing becomes a way of describing ourselves and our difficulties, of specifying our proficiency and our ideas, of comprehension and resolving our problems.

Thus, writing is a tool to examining and purifying our understandings of the world around us. It needs us to evaluate our ideas on a sequence outside of the self. Once we have written our thoughts down, we will be a reader, the evaluator of that thought, going outside ourselves and making distance between the thoughts and ourselves. From this view, we are capable of looking at and examining the idea, thought or experience from a new outlook, within a bigger framework than existed within us before the idea has been created on paper. By organizing and classifying perceptions and comprehension "under a relevant and more inclusive conceptual system" (Ausubel 1965, p.105), we achieve new visions, detect various perspectives and in the process, are led to the exploration of concept.

2.3.2.3. WRITING FOR SELF-ACTUALIZATION

Edward Albee is quoted by Murray (1968) as claiming, "Writing has got to be an act of discovery. I write to discover what I am thinking about". Writing, as a way of detecting and progressing ourselves, is a tool for self-actualization. What we acquired about ourselves and progress within ourselves via writing can assist us to recognize our personal potential and to gain personal aims. Thus, as well as being external activity through which we interact with other people, writing also works for our internal selves. As an inner-oriented activity, writing is, as Irmscher (1979) points out, "a way of connecting with ourselves, an internal communication. In writing, this externalizing and internalizing occur at one at the same time. Putting out is putting in"
Therefore, when we write we are also detecting something about who we are and what we believe.

As a part of the essential human need for self-actualization, one sudden goal frequently kept in mind by student-writers is success in the academic world. They require demonstrating their knowledge, their conception of various subjects and their ability to interact that knowledge and conception intelligently to other people. They are requested to write reports, research papers, essays and examinations to demonstrate that they know and realize the ideas of other people and can combine the new experience into their own thoughts (Hughey et. al. 1983). Their success is specified, at least in part, by how effectively concept is conveyed. The ability to create well-written papers will increase students' academic progress because of what Hirsch entitles the principle of "relative readability":

“Increased communicative efficiency is a universal tendency in the history of all languages. The trend is to achieve the same effects with less and less reader effort... The tendency to greater linguistic efficiency is a universal because for mankind it is a human universal to minimize time and effort in order to produce the same effect” (Hirsch 1977, p. 54).

Therefore, student-writers require having writing skills which make them capable of addressing problems easily and shortly. Research data from second/foreign language learning propose that writing also works to promote development in other manners of language. For second/foreign language learners, writing is an instrument to make their language skills better. As learners attempt to offer and describe their ideas in writing, they seek for accurate word selections and appropriate structures in which to formulate their ideas. Writing makes them capable of expanding these other fields, as they work to improve fluency in their language. As they look for proof to support a perspective or status on a subject, their reading skills are improved. Via reading, their writing performances are improved. They start to gain a sense for the
readers' expectations which in turn affect each student's writing process (Hughey et al 1983).

Writing develops and improves vocabulary skills as ESL writers attempt to make suitable word selections for their composition. Moreover, the spelling system of English demands that the writers become proficient in a wealth of morphological structures not involved in the speech system (Byrne 1988). Recognizing of this morphological information enables learners to create their vocabularies more rapidly as they imagine (picture in their minds) word development. Grammar skills are improved as ESL writers make decisions about the mode in which to express thoughts (Hughey et al 1983). They must employ their information about sentence patterns, always conceived as isolated principles, to form their thoughts into desirable and useful sentences. They actively employ knowledge of coordinating and subordinating structures, for instance, to emphasize or deemphasize ideas. In this case, ESL writers put the theoretical information they have been given into practice.

2.3.3. TEACHING WRITING

Archibald (2004) quotes Cumming: "although proficiency in writing is somewhat related to overall language proficiency" (p.5). While, he adds: "improvements in general language proficiency do not necessarily affect a student’s proficiency in writing in their L2. However, writing instruction can be effective in raising proficiency in a number of areas. Recent approaches to instruction have recognized that, while weak areas can and should be specifically addressed, writing must be always seen as culturally and socially situated" (p.5). Furthermore, Cumming (2002) warns writing teachers to be careful about exercises which try to break writing down into component skills as these type of exercises often remove parts of the task that are essential for the personal and cultural significance of the writing.
Learners’ demands are varied at different steps in their learning and that instructor must develop tasks to support and adjust this. Grabe and Kaplan (2001) present a comprehensive discussion of teaching methods at beginning, intermediate and advanced proficiency levels. At lower levels frequent, brief writing exercises can assist to make familiarity and create effective, productive words. The diversity and length of tasks can be increased for intermediate level learners, creating more complex subjects and making a repertoire of strategies for successful writing. Advanced level learners require developing a higher understanding of types and the place of writing in specific discourse communities. They also require developing their strategies and create their own voice in the second language. In addition, Monaghan (2007) point out that teaching writing would contain writing strategies, described as methods of conveying necessary knowledge of the conventions of written speech or utterance and the basis of grammar, syntax via different pedagogical approaches. Eventually, teaching writing can be defined as instructing students for achieving the greatest ability in interacting in words.

2.3.4. THE DEVELOPMENT OF ESL/EFL WRITING INSTRUCTION

From the establishment of the TESOL organization forty years ago in 1966, subjects regarding teaching English to users of other languages, consisting the teaching of writing, have been suggested a channel for discussion. Within this time, different methods or teaching approaches have emerged. Although, scholars in this area do not come to an agreement as to what methods stand for the main trend at a particular period of time or what methods are the most efficient ones for learners acquiring English or instructors teaching English as a second or foreign language. Every scholar describes the development of writing instruction from his or her own view.
Raimes (1996) studied approaches to L2 writing instruction and gave a summary of four approaches, each having a specific focus. She proposed only the estimated beginning point of these approaches, but no ultimate dates, as these approaches are still being employed at the present time. From the beginning in 1966, the first approach she pointed out is the product approach, which concentrates on form. At the present time, the audio-lingual approach was the major instruction method. Thus, writing is sentence drills like fill-ins and substitutions. Additionally, accurate grammatical structures were extremely emphasized. The concept of contrastive rhetoric was also contained at this time. As well as grammatical structures, proponents of contrastive rhetoric considered English textual specifications. They coped with matters of preliminary paragraphs, topic sentences, cohesion and coherence, and discourse analysis.

The next approach, beginning from around 1976, was the process approach, which concentrates on the writer. It can be assumed as an objection against the previous approach. Instead of concentrating on the finishing product learners produce, this approach is interested in what L2 writers really do when they write. Ideas of process, creating concept, innovation, multiple drafts, and peer evaluation are represented. Before students have chances to make ideas, teachers are not advised to give outlines or basic ideas for them. Furthermore, linguistic correctness is ignored at least in starting of the writing process. The third approach, which developed from 1986, focuses on content and is mostly considered as the content-based approach. By this approach, an ESL course is typically connected with a content course. For that reason, English is observed as a tool of learning other rules. The fourth approach, academically-directed approach, has a focus on the reader. It has been appeared almost at the same time with the content-based approach. As stated by Reid (1987),
“teachers must gather assignments from across the curriculum, assess the purposes and audience expectations in the assignments, and present them to the class” (p. 34). Briefly, the four approaches concentrate on form, the writer, content, and the reader respectively.

Other scholars investigated the development of approaches to ESL/EFL writing instruction in a different way. Richards (2002), according to 30-year knowledge in TEFL/TESL, claimed that 1970s was a period for controlled composition, which attempted to eliminate errors and create accurate writing habits. Afterward the focus changed to the paragraph-writing approach with a concentrate on topic sentences, supporting sentences, transformations, and various functional models. In the 1990s, process approach of writing represented a new aspect into writing instruction, emphasizing on the writer. Recently and not long ago, writing field of the second/foreign language has been affected by a genre approach. This approach explores the correlation between writer, reader, and text. Controlled composition is same as the product approach, and paragraph-writing approach is associated with contrastive rhetoric, which is under the product approach pointed out by Raimes (1996).

Some scholars in Taiwan have described the approaches from various angles. For instance, Feng (2000) assessed the historical background, teaching viewpoints, teaching methods and research results of the subsequent four approaches, and also made brief statements. The first one is controlled composition, also defined as guided composition. The second is the contrastive rhetoric approach in accordance with Kaplan’s (1966) opinion that each language has a distinct internal logic and thought model. The third one is process approach, considering writing process as a recessive one instead of a lineal one. Thus, multiple drafts, teacher-student conference and peer
evaluation are examined. The last one is content-based approach, purposed at training students’ study skills and writing strategies.

2.3.5. RESEARCH ON TEACHING WRITING TO ESL STUDENTS

If somebody studies the literature about the teaching of writing in second language classrooms, he/she finds out a plenty of suggestions regarding how to teach it. Generally different methods are based on the individual experiences of the writers and their opinions of what teaching of writing contains. Whereas much can definitely be learned from the masters and methodologies, it is discouraging to make out that except for only one pilot study (Bie’re 1966) approximately no survey has been performed in the teaching of writing to the learners of a second language. Therefore, a success of a specific approach or method may have been because of some factors that are only slightly or minimally associated with a special technique, such as the level of intelligence, motivation, or efficient attentions (Zamel 1976). The matter is that without investigation and some of the responses it can represent, a teacher is encountered with the practically unfeasible task of deciding which method (and/or textbook) to employ.

The background of the teaching of writing in the second language appears to demonstrate that there is a concurrence as to how writing should be instructed: while grammatical exercises are refused as having little to do with the task of writing, there is simultaneously, a significant relevance with control and guidance. In spite of the consensus that learning to write contains real practice in writing, this practice is mostly no more than the orthographic translation of spoken pattern practice or substitution exercises. There are those that are critical of these pseudo-writing practices, persuading the deletion of total control, so coming closer to recognizing what writing is actually all about. These, although, are the exclusion. Most of the
approaches stress and concentrate on practices that have minimum roles in the creative process of writing. Traditionally, training in (and theory about) second language writing has supposed that the most significant variable, is grammatical correctness. According to Vivian Zamel (1976):

“Methodologies have devised particular exercises which, while not based on learning grammar qua grammar, are in fact based on the grammatical manipulations of models, sentences or passages. For them, writing seems to be synonymous with skill in usage and structure, and the assumption is that these exercises will improve the students’ ability to compose. Influenced by audio-lingual methodology, writing is seen as a habit formed skill, error is to be avoided and correction and revision to be provided continuously” (Zamel 1976, p.69).

Based on Peter Elbow (1973), “It’s no accident that so much attention is paid to grammar in teaching of writing. Grammar is the one part of writing that can be straightforwardly taught” (p.138). Due to the consideration given to the proficiency over grammar, syntax and mechanics, short time is assigned for the consideration to the ideas and the concept of a piece of writing. Paulston (1972) proposes the use of models and the utilization of their patterns depend on which to base an individual’s writing. Dykstra (1964) in addition provides some of model passages which students are to modify based on a series of stages, Spencer’s (1965) manipulations includes the reconstructing of whole sentences next to a single pattern and Rojas’ (1968) drill type exercises of copying, completion, and substitution obviously reflect concern with the elimination of mistake. Ross’s (1968) combination and reorganizations of patterns upon a transformational grammar method and both Pincas (1962) and Moody (1965) stress the demand for strong control by authenticating the usual manipulation of patterns. Therefore, when the teaching of grammar is explicitly declined by these methodologies as having a little role in writing, the types of exercises they propose are based on the meaning that the writing contains grammatical proficiency. Totally, grammatical facility is viewed as writing ability.
Organization, style and rhetoric are the critical aspects of skill in writing, however, here again, control and guidance have an important role; drill prevails, but on the rhetorical level. Instead of sentences to modify, whole reading texts become the models that students should differentiate and mimic. Kaplan (1967), mentioning the impact that cultural contrasts have against the rhetoric, proposes the study and mimicry of paragraphs, Pincas (1964) makes a multiple substitution method that includes habituation in the employment of specific style. Arapoff (1969) focuses on the significance of detecting, contrasting and imitating stylistic variances. Carr (1967) emphasizes the significance of reading, studying and analyzing the formation and rational organization of passages and Green (1967) restates the practice required in certain varieties of written language. While this group of methodologies approaches more intimately what writing for the purpose of creating, truly contains, they still, like the first group emphasize on control. Rejecting the idea that writing is the ability or knowledge of sentence patterns, still they put restrictions on the writing process. Writing for the ESL students is still supposed to be essential as the creation of habit.

It is clear that there is a prevailing relevance with the quality of students ‘output; because the students are trying to write in a language different from their own, control and guidance are superior. In contrast with this statement are individuals who assume that the writing process needs a lack of control; rather than stress to write accurately, the proponents of this approach emphasize the necessity to write more and often. On the other hand, it is all about quantity, and not quality, that is important. Erazmus (1960) states that the higher the frequency, the greater the progress and Biere’s (1966) pilot study pretends to mention that, when the stress mostly is on writing rather than error correction, students write a lot and with fewer mistakes. Povey
(1969) restates this subject, emphasizing the significance of providing chances to say something basically relevant.

It is not a strange matter, according to the above discussion, that ESL teachers are confused and yet exploring for answers. They encounter to take decision about choosing one of the several methods. These approaches can be known as points along a perspective varying from total control to total freedom.

2.3.6. PRODUCT AND PROCESS APPROACHES OF TEACHING WRITING IN ESL CLASSROOM

A large number of applied linguists and instructors in the field of ESL writing have suggested different classroom methods/approaches at different periods of time. Each of these methods has done a great deal to both L1 and L2 writing pedagogy. The emphases they put have always been changing from one aspect to another one. The main concerns have been precision, fluency, text, error correction, aim, interaction, process and register/genre (Kroll, 1990). Nevertheless, the attempts employed to come up with the best method/approach have continued to be useless. The recent insights over the past decade have indicated that as somebody learns more about the writing process, shares knowledge and encounters new challenges, he/she may require to change his/her method in order to meet the needs of those contexts. The reason is that there is no single method to teach writing efficiently (Murray, 1982; Raimes, 1982; Maxwell & Meiser, 1997).

In the following section, first, two approaches will be reviewed which have been studied in this survey and after that in next section, other major approaches are going to be explained briefly.
2.3.6.1. PRODUCT APPROACH

Product-oriented approach originates from the behavioral psychology and structural linguistics. In these areas, learning was regarded as habit formation whereas language learning was basically mastering the models of language via imitating methods. In this view, writing in this approach is in favor of students’ text analysis after they are produced (Zamel, cited in Long & Richards, 1988). In this method, the instructor divides the writing lessons into small parts so that they could be taught, re-taught, practiced and examined and the teacher focuses on the writing which students produced and creates critical opinion about it. He is the only authority to correct mistakes of students' composition, and the type of correction is usually related to grammar. On the other hand, the whole teaching and learning process is teacher-centered.

The students are asked to copy and mimic models usually at the level of sentence and make parallel text (Nunan, 1991). In this way, one can observe that writing activities, instead of engaging students in innovative thinking and problem solving, they help them simply remember realities. There are four steps for teaching writing through product approach:

1. Introducing principles and rules of writing to the students.
2. Providing reading models for the students to be explained analyzed and clarified.
3. Suggesting a guided writing exercise.
4. Reading and criticizing students' assignments prior to the next example of the cycle (Kroll, cited in Celce-Murcia, 1991)

Pincas (1982) also clearly explain learning in the product approach as having the following steps:

1. Familiarization
2. Controlled writing
3. Guided writing
4. Free writing

It can be understood from the model that serious emphasis is put on control and guidance, and the whole managing of writing is determined by being a single activity. Team work is viewed as cheating. The writing classroom is same as a laboratory for analyzing of final products (Horwitz, 1986) and students are considered to "turn in a perfectly polished piece of work" (McDonough & Shaw, 1993, p.186). Briefly, writing in the product paradigm is considered as subordinate to other skills and is not employed independently in the ESL syllabus (Raimes, 1982; Hedge, 1988; Kroll, 1990). The product approach to writing has been summarized and displayed in the following model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY THE MODEL</th>
<th>MANIPULATE ELEMENTS</th>
<th>PRODUCE A PARALLEL TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 2.2. The Product Approach Model (White, 1989: 5)

The product approach to writing could be categorized into the following three parts: Guided or controlled writing, Current-traditional Rhetoric and English for Academic Purposes.

2.3.6.1. GUIDED OR CONTROLLED COMPOSITION

The concealed hypothesis of guided or controlled composition depends on the rules of structural linguistics that claims, "Language is primarily speech"(Stern 1983, p.158), and behavioral psychology that keeps the idea that learning is habit formation. Therefore, the main practices of guided composition are transformations, substitutions, completions and fill-ins which concentrate only on sentence construction and vocabulary. On the other hand, the learner is only required to modify
the linguistic structures he/she has learnt, and practically no consideration was given to the difficulty entailed in writing.

2.3.6.1.2. CURRENT-TRADITIONAL RHETORIC

The phrase, current-traditional rhetoric, is a compound of two different concepts: composition and structure of native speakers with the theory of contrastive rhetoric. The notion of contrastive rhetoric stands in that speakers of various languages employ different instruments to give information, to make relationships among concepts and to indicate the centrality of an idea as in contrast with another. Therefore, under the situations, the reading of a passage in one's mother tongue may be tough. For that reason, the difficulty a language learner struggles with is not merely linguistic (Silva, 1993).

Briefly, the main idea is that second language writers mostly garble the syntactic structure and sequence of native speakers’ idea. Thus, this approach concentrates on paragraph/essay improvement. At the paragraph level, strong stress is put on topic sentences, final sentences, and the application of linking phrases. Moreover, methods like illustration, comparison, contrast, are trained. The precise imitation of the sample is highly emphasized in this approach.

2.3.6.1.3. ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES (EAP)

This part is the expansion of the guided composition and current-traditional rhetoric. The prominent feature of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) is that it considers language teaching as interacting with the academic discourse society and their written work should be enlightened accurately by the second language writer so that to produce an equivalent text (Horwitz, 1986). Thus, afterwards, this traditional product-centered approach to writing was considered as shortsighted mostly because the stress was solely on what the final writing of students resemble, if they contain
errors or not. On the other hand, it extremely accounts for the process students undertake before they could finish a final work (product). As cited in (McClelland & Donovan, 1985) by Brannon, he summarizes the outcome of new conception as follows: "What [researchers] soon discovered was the vast separation between actual composing activity and textbook statements about it, between what writers do and what teachers tells them they ought to do" (p.10).

2.3.6.2. PROCESS APPROACH

The product approach of writing has not gone further than allowing students to change or modify the forms. On the other hand, the classroom exercises have been attentively guided so that students beware mistakes. Except from being too mechanical, these types of exercises do not allow students to find out new ideas and enhance their knowledge. As they mostly concentrate on strict guidance and control, students would be deprived of their freedom to select topics, styles, and categories and so on (Clark, 1991). In the other words, the process approach of writing originates from communicative language teaching (Flower & Hayes, 1982). Therefore, its major concentrate is on creating ideas and concept. For that reason, learning to write includes different processes that can be analyzed in obvious forms: what happens before writing occurs (prewriting phase); the composing phase - that which happens during the real process of writing; and after the writing or editing and publishing step –that which happens after writing has occurred.

So many of investigations dealt with L1 and L2 learners propose that the nature of the problem of writing, totally, depends on the absence of the primary skills of writing (Zamel, 1982). On the other hand, some of researches suggest that difficulties in composing are mostly due to the absence of such skills as reviewing, arranging, editing etc. rather than linguistic skills such as grammar, and vocabulary (Widdowson as quoted in Freedman, et.al, 1983). Thus, the process approach of
writing entails the teaching of grammar and mechanics as component of, for example, the reviewing or editing process, not in isolation. Therefore, a process approach of teaching writing seems to be out of this discontent. The process approach considers writing as an extremely complicated process including various sub-processes which take place not one after another but circularly and, in different patterns (Murray, 1982; Graves, 1983; Horwitz, 1986; Block, 1997). As opposed to the product-centered approach, here teachers intend to help students write in higher quality by assisting them at every real process of composing, and making them capable of overcoming those problems. Accordingly, students are trained strategies at each and every step that could enable them present a better product in the final analysis. The function of teaching composition as a process has well been explained as follows:

“The teaching of writing as a process means that writers can improve their writing at any or all stages from the first thoughts about a topic to the finished draft. The process is described as loosely fitting into stages: prewriting or discovery, drafting, revising and editing. However, the writing process is not made up of a series of discrete linear steps leading to a finished product: it is recursive” (Maxwell & Meiser 1997, p.139).

These various steps that are essential in this approach, such as prewriting, drafting, and so on provide way to important classroom techniques like, 'conferencing', which enable student to practice together by sharing their works with one another. Moreover, a teacher's cooperation in all the stages improves positive perspectives on the skills of writing (McDonough & Shaw, 1993). The solitary situation of the classroom which used to make the writing process cloudy has now been shifted to a place of a workshop for producing innovating texts (White and Arndt, 1991). For better understanding, the model of process approach has been represented as following:
2.3.6.2.1. STEPS IN PROCESS WRITING

It may be absolutely difficult to specify entirely all the processes one may go through while writing every piece of text, like a letter, a note or a story. Although, there are specific regular stages to be pursued before one finish the final version of his/her piece of writing. The following activities have been proposed by McDonough and Shaw:

“They jot down ideas, put them in order, make a plan, reject it and start again, add more ideas as they go along, change words, rephrase bits, move sections around, review parts of what they have written, cross things out, check through the final version, write tidy notes, write on odd piece of paper as thoughts occur to them, write directly into the typewriter or a word processor… look at the blank page for a long time, change pens, refer back to something they have read - many more things, some of them quite idiosyncratic” (McDonough & Shaw, 1993, p.185-186).
Byrne (1988) and Hedge (1988) also classify the different steps of writing in the same way as including listing ideas-planning and formatting-writing a first draft-rectify and improve (revise) the draft-editing-writing the final copy. However these stages evidently supposed to be linear improvement from one step to another, they are not the same in the real process of writing the text. Consistently there is "going back and forth from one stage to another as the writing progresses" (Maxwell & Meiser 1997, p.139); "...it is messy, recursive, convoluted and uneven" (Hairston, cited in Celce-Murcia 1991, p.247). Accordingly, most scholars concur that all these stages could be summarized into the following four stages:

1. Prewriting (Discovery) phase
2. Drafting Phase
3. Revising Phase
4. Editing and Publishing Phase

What should be evident here is that total time assigned and the frequency of going back and forth in every stage may considerably be different from one writer to another. What is important, though, is the awareness of the various stages and compose correspondingly.

2.3.6.2.1.1. PRE-WRITING

The first and most essential stage of the writing activity is the prewriting (discovery) stage, where specific times assigned to students to probe ideas, think about alternatives and develop their thoughts (Block, 1997). This phase of writing enable students to talk and interchange ideas, just as in actual world, where people share their thoughts before and after they have written them down. This collaborative conversation is of greatest importance:
“Pupils are virtually unanimous in describing the major value of group work as being, like classroom discussion, that it widens the pool of available ideas, and through this, enables pupils to advance their thinking in ways which they could not achieve alone” (Cooper & McIntryre quoted in Hughes 1994, p.86).

“… We must remember that our students are language learners rather than writers and it would not be particularly helpful to have them spend all their time writing alone” (McDonough & Shaw 1993, p.187-188).

For achieving the teaching goals, thus, teachers should prepare collection of strategies for their students (Kroll, 1990). As students may select various ways to finish any written task, the training of proper strategies could save them from using those that have certain benefits. And as every learning activity, the average students complete their tasks, the more they will be aroused to learn. Oxford quoted in Hughes (1994) explains the efficiency of learning strategies as follows: "Learning strategies are specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, and more transferable to new strategies”. Therefore, in the prewriting stage, strategies, like brainstorming, talking about vocabulary groups, planning, preparing notes about observations, interviewing are mostly used to begin with writings. Teachers can prepare students to go through a compound of these detection (pre-writing) exercises.

“The purpose of acquiring invention strategies is for students to feel that they have a variety of ways to begin an assigned writing task and that they do not always have to begin at the beginning and work through an evolving draft sequentially until they reach the end”. (Kroll, quoted in Celce-Murcia 1991, p.25)

2.3.6.2.1.2. DRAFTING

Drafting is another main step in this writing process. After having collected data and created ideas, students should write them down on a sheet. As students remove, add new ideas and connect with other messages at this step, teachers are expected to assist them understand that the goal is not creating error-free writing,
though, the aim here is to make meaningful compositions instead. Students can make as many drafts as possible till they assure they have conveyed their messages exactly. However, occasionally, students may not go directly to their sheets and begin writing. They may encounter a 'barrier' to begin. Here, the teacher could assist students by asking them several questions that would allow them think about what they want to write; inducing with a starter sentence is also another method the teacher could employ to prevail over students' "barrier".

2.3.6.2.1.3. REVISING

Revising is the other step which students are thought to work again on the multiple drafts they have been exercising. For most of the students, the act of revising (redrafting) is not a simple task. The major reason for this is the truth that they do not often simply find out where and how to make specific modifications. On the other hand, it causes to waste a lot of time. Nonetheless, teachers could reduce this difficulty by using specific techniques such as allowing them read loudly to enable them perceive redundancies, wrong phrasing or eliminations (Maxwell & Meiser, 1997). Another strategy is writing several questions on the board that could work as checklists, like following:

1. May I change a word so my text targets become more apparent?
2. Does every paragraph include understandable points and a major message?
3. Can I compress some sentences to make ideas closer to the text goal?
4. Can I employ stronger connective phrases?
5. Can I add instances to make ideas comprehensible?

(Block, 1997)
2.3.6.2.1.4. EDITING AND PUBLISHING

Editing is a stage exactly prior publishing. It is a phase in which students go through and check each other's drafts. While guiding instructions or checklists might be effective, they may not be helpful if students employ them for their own work. Therefore, some editors are required at this phase so as to observe what another has connived. If the purpose stresses a particular area (or general) problems, offering the whole class a mini-lesson would be the most proper method. To finish the process of the writing task, another activity remains-publishing. Publishing takes various forms at different grade levels: from representing papers on classroom or school bulletin boards to publishing, declare in the yearly magazine of the school. Students should also be motivated to write letters, short research papers, and local newspapers. But the most feasible and probably easy form of 'publishing' is to choose the best few papers and make them to be read in the classroom. Afterwards, "writing is designed to be a public act ... it is meant to be shared with others" (Block 1997, p.261).

But, this approach, same as the former ones, has not run away from criticism. Most teachers stated that it was considered to be time-consuming. For example, the employment of multiple drafts, in spite of its efficiency for students to get more concentrated does not account for the present instructional program. Moreover, the strong marking load makes this use of multiple drafts unfeasible to the usual large classroom environments. In addition, some teachers suspect its usefulness for testing objectives, for there won't be enough time for prewriting in testing, in which students share and brainstorm ideas in pairs or groups (Horwitz, 1986). Briefly, the process-oriented approach has represented a better understanding of the essence of writing. It has arranged practical procedures for students to improve their writing skills.
2.3.7. OTHER APPROACHES OF TEACHING WRITING TO ESL STUDENTS

There is no single response to the question of how to teach writing in ESL classrooms. There are as many responses as there are teachers and teaching styles, or learners and learning styles. The following diagram (Figure 2.2) demonstrates what writers have to work with as they create a piece of writing. As teachers have emphasized various features of the diagram, mixing them with how they think writing is learned, they have made different approaches to the teach writing.
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*Figure 2.2. Producing a Piece of Writing (Raimes 1983, p.6)*

2.3.7.1. THE CONTROLLED TO FREE APPROACH

Controlled composition (sometimes defined as guided composition) is supposed to originate from Charles Fries's oral method, the pioneer of the audio-lingual approach of second language learning. Usually a controlled composition includes a written pattern with directions for transformations or certain language modifications in rewriting the model. The level of control lays both within the model and within the kind of manipulation the student is inquired to perform on the model (Paulston and Bruder, 1976). As claimed by Raimes (1983) the controlled-to-free approach in writing is consecutive: students are first assigned sentence practices, then
paragraphs to imitate or modify grammatically by, for example, replacing questions with statements, present to past. With the features of this kind of composition with strongly determined operation, it is somewhat easy for students to write a large deal besides avoid mistakes. The text created by the students becomes a collection of sentence patterns and vocabulary items—-a linguistic artifact, an instrument for language activities.

2.3.7.2. FREE-WRITING APPROACH

Some teachers and scholars have emphasized the significance of the size of writing instead of the quality. For that reason they have approached the teaching of writing by allocating a great number of freewriting on a specific subject with only the least correction of mistakes.

“Students need to give vent to their feelings, put across their own ideas and get a feeling of independent achievement in the new language. The major guidelines, then, to procedures dealing with free compositions on this level should be to preserve this sense of achievement by minimizing the possibility for and emphasis on errors. Students on the intermediate and advanced levels need much practice in writing free compositions. Our students write a composition a week, but a more useful guideline is probably to have the students write as many free compositions as the teacher can reasonably correct” (Paulston and Bruder 1976, p.203).

To stress the fluency even more, some ESL teachers at the beginning of their classes ask the students to write freely on any topic they are interested in without considering to grammar and spelling for a duration of five or ten minutes. At the beginning, students think this is very tough and finish up writing, "I can't think of anything to write". When they do this type of writing more and more often however, some of them find out that they write more easily and that bringing words down on paper is not scaring at all.
23.7.3. THE GRAMMAR-SYNTAX-ORGANIZATION APPROACH

Some teachers have emphasized the demand to work at the same time on more than one component of the writing skills (grammar, mechanics, organization, syntax, content, the writer’s process, and audience, goal and word selection). Writing, as they claim, cannot be viewed as combination of isolated skills which are learned step by step (Raimes 1983). Writing has been designed in order for the students to notice to constitution or formation while they work on the essential grammar and syntax as well. For example, to write an understandable series of instructions on how to run a calculator, the writer requires more than the proper vocabulary. He requires the simple forms of verbs; an organizational structure according to chronology; sequence words such as first, then, finally, and probably even sentence structures such as "When...then..."(Raimes 1983). In this case, students will observe the relation between what they are attempting to write and what they require to write. So, this approach connects the objective of a piece of writing with the forms that are required to express it.

23.7.4. THE COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH/THE FUNCTIONAL APPROACH

The communicative approach emphasizes the objective of a piece of writing and the viewers for it. Student writers are motivated to act like writers in actual life and to ask themselves the important questions about the objectives and viewers.

Why am I going to write this?

Who is going to read this?

In the traditional mode, only the teacher has been the viewer for student writing. It has been confirmed that writers extremely attempt when writing is actually a communicative task, with a writer composing for a real reader (Johnson and
Morrow 1981). Teachers employing this approach, thus, have expanded the audience to other students in the classroom, who do not just read the work but in fact do something with that, like response, rewrite in other forms, make a summary, or suggest their ideas but do not correct. In another mode, the teachers determine readers outside the classroom, thereby providing a context for student writers in that to choose proper content, language, and levels of formality (Raimes 1983). For instance the subject "Describe your room at home" is not only a practice in the employment of the present tense as well as prepositions but in this method the task takes on new aspects when the assignment reads:

You are writing to a pen-pal (in an English-speaking country) and describing your room for him or her. You like your room, so you are going to make it looks as beautiful as possible.

Or

You are writing to tell about your room to your pen-pal's mother. You are not interested in your room so much at the present time and you desire to modify, therefore, you request your pen-pal's mother to 'suggest' about what changes should be made in your room.

Or

You are taking part in a student exchange programme with another school. Students will interchange schools and homes for three months. A blind student whom you have never written to previously is going to come to your home and occupying your room. Explain about your room in detail to enable the student to imagine it, supposing that your explanation will then be read onto tape that the student will listen to (Raimes1983: 9).
Usually, in a functionally directed writing approach, writers undertake different roles; academic writing is solely one context and generally not the single focus. Contexts for writing acts are attentively specified; aim and audience are regularly defined. If a writer is assigned an unknown roles in which background experience about the subject may be missing, data may be provided in form of realities, notes, figures or tables, quotations, documents and etc. (Shih 1986).

2.3.7.5. THE PATTERN-CENTERED APPROACH/THE MODEL-BASED APPROACH

This method asks writers to analyze and practice various rhetorical or organizational patterns usually observed in academic discourse: process analysis, separation and categorization, contrast/comparison, cause-and-effect analysis, advantages and disadvantages discussion and so on (Shih 1986). Kaplan (1967) and other scholars mention that rhetorical patterns change among cultures and propose that non-native students require learning specific rules for improving and organizing ideas in American academic discourse, such as approving generalization by offering proofs in inductive and deductive models of arrangement.

Escholz (1980) and Watson (1982) suggested employing patterns after students have begun to write- as instances of how writers resolve organizational matters- instead of ideas to be emulated. Writing tasks need students to use the certain patterns under study. Traditionally, the resource of content for such essays has been students' previous individual knowledge (how to create something, to work on process analysis; shifting from one city to another city, to work on comparison/contrast). The hypothesis has been that once student writers keep the rhetorical frame work in the mind, they will be capable of using the similar models properly in future writing for college courses (Shih 1986).
However Escholz (1980) and Watson (1982) suggested this method, they also criticize it. They mention that the pattern-based approach has a tendency in being too long and too far from the students' own writing matters, whereas the traditional sequence of functions-Read-Analyze- Write-entails the questionable hypothesis that advance recognition of writing problems elevates learning. Moreover, this precise analytical work motivates students to view form like a mold into which content is somehow poured leading to thoughtless copies of a specific organizational strategy or style. Generally, Escholz (1980) considers the emulation of models as being neutralizing and hampering writers instead of authorizing them or making them free. Flower and Hayes (1977) have also made some criticisms about this model-oriented approach to teaching writing:

“In the midst of composition renaissance, an odd fact stands out: our basic methods of teaching writing are the same ones English academicians were using in the 17th century. We still undertake to teach people to write primarily by dissecting and describing a complete piece of writing. The student is (a) exposed to the formal descriptive categories of rhetoric (modes and argument -definition, cause and effect, etc and modes of discourse - description, persuasion, etc) (b) offered good examples (usually his/her own) and (c) encouraged to absorb the features of a socially approved style, with emphasis on grammar and usage. We help our students analyze the product, but we leave the process of writing up to inspiration” (Flower and Hayes, 1977, p.459).

As stated by White (1988) this model-oriented approach was shifted to the more recent interest in rhetorical instead of structure of the language in written discourse. With such interest, they developed materials with a concentration on the organization of rhetorical functions and the modification of cohesive specifications. This describes the plethora of practices in which the student needs either to include rational connectors to available sentences or to connect sentences with them. In both
the language-oriented and rhetorically directed approaches to the teaching of writing, the similar fundamental procedural pattern is followed.

2.4. READING

Plenty of definitions about reading offered in the literature. According to Carrell (1988a), Grabe and Stoller (2001), it is the most significant academic skill of language. Grabe and Stoller (2002) describe reading as “the ability to draw meaning from the printed page and interpret this information appropriately” (p.9). Widdowson's (as cited in Ajideh, 2003) opinion of how concepts can be discussed in discourse is concurred with Goodman's ideas about the reading process. As claimed by Widdowson (as cited in Ajideh, 2003), recent researches of reading have shown it as a logical task wherewith the reader produce meaning based on textual signs. In his idea, reading is considered not as a response to a text but as a communication between the reader and the writer mediated via the text.

Kim (2010) asserted, “a text by itself does not carry meaning, but rather guides readers in retrieving meaning based on their own prior knowledge” (p.36). Thus, readers may vary in the concept that each connects with a specific word. However reading was formerly considered simply as sets of skills that are consecutive and hierarchical, with the broadly adopted role of active readers, they create meaning by managing their own cognitive sources and previous knowledge to connect with the text (Garner, 1987; Logie, 1995). Many scholars in the field of language learning (Bernhardt, 2005; Carrell, 1985; Grabe, 2009; Urquhart & Weir, 1998) affirm this interactive part of the reading process. Furthermore, investigation in this area is progressively regarding the variables of every single reader, like gender (Brantmeier, 2005; Oxford, 1993), language expertise (Anderson, 1991; Huang, Chern, & Lin,
Despite the fact that there are different kinds of definitions, Goodman (1967), as one of the most well-known researchers in this field, describes reading as “a psycholinguistic guessing game” via that the reader is subjected to a reading passage, creates hypothesis about forthcoming points or facts with the usage of existing minimal language signs, syntactic limitations and semantic limitations, while sampling the passage for confirming or rejecting the hypothesis. However the psycholinguistic style of reading is viewed as a correlation of factors, it has generally failed to give enough stress to the role of background knowledge. Current researches represent that what the reader creates in the reading skill is more incisive and more important than what the general psycholinguistic model offers: More information is provided by the reader rather than the print on the page. The reason behind the fact is that, readers are able to understand what they read as they are capable of taking the stimulus behind its graphic demonstration and allocate it membership to a proper sets of concepts formerly stored in their minds. The reader provides a large amount of information and notions, perspectives and beliefs for the reading task. Such knowledge, accompanied with the ability to bring linguistic prognosis, specifies the demands the reader will make while he reads. Proficiency in reading is based on the impressive relationship between linguistic knowledge and world’s knowledge (Clarke and Silberstein, 1977, pp.136-137).

2.4.1. READING IN A SECOND LANGUAGE

Most of the recent opinions about L2 reading are represented by investigation in L1 reading. Although, reading in L2 is influenced by issues which are not investigated in the field of L1 reading. Contrasts between L1 and L2 reading
backgrounds and readers can be classified under three titles: (1) “second language acquisition and training background differences, (2) language processing differences, and (3) social context differences” (Grabe, 1991, p.386). Second language acquisition and training background contrasts stand for the fact that L2 readers start the reading procedure with knowledge that is so different from readers of L1. While L1 learners already have storage of “5,000 to 7,000 words” (Grabe, 1991, p.386) plus a perfect perception of grammar before they start reading instruction, L2 learners have restricted words and structural knowledge of the language (Czicko; Hatch; Henning; Kern; McLeod & McLaughlin; Muchisky as cited in Kern, 1989; Singer as cited in Grabe, 1991).

Language processing contrasts are due to transfer impacts from L1 to L2 reading texts. For this reason, syntactic knowledge of L1 students can intervene with their L2 learning. For instance, differences in word order variance and other syntactic structures between L1 and L2 can result in intervention in L2 learning due to the fact that the readers process the two languages in different ways (Cohen, 1990; Grabe, 1991). Social context contrasts are associated with the “L1 socialization to literacy practices that L2 students bring from their L1 cultural backgrounds” (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p.59). In some societies, literacy is not usual whereas other cultures widely use literacy. Students from cultures with restricted literacy may possibly not identify the significance of literacy skills. As opposed to this matter, students from societies where a big amount of print data is available have different expectations about reading (Grabe, 1991). Additionally, contrasts happen among cultures in terms of how they employ text sources. Grabe and Stoller (2002) argue that some social groups consider texts as unchangeable. Students from such cultures may “tend not to challenge or reinterpret texts in light of other texts” (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p.60). On the other
hand, other cultures view texts as “alternative interpretations of realities and facts that can be disputed” (Grabe, 1991, p.389). Students coming from such cultures have a tendency to explore about the information in various sources. In this case, “the social context of students’ uses of reading in their first languages, and their access to texts, may have a profound effect on their abilities to develop academic reading skills in English” (Grabe, 1991, p.389). Such contrasts between L1 and L2 reading cause troubles in academic reading of second language.

Academic reading is a strict and complicated procedure, entailing deep comprehension. Language learners of university level are commonly required to carry out “identifiable cognitive and procedural tasks such as taking a test, writing a paper or giving a speech” (Shih as cited in Li & Munby, 1996, p.200). For such students, there is not a simple changeable phase between short revised expositive texts offered in the beginning phases of language learning and complicated academic passages read in university classrooms (Bouvet, 2000). As a result, adult academic readers of a second language, even those with adequate knowledge of the language, “suffer from deficiencies at the level of identification which interfere, despite all of their higher-level skill, with their attempts to comprehend the texts they must read” (Eskey as cited in Li & Munby, 1996, p.200).

There is proof that the lack of knowledge and abilities in L2 reading can be compensated by academic second or foreign language learners by “invoking interactive strategies, utilizing prior knowledge, and becoming aware of their strategy choices” (Devine; Hudson as cited in Auerbach & Paxton, 1997, p.238). Therefore, second language readers necessitate to be taught how to employ such skills and previous knowledge, improve vocabulary proficiency, and develop reading
comprehension via the employment of reading strategies (Anderson, 1999; Li & Munby, 1996).

2.4.2. READING COMPREHENSION

Some individuals have formulated about reading comprehension, below are different definitions of reading comprehension:

As stated by Kustaryo (1988), reading comprehension is an active thinking procedure that is not only based on comprehension skills. He claims: “Reading comprehension means understanding what has been read. It is an active thinking process that depends not only on comprehension skill but also on students’ experience and prior knowledge comprehension involves understanding the vocabulary, seeing the relationship among words and concepts, organizing ideas, recognizing author’s making judgment, and evaluating” (p.4). In this case, it can be stated that reading comprehension is vital because the students do not comprehend what they have read; they cannot realize the opinion of the writer via reading. Anderson and Pearson in Alexander (1988) define that “Comprehension is a special thinking process; the reader comprehends by actively constructing meaning internally from interacting with the material that is read” (p.160). Reading comprehension skills are necessary for students to become successful readers (Grabe & Stoller, 2002).

Reading initiates with the detecting letters, groups of letter and the recognizing the words’ sounds. Afterwards, learners start to read words, sentences, picture books, novelettes and other texts. Reading loudly enables learners to improve their decoding skills which can be a worth diagnostic assistance. This procedure focuses on the improvement of fluency. The shifting from passive to active reading entails the improvement of reading comprehension skills (Machado, 2010). Reading comprehension is the capability of understanding what we read where words have
context and texts have meaning. Reading comprehension skills enable us to read expertly, learn efficiently and to conceptualize. Such skills, mainly, depend on former steps of reading development, containing oral reading and reading fluency. Without improving such earlier skills of reading, students should constantly concentrate on decoding letters and vocabularies, instead of proceeding to meaning and comprehension (Grabe & Stoller, 2002). The clue to improving professional reading skills in the primary years of education is an even earlier fundament in primary skills of language learning (Brewster & Ellis, 2002). Thus, strong reading comprehension skills are supposed to be reliant on the ability of the cognitive strategies created in the early years.

Notions of reading comprehension have varied considerably through the decades. Theories of language learning have again transferred obviously during the second part of the 20th century (Crain, 2011). We have shifted from a behavioral view, which had mastery over the field from the turn of the century to the seventies and eighties to a comprehensive or interactive method, which initiated in the late eighties, and carry on to form our thinking about reading comprehension at the present era. Some scholars define reading as a cognitive, developmental, and socially oriented skill that acts beyond comprehension of the words on a page (Hedgcock and Ferris, 2009). Formerly, reading was viewed as a relatively invariable activity. Overall concept was embedded in the text, and the reader’s task was to realize what was being conveyed through the words on the page. Recent researches consider reading as a more dynamic procedure in that the reader “develops” meaning according to information he/she collects from the text. Katherine Maria (1990) describes reading comprehension as: “holistic process of constructing meaning from written text through the interaction of (1) the knowledge the reader brings to the text, i.e. word
recognition ability, word knowledge, and knowledge of linguistic conventions; (2) the reader’s interpretation of the language that the writer used in constructing the text; and (3) the situation in which the text is read” (p.14-15). Reading in university level is much more professional than at high school, and in a particular course load, students may face and encounter many more literary types than previous. They may be inquired to read, understand, and employ them in a conceptual way. Comprehension of such texts are necessary for academic achievement, nevertheless in an average classroom, concentrate will not be allocated to the teaching of reading strategy which may be essential for the language learning skills.

Successful teaching of reading comprehension requires a comprehension and analysis of its essence and constituents, containing both variables of text and reader. Grabe (1997) explains it as “The central components of reading processing include: orthographic processing, phonological coding, word recognition (lexical access), working memory activation, sentence parsing, propositional integration, propositional text-model formation, text-model development, and the development of an appropriate situation model (mental model)” (p.9). We require to realize when and why some readers don’t succeed in generating proper situation models of the text they read despite conformity involved in the linguistic features (Grabe, 1997). Reading comprehension proficiency is necessary for meaningful and successful reading. Early reading is constructed in strong cognitive abilities, for example, learning styles like auditory analysis, sound combining and separating, memory and imagination. Thus, the clue to developing reading comprehension ability is to overcome weak skills of language learning at the basic steps.

Successful reading comprehension needs not only precise reading skills but also fluent and automatic reading ability. So many challenging students of university
level have problems in progressing to a level of fluency and automaticity that enable them to understand what they are reading. Automaticity is the proficiency to recognize, at the individual word level rapidly, precisely and effortlessly. The precision and speed with which individual words are recognized is considered as a predictor of text understanding (Wallace, 2010), although, fluency in reading entails not only recognition of automatic word, but also the employment of prosodic traits like intonation, phrasing and rhythm. Wood, Flowers, and Grigorenko (2001) propose that fluency entails the prognosis of what comes next to the text. As well, they state that speed of reading and exercise are not sufficient to develop comprehension and fluency. The capability of predicting what is coming next upgrades speed of the reading and is essential for text understanding.

More and more, experimental research testifies to the significance of scheme in reading comprehension. Most of the studies included reading comprehension in the first language; however the insights were adjusted to the requirements of investigations about second language reading comprehension. Consideration is assigned to interactive methods of reading, which propose that reading comprehension is a compound of word interpretation and recognition. Grabe (1991) makes a list of five most significant areas of recent researches: “Schema theory, language skills and automaticity, vocabulary development, comprehension strategy training, and reading – writing relations” (p.375).

The origin of reading comprehension is the cognitive tasks entailed in reading plus the different activities instructors apply in teaching reading comprehension. Recent studies propose that insufficiency of automaticity in “lower level processing” (for example, automatic lexical access via bottom-up procedure) results in weak reading skills. As a result, most current varieties of interactive methods to reading
have employed a strong bottom-up direction to the processing of lower-level linguistic structure via expansive investigation of eye movement. Grabe (1991) proposes that “most words are recognized before higher level (non-automatic context information can be used to influence lexical access” (ibid: 385).

2.4.2.1. EFFECTS OF LEARNING STYLE ON READING COMPREHENSION

In the 1920s Carl G. Jung suggested typologies of personality to identify various styles of human data processing (Harrison & Lester, 2000; Loo, 2002; Reed, 2001; Sadler-Smith, 2001; Salter, Evans, & Forney, 2006). Drawn from Jung’s psychological opinions, the personality typologies considered various human data processing styles as various learning styles. Thus, the term learning styles and its meaning have been employed in different situations or instructional patterns (Karns, 2006; Reed, 2001). Sadler-Smith (2001) considered learning style as “a proxy, perhaps unintentionally, for cognitive style or some other individual difference construct” (p.294). As for examining the impact of individual cognitive styles on academic success and other learning activities, Aptitude-Treatment Interaction (ATI) scholars carried out experimental researches by managing or controlling an aptitude scale. Some scholars discovered significant correlations between learning style and academic success when they investigated experimental impacts on the performance of knowledge acquisition and generalized a learning style evaluation (Daniels & Stevens, 1976).

Some scholars study the relationship between learning styles and other elements, like learning priorities, learning knowledge, learning strategies, cognitive styles, characteristics, instructional styles and etc. (Buckley & Dwyer, 1987; Neils-Strunjas, Krikorian, Shidler & Likoy, 2001; Reed, 2001; Reed, Oughton, Ayersman; Sadler-Smith, 2001). Although, the results connected with learning style require to be
analyzed with prudence, since other factors have effects on individual academic success (Anderson, Hattie & Hamilton, 2005). Additionally, learning style does not indicate individuals’ ability but rather how individuals can learn perfectly. The notion can assist students to ‘be conscious of’ their own strengths and priorities in different learning circumstances, so that they can efficiently improve some learning skills (Heffler, 2001; Loo, 2002; Sadler-Smith, 2001).

2.4.2.1. FIELD-DEPENDENCE/INDEPENDENCE AND READING

However the study performed on FD/I in many areas, has been extended, total number of researches viewing reading in terms of this cognitive style has not been as great as one may expect. FD/I have seemingly never been in prevalence with reading scholars and reading has not been a favorite area of FD/I researchers: Still some interesting investigations are available. Some of them will be reviewed here and be followed by a survey of contributions of FD/I in reading instruction. Some of the primary researches differentiated the general reading skill and performance of field dependents and independents, Stuart (1967) and Wineman (1971) discovered the proof that field independent fourth- through eighth-graders had a tendency to have greater levels of reading success than dependents as evaluated by standardized tests. Readence, Baldwin, Bean, and Dishner (1980) discovered that field-independent eight-graders had a tendency to perform better than dependents on comprehension cloze test and tests of vocabulary. In a research of investigating study techniques of reading (mapping, paraphrasing), Smith and Standal (1981) realized that college students of field-independent community had total premier comprehension when comparing with field-dependents irrespective of the study technique employed.

In the same way, Provost (1981) presented one of two kinds of texts to college students, on the similar content for learning. One needed only reading whereas the
other person needed interaction in the mode of responding questions and differentiating options inside the text. On both delayed and immediate tests of recalling, the field-independents considerably performed better than dependents irrespective of the kind of reading text. Wilcox, Richards, and Merrill (1977) offered different forms of a text to high school students to read and instruct them to reply application type questions connected with the text. The field-independents outperformed considerably the dependent individuals while all types of the text were taken simultaneously. Guyer and Friedman (1975) contrasted learning-disabled with normal boys (ages 8-13) on a diversity of measures. The learning-disabled boys were weaker readers compared to the normal boys and as well had a tendency to be more field dependent. In an investigation about reading perspectives Blaha and Chomin’s (1982) outcomes indicate that field-dependent fifth-grade students realized that they encounter difficulties while reading the texts and desired to affirm it.

As opposed to this matter, field-independent students have shown the minimum amount of encountered difficulties. Therefore, one of the early overarching and stable results in this area of research has been that good readers have tendency to gain higher scores on field independence measures than weak readers. Field-independent individuals have tendency to be successful readers whereas field-dependent individuals have tendency to be less skilled readers. Provost (1981) proposes that one reason for this fact is that field-independent individuals may utilize more impressive cognitive strategies for reading than field-dependent individuals. More particularly, Guyer and Friedman (1975) point out that contrasts in reading ability between L.D. children (field-dependent ones) and normal children (more field-independent) may be because of a deficiency of ability to discriminate in the learning-disabled children. The learning-disabled children may not be capable of
distinguishing between words with same meanings. Moreover, their arrangement of words in mind may be global, leads to difficulties in accessing the accurate lexical record required.

Total reading ability is a vast area and does not respond questions regarding contrasts in certain reading procedures along the FD/I dimension. Miscue analysis allows scholars to observe specific dimensions of the reading procedures in a more précised way. An early study in employing miscues analysis in connection with FD/I cognitive styles is now starting to exude. Scott, Annesley, Maher and Christiansen (1980) have investigated mistakes in oral reading for eighth-graders on content materials. They realized that both below and above-average field-dependent students made fewer grammatically passable errors, showed poorer grammatical relationship models, and had weaker retellings of the text than field-independent students. Both groups employed grapho-phonic cues in reading; but the field-independent students employed syntactic and semantic cues in a higher level.

The field-dependent students answered to the text in an attentive and passive manner instead of employing what they knew and merging it into the text. They were more interested in surface structure and less in meaningful predictive strategies. Scott, et. al. (1980) propose that it’s not required for field-dependent individuals to read orally in the class as this places preference on precision about meaning for them. As well, they propose that field-dependent individuals to be shown how to separate the texts, reorganize them, and the correlation between the different parts inside the texts. As well, Summarizing and paraphrasing activities might be helpful here.

Most importantly, the teacher requires realizing that instructional strategy assigned for one person is not suitable for all children. Christiansen, Annesley, and Scott (1980) investigated the ninth-graders’ process of silent textual employing an
analysis of the cloze test. They realized that the types of mistakes were different among the cognitive styles most significantly at the frustration level texts. At this level the field-independent individuals showed a higher control over meaning (semantic acceptability of errors) and syntax (syntactic acceptability of errors) than field-dependent individuals via miscue analysis. Generally, these scholars suggest the use of coordinators, reviews, and objectives setting questions, so on for all students to assist them systemize the text for comprehension. They as well recommend to group children heterogeneously in reading instruction for maximizing the styles interaction.

The major interest of late reading scholars has been the formation of knowledge in memory and how it can influence reading comprehension (commonly considered schema theory). Spiro and Tirre (1980) studied how field-dependent and field-independent individuals would understand two isolated but same texts. The first text was about purchasing food items from a supermarket. The next text concerned purchasing the similar items from a restaurant. The second one represented more limitations and structure as the number of items a person can usually purchase from a restaurant is normally less than a supermarket. The number of alternate selections an individual has to select from memory is in smaller extent. Therefore the restaurant text should be finer recalled if the reader employs the knowledge he formerly owns in his mind. Spiro and Tirre realized that the field-independent individuals’ remembrance grew from 36% to 60% from the supermarket to restaurant texts. Field-dependent individuals, on the other hand, grew their remembrance only around 3%, from 37% to 40%. This proposes that field-independent individual have better schema (background) employment than field-dependents, rather than only a better total ability to remember. Field-dependent individuals are not as successful in their utilization (synthesis) of background experience to understand a text as are the field-independent
individuals. Some of the studies have investigated the ability of field-independent and field-dependent individuals to benefit from particular reading strategies and assistances.

Pierce (1980) requested field-dependent and field-independent children of kindergarten and third-grade to remember a story text, under two circumstances. These situations were an imagery strategy (imagine a picture of the text) and non-imagery strategies (think about and attempt for recalling the text). The field-independent children had greatly better remembrance than the field-dependent children at every grade levels and situations. The third-grade field-independent children had the greatest profit from the imagery strategy. Pierce proposes that employment of imagery strategy may be adjusted by individual contrasts in FD/I. Field-independent individuals are more capable of combining parts of stories to help their remembrance, and such ability is improved or developed through imagery employment. Spiro and Tirre (1980) proposed that field-dependent individuals are not as expert in utilizing their own structures in the text as field-independent. Two techniques of compensating for this issue would be motivating the field-dependent individuals to utilize 'their own structures in a specific way or to append extra structure that the reader can use. Another two studies convey these recommendations. Satterly and Telfer (1979) represented one of three treatments to 15 year old average IQ students. The prime treatment contained two lessons about structure of word. The latter treatment consisted of the similar lessons as well as an advanced organizer for the students. The third treatment contained both of two lessons as well as advanced organizer and also particular references inside the lessons to the organizer. Such references tried to attract the learners’ attention to the related or dependent ideas within the organizer. All students were submitted a test of conveyance of learning.
However both field-dependent and field-independent students had the best efficacy with the third treatment, the field-dependent students represented the higher benefit with that. Satterly and Telfer (1979) found, "Thus, field dependent subjects, whose ability to deal with formal structures is limited, are helped by its (the advanced organizer's) use but only where the teacher emphasizes its properties during the lesson" (p.176).

Brooks, Dansereau, and Spurlin (1981) submitted one of three 2,500 word university level texts to a group of general psychology college students to read. The passages varied in that one of them had titles in the text and the students received practice and instruction in reading these kinds of text. The second text had just titles and the control text included no titles. Different measures of comprehension and recall were given to students after reading (essay test, outline test, short answer test, and multiple choice tests). The field-independent students performed better than field-dependent students in all tests. Although all groups had a tendency to make their performance better on chosen measures as extra structure was appended to the text. In fact, the field-dependent students’ performance under the titles with instruction condition was almost similar to the field-independent students with just titles and outperformed the field-independent students in the condition of control text. Therefore, this proposes that preparing the text with the instruction and structure in using it may not only assist to enhance the performance of field-dependents' students, but also enhance it to the extent of the field-independent students’ normal performance.

2.4.2.2. EVALUATION OF READING COMPREHENSION

The evaluation of reading comprehension is a strict and difficult part in realizing what reading comprehension is, how reading comprehension investigations
are carried out, and how reading comprehension can be instructed in the best way. Valid and reliable measures of reading comprehension can enlighten the instruction of teachers in reading. Reading comprehension can be evaluated by various kinds of measures (Paris & Stahl, 2005), for instances, multiple-choice test after reading short passages silently, cloze tests in which student should read the texts silently and find and write absent words, short-answer organized response exam, and long organized answers tests like recalling the text and writing summary after reading a text. There is developing recognition that various measures evaluate various reading tasks (Cutting & Scarborough, 2006; Keenan, Betjemann, & Olson, 2008).

Few measures may be more requiring bottom-up strategies than other ones, for example, question-and-answer tests (reading of passage with short-answer questions) vs. cloze tests (Cutting & Scarborough, 2006). In their research with participants of 97 first through tenth graders, Cutting and Scarborough (2006) employed three measures of global reading comprehension usually used by scholars: the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test-Revised which includes reading of silent passages with texts present at the time of multiple-choice questions (GMRT; MacGinitie, MacGinitie, Maria, & Dreyer, 2000), the Gray Oral Reading Test-Third Edition which entails reading of oral passages with passages deleted at the time of multiple-choice questions (GORT-3; Widerhold & Bryant, 1992), and the Weschler Individual Achievement Test which includes reading of silent passages with passages present at the time of open-ended questions (WIAT; Wechsler, 1992). Cutting and Scarborough (2006) concluded that almost twice as much unique variance was allocated for by measures of word reading (decoding and combination of word reading precision) on the WIAT (11.9%) than on GM (6.1%) or GORT (7.5%). The unique variance described by oral language
proficiency was same for the WIAT and GORT-3 (each 9%) but more for the GM (15%).

In the same way, in Nation and Snowling’s (1997) sample of 7- through 10-year-olds, decoding described more variance in reading comprehension scores while cloze tests vs. question-and-answer tests were employed (79% vs. 53%). Some of reading comprehension measures may have tendency to engage higher-level skills, for example, text remembering and tasks of summary writing. For instance in summary writing, students should choose what is most significant in the passage, in some occasions they have to organize major ideas to unify text components, and after that summarize the text in a coherent mode, all of these are supposed to need higher level or deeper procedures (Kirby & Woodhouse, 1994). Task conditions have been demonstrated to affect summary writing; one of the variables of task condition is the presence or absence of the text during summary writing. The study has shown that absence of the text during summarization (for example, guiding participants to read a passage and then make a summary of it without being capable of referring back to the passage) motivates the reader to accomplish the text in a more active mode, therefore enabling higher-level processing, at the time of summary writing creates lower-level strategies (like verbatim copying) that result in weaker level processing (Hidi & Anderson, 1986; Kirby & Pedwell, 1991; Stein & Kirby, 1992).

Kirby and Woodhouse (1994) realized that students who indicated pursuing a deep method for learning outperformed while they were asked to write a summary without the passage being shown; although, students who indicated a surface method for learning were negatively influenced by the text absence. Later remembering of the text by students in passage absent summary writing group was obviously higher than which by students in the group of passage present summary writing (Stein & Kirby,
Thus, summary writing in the mode of text absent should be useful in the higher level occasions of reading comprehension as it motivates and needs deeper processing. Summary wiring can be assessed at various levels, for example details, major ideas, and subjects (Kirby & Pedwell, 1991; Stein & Kirby, 1992). The major idea and thematic levels should demonstrate deeper levels of processing than details, just as Kintsch’s (1998) condition model demonstrates deeper processing than the text-oriented and surface models.

Reading comprehension is obviously a complicated structure that entails many various elements. There are various levels of processing in reading and every level is essential to attain successful reading comprehension (Kirby & Woodhouse, 1994). As claimed before, reading comprehension is accomplished from a surface demonstration of the passage (propositions), to a text-oriented which identifies major ideas from details, and afterwards to a condition model which unifies text information with previous knowledge (Kintsch, 1998). Some of elements at both higher and lower levels play a role in reading comprehension. The contributions of elements to reading comprehension might vary based on which reading comprehension evaluation or which level of the reading comprehension evaluation is employed. Several evaluations should be employed to make sure that all related components of reading comprehension are included.