5.1. PRELIMINARIES

Among the cognitive styles which have been recognized till today, the field dependence/independence aspect has been the most substantially investigated and has had the greatest usage in educational subjects. However study on application to educational matters is still in its early steps, the records and documents claim that a cognitive-style method might be utilized with benefit to various educational matters, and language testing is not an exceptional subject. It is commonly accepted that the utilization of psychological matters to educational subjects has been of considerably essential for the successful learning and teaching procedures. It is expected that educators pay attention to the exceptional correlation between learners’ cognitive processing and linguistic performance, also singularize their method according to the needs of particular learners. It should be in the format of a scheduled teaching emanation that lets instructors to support learner’s individual differences (IDs), and in that learners can do the job or task at their own style and employ the materials they find perceptible. It is considered that the awareness and cognition of IDs is important factor for a better percieving of learners’ requirements and the accurate applicaion of teaching approaches. Ellis (1994) ponits out that L2 learners are different in the level of acquisition and which this distinction is the outcome of individual issues. Among these there is field dependence (FD) / field independence (FI) aspect that pertains to the cognitive styles group.

In initial phases, the subject of writing noticed first at the “what” of composition, the product. After that it added the “how” of composition, the processes. Afterwards, it changed its perspective to the “why” of composition with a concentrate on the impressive and learners’ cognitive style (Brand, 1987; Silva, 1990; Sasaki, 2000). This style of inquiry can assist to instructors and scholars in perceiving why
writers of English language are successful in some language tasks but not in other activities, why they represent specific writing acts but not other individuals, and why they are expert in producing certain written texts but not in producing other things (Jensen & Ditiberio, 1984). One factor that may have a role in and impact the writing performance is personality differences (Callahan, 2000; Jensen & DiTeiberio, 1984; Marefat, 2006). In addition, reading comprehension which has been investigated in this research is identified as a dynamic procedure of comprehending. As regards knowledge, information, technology and science can be achieved from the books, internet, research papers and other reading stuffs for improving the learners reading ability. Reading comprehension is affected by child’s own personality, reading material, interest, attitudes, cognitive style, motivation, habit, environment, self-efficacy, and other issues. Learners’ success in language skills influenced by two elements: external and internal factors. Cognitive style is one of internal factors that may impact learners’ performance in their acquisition. It is highly proved that cognitive styles impact learners’ performance in reading comprehension. Therefore, being conscious about learners’ cognitive abilities, attempting to support their individual requirements, assisting them bring specific learning styles to mind, in different learning circumstances should be understood by modern instructors as vital factors in an impressive teaching procedure.

In this chapter the outcomes of the research and a summary of the results of different analyses along with a discussion of mentioned research questions and hypothesizes are represented. The present study aimed to investigate whether, and to what extent FD/FI cognitive styles impact on the performance of ESL Iranian Students in process/product writing approaches and reading comprehension ability in classroom environment.
5.2. HYPOTHESES OUTCOMES

5.2.1. RESEARCH QUESTION 1

**Research Question1:** Does Cognitive Style significantly affect the ESL Students’ Performance in Process and Product Writing Approaches?

**The First Hypothesis:** *Cognitive Style significantly affects the ESL Students’ Performance in Process and Product Writing Approaches.*

Analysis of the data revealed that Filed-Independent students outperformed in product approach of writing rather than field-dependent students. Field-dependent students, on the contrary performed better than field-independent students in process approach of writing. Thus, the answer to the Research Question 1 is affirmative and the 1st hypothesis is accepted.

Regarding the relationship between Field-Dependency/Independency and writing, Kinsella (1996) claimed that students with analytical characteristic (field-independents) have better disposal to traditional teaching method a part of which is filling out writing task. In accordance with Entwistle (1988), on writing assignment, learners with holistic cognitive style have more tendencies to utilize a global technique of drafting and redrafting in compare with completing an initial outline. They may encounter difficulties in assessing phase and noting to assignment and deciding what is necessary in the initial steps. In other words, field-independent individuals make extra attempts for brainstorming to approach the topic. They may encounter difficulties in assessing form (Town, 2003).

According to Abraham (1985), field-independent individuals were more successful in inductive instruction, whereas field-dependent individuals have done better in deductive exercises. Thus, it is believed that field independent learners think
inductively and field dependent learners think deductively. These two types of thinking may have influences on the way learners write in a foreign/second language, as regards in deductive strategy to the writing process with the affirmation on the expansion of thoughts and ideas and inductive strategy concentrating on the product and format of composition (Allami & Salmani-Nodoushan, 2006).

Field-dependent students want the teacher to specify goals for them but field-independent students wish to specify goals and principles in a certain assignment. They are unwilling to request for assistance and favor to finish their assignment alone. Ehrman and Oxford (1990) carried out a research with 20 adults learning Turkish in the United States. The outcomes of the investigation demonstrated that field-dependent students were interested in functional practice strategies and social strategies, whereas field-independent students had tendency to utilize strategy of learning on their own. As mentioned before, process approach of writing is an interactive approach, and in each and every stage of the writing process, the student writer will interact either with instructor or other students. As well, teacher cooperation at the time of writing is acceptable. Since this approach is social and contributory method, FD learners perform better in this approach. As opposite to the process approach, the product approach of writing is a student-oriented method in which the instructor doesn’t interfere at the time of writing and the student writer will do the task alone. In the field of second/foreign language composition, though there have been some investigations concentrating on the students’ utilization of skill-based techniques in their writing exercises in English such as (Abdollahzadeh, 2010; Dehghan & Razmjoo, 2012; Fahandezh Sadi & Othman, 2012;), and also some studies on the impact of cognitive style on writing ability in general like
(Nilforooshan & Afghari, 2007; Yarahmadi, 2011), no study has addressed the relationship between learning styles and writing approaches.

The gap becomes more obvious when it deals with surveys regarding EFL/ESL students. The present study was an attempt to examine the relationship between writing approaches and individual differences of ESL learners and to explore the correlation between these two. The presence of a significant influence of cognitive styles on writing approaches was asserted by independent t-test result. This area of research should assist instructors perceive the probable causes underlying the variable proficiency of learners and their lack of achievement in writing exercises that are not accordant with their favorite techniques. Additionally, learners’ knowledge of their cognitive style of individual feature might result in more attempts from their side to improve their natural abilities and tendencies. As for the teachers, this kind of knowledge might help in selection of types of methodology, assisting in the identifying of individual differences and developing teacher-student comprehending. As a result, teachers can provide a mechanism for the learners to observe their own improvement in learning and the contribution of writing approaches in performing writing assignment. The point here is that EFL/ESL students are subjected to a perfect list of writing approaches to be capable of using the approach they favor based on their cognitive style. In this manner learners’ autonomy can be improved in writing assignment. Since in the class environment, the students are not homogenous from the personality aspect; the teacher can balance and combine these approaches to meet the learners’ needs.

Based on (Batstone, 1994), to make the situation better it is required to combine “the careful control of language for learner (as in product), and the creative use of language by the learner (as in process)” (Kim and Kim, 2005, pp.7-8).
Scaffolding was an approach for this (Kim & Kim, 2005). This assists to make a dynamic balance between an instructor and the students as well as between the students themselves. More collaborative method to instruction of ESL/EFL writing is required for the situation in which students are of different style preferences. Both product and process methods of writing have their advantages and detriments; thus, it is approved that supplementary application of both methods assists student writers with different cognitive styles enhance their skills in utilizing language through dealing with a whole writing process and also obtain knowledge from the model passage. This supplementary application of both methods would assist learners of different cognitive preferences to be writers rather than transcriber, and so have the potential advantage of combining critical thinking into their educational writing (Akhand & Hassan, 2010).

### 5.2.2. RESEARCH QUESTION 2

**Research Question 2:** Does Cognitive Style significantly affect the ESL Students’ Essay Writing Ability in General?

**The Second Hypothesis:** *Cognitive Style significantly affects the ESL Students’ Essay Writing Ability in General.*

The result of this study revealed that FI students outperformed FD students in writing ability in general. This is in line with the results reported by Large (1998) and Graffin (1983). Therefore, the answer to the Research Question 2 is positive, and the 2\(^{nd}\) hypothesis is accepted.

The finding that field independents outperformed field dependents in writing task is in accordance with the result obtained by previous studies. Earlier researcher suggested a significant association between cognitive styles and writing as well as academic achievement (Moor & Dwyer, 2001; Lynch, et al., 1998; Nilforooshan &
Afghari, 2007). Results demonstrate that field independent learners relate significantly and positively with language learning achievement in classroom (Brown, 1994; Chapelle, 1995; Chapelle & Roberts, 1986; Chapelle & Abraham, 1990; Mancy & Reid, 2004). As declared by Tianjero and Paramo (1998) “Field independent subjects consistently achieve higher academic levels than field dependent subjects, whether specific subjects or global performance are considered” (p.36). As claimed by Nilforooshan and Afghari (2007) “There is a significant correlation between cognitive style and performance in general writing ability and also narrative writing in particular, whereas no significant difference was found between field dependents and field independents in argumentative writing” (p.27).

The possible cause of difference between the abilities of field dependent and field independent learners may be associated with the difference between the two groups of learners in the way of thinking, reorganizing ability, the utilization of techniques in data processing and in process of writing, and retrieval of memory (Nilforooshan & Afghari, 2007). Witkin et al. (1977), describing the correlation between field-dependent/independent cognitive style and academic success, mentioned that field dependent learners use less strategies for performing an assignment. Thus, their weak performance in opposite to field independent learners in tests is correlated to their debility in using strategies for data processing rather than cognitive incompetency. Field independent learners utilized internalized techniques like hypothesis testing, analytical reasoning, etc. that help them in doing better in inverse conditions and conceptually ambiguous tasks (Hacker, 1990). The other potential reason for achieving this result is that the teaching approaches in East Asian countries benefits field independent learners rather than field dependent ones (Zhenhui, 2001).
5.2.3. RESEARCH QUESTION 3

**Research Question 3:** Does Cognitive Style significantly affect the Cohesion and Coherence in ESL Students’ Essay Writing Task?

**The Third Hypothesis:** *Cognitive Style significantly affects the Cohesion and Coherence in ESL Students’ Essay Writing Task.*

The results show that cognitive style significantly impacts on cohesion and coherence in writing. The writing of field-independent learners was assessed significantly more coherent than field-dependent learners. Thus, the answer to Research Question 3 is assertive and 3rd hypothesis is accepted. This result supports the previous claims for the relationship between cognitive style and coherence by Williams (1985).

Field-dependent learners constantly had failures to realize topics under all situations. However, the matter that some individuals fail to employ rhetorical strategies is usual in writing classrooms; these outcomes demonstrate the first time that this kind of behavior can be associated with differences in cognitive style. Without response from a textual audience, field dependent learners can hardly recognize that their goals are not recognized in their composition. In addition, analysis of writings proposes that cohesion and coherence follow from, leastwise in part, a professional mastery of rhetorical strategies and their relevant materials, because the writing of field dependent learners characteristically revealed a lack of these strategies. Within the structure of cognitive style, this manner is promptly perceived. The field dependsents’ context of writing was not defined by the situations and they had to use their own context. In the lack of a certain context, such learners assumed what they suppose the ordinary condition or context for incidence of the linguistic phenomenon. The result as well proposes that distinctions in cognitive processing
underlie differences in writing performance, leastwise as much as cohesion and coherence is pertained.

It is very obvious that cohesion and coherence in the writing is one of the key factors in the essay writing. Cohesion and coherence demonstrates the unity and skillfully managed paragraphing which follow the essay’s topic. Generally written language is an important key form of communication. Subsequently, acquiring skill to write correctly is considered as paramount educational objective and one that needs the expansion of a complex diversity of skills. “Among these are fluency with transcription (spelling and letter formation/keyboarding), language based skills such as word choice and construction of grammatically correct sentences, and mechanical skills such as the appropriate use of capital letters and punctuation” (Struthers et al. 2013, p.198). Accordingly, for students to efficiently communicate their thought in writing they require to do more than write accurately; they should acquire to build coherent text.

“For the last three decades, cohesion and coherence and their relationship have been a subject of discussion in the international linguistic community (Hulkova, Jancarikova 2009, p.10)”. In fact coherence is a notion and the comprehending of which is yet not totally agreed upon. Anyhow, the conception of cohesion has been approved as an established category for discourse analysis since the publication of Cohesion in English. So many scholars agreed that there is a functional distinction between coherence and cohesion, observing them to be different approaches (Beaugrande & Dressler 1981; Hoey, 1996). Cohesion commonly explained as “the way certain words or grammatical features of a sentence can connect that sentence to its predecessors and successors in a text” (Hoey, 1996, p.23). In consonance with (Tarnyikova, 2009) cohesion is “surface structure linkage between elements of a text”
In broad term, it is essential to study cohesion and coherence with each other due to the fact that, they show how the text is joined together and how it transforms its message. Tarnyikova (2007), declared that “traditionally, written complexes are prototypically associated with a higher degree of complexity, more intricate ways of integrating particular clauses within the complex, as well as a higher probability of longer, more compact (condensed), or fused (amalgamated) structures” (p.36). In fact cohesion and coherence are not synonymous expressions. Coherence connects to the unity in meaning that transmitted by a text, cohesion equals to the text level markers through which coherence is shown (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Graesser et al., 2004). “As cohesion is related to text quality and coherence, it may therefore act as a good indicator of coherence. Whereas coherence is not directly observable, cohesion is. Thus, examination of cohesion can help educators pinpoint where some children maybe having difficulty in composing well-constructed unified texts (Struthers et al., 2013, p.200)”.

The subject of cognitive style and cohesion and coherence requires to be investigated further in a more detailed research. If another study confirms the correlation between cognitive style and coherence in writing, the next stage is to teach students to use field independent style and then assess what influence such training has on their writing performance. Teaching students to apply an alternate cognitive strategy could possibly serve as a precious instrument in writing pedagogy.

5.2.4. RESEARCH QUESTION 4

Research Question 4: Does Cognitive Style affect ESL Students’ Grammar Performance in Essay Writing Task?

Analysis of data showed that field-independent language learners tend to have a higher level of ESL grammar proficiency compared with field-dependent language learners. In this reason, the answer to research question 4 is positive and 4th hypothesis is accepted.

In several researches about language acquisition/learning it has been identified that some students pursue an ‘analytical’ whereas other students pursue a ‘holistic’ method for learning language (Richards, 1990). Analytical learners begin with small parts of language and proceed towards wider parts of language. Holistic learners begin with wide parts that they then slowly progress into smaller sub-categories. These distinctions in cognitive style seem to influence all linguistic parts. As for phonology, analytical learners begin with phonemic or syllabic units whereas holistic learners start with suprasegmentally features like intonation. Regarding syntax, analytical learners start with ‘telegraphic speech’ but holistic learners start with unanalyzed parts of standard speech. As for pragmatics and semantics, analytical learners start with creating word-referent correlations whereas holistic learners have more tendencies in the social acts of speech. While the accurate correlation between learning and cognitive styles is not obvious, a study of the field-dependence development by Davis & Cochran (1989) represents a connection between field-dependent cognitive style and holistic style on one side and field-independent and analytical style on another side. Lefever & Ehri (1976) realized impact of field-dependent cognitive style on syntactic ambiguity resolving with better performance by field-independent learners. As field dependent cognitive style has been related with acquisition of naturalistic second or foreign language and field independent style with classroom learning (Brown, 2000; Carter, 1988), it looks normal for FI learners to utilize more meta-cognitive strategies to improve their grammatical learning. In the same way, FI
learners mostly employ cognitive strategies containing repetition, translation, rehearsal, transfer, etc. This may also be associated with conscious learning and the tasks which can be done in formal classroom settings.

5.2.4.1. TEACHING GRAMMAR IN ESL/EFL CLASSROOM BASED ON COGNITIVE STYLE

As stated by language researchers (Ellis, 1999), learners of English Language should become proficient of native style of English so that they could easily interact with other people in business environments. Additionally, they also require perceiving careful style of English (for example, rhetoric), if they need to do lectures or write business letters with clients. Thus, English grammar method, which assist learners perceive structure of English language and the approaches of using English efficiently, is an essential and vital component in curriculum of the university. Latest grammar method has allocated so much of considerations to the meaningful exercises and efficient interaction among learners. Teaching methods concentrate on improving the techniques (Sharwood-Smith, 1981) to increase learner’s awareness on specific grammar structure (Fotos & Ellis, 1991). By applying this idea, it may arouse learner’s inherent grammar knowledge, assist learner improve their comprehension of grammatical principles, and finally understand how to utilize those principles into reliable relationships.

A brief review at the background in methodology of language teaching represents a diversity of ideas regarding language teaching particularly in the field of grammar. In traditional approaches particularly grammar translation approach; the teaching concentration was widely on the structure of language, remembering grammatical rules and long lists of vocabularies. Nevertheless, from 1950s, because of the impact of behaviorism on structuralism and psychology in linguistics, language
instructors pursued the audio-lingual method in classrooms by the mode of language patterns habitualization. Learning a language assumed to be perceived as learning its parts and elements and being capable of arrange them to utilize in speaking, listening, writing, and reading tasks. Since, the attitudes of linguists shifted to generativism and the ideas of psychologists changed to cognition, language instructors pursued the cognitive code learning method. So many criticisms have been made toward teaching and testing by bits because it did not notice the ability for language utilization; as well as the linguistics concentration on pragmatism and psychologists on theories of second/foreign language learning, improving communicative proficiency has become important issues.

By a different viewpoint, traditional approach particularly the approach of grammar translation, regarding grammar teaching, mostly emphasized the employment of deductive mode in language instruction. In spite of that it may be proper at times to state a principle and then go forward to its examples, most of the records in communicative language learning mentions to the supremacy of an inductive method to the structures and generalizations. But, both inductively and deductively directed teaching approaches can be efficient based on the objectives and context of a special language teaching condition (Brown, 2000). The other two strategies are strongly relevant to these teaching approaches. One is integrative (holistic) approach for teaching of grammar in that the rules are made in a communicative framework to be afterward dawn out and acquired by the students. As stated by (Farhady et al., 2006) this approach consists of the real dimensions of functions that one should commonly carry out in language employment. Conversely, in the discrete-point (atomistic) approach rules are provided out of the framework, by the utilization of demos or exercises for that audio-lingual approach is a good
instance. However, in accordance with few scholars this approach has no correlation with the real life environments.

As it is clear, selecting a proper approach is not a simple task particularly when other additional variables come to engage in teaching. Among these variables are the cognitive ones that consist of learning styles. Two prominent cognitive styles include field dependence and field independence. Based on Chastain (1988) some students are more dependent on their surrounding environments (field dependent) whereas other students are more independent in their thoughts and activities (filed independent). Scholars affirm the correlation between these two styles with students’ success. In the field of second/foreign language learning record has been discovered for its impact on ESL/EFL students. But, scholars have not achieved the strong proof as to the correlation of these cognitive styles with the atomistic and holistic mode of grammar teaching. From the commencement of language teaching, a wide variety of approaches and methods have been recognized and utilized in the classrooms. Discrete-point and integrative approaches of teaching are the examples of those methods. As claimed by Oller (1979) discrete-point analysis ineluctably takes the components of language apart and attempts to teach them in separate with minimum or no consideration to the way those components interface in a larger framework of interaction. But, the integrative approach attempts to teach language in the framework and is related to concept and overall communicative impact of content (Salehi, 2008). The logic for integrative mode of teaching is that as language purpose is communication, teaching should be focused on communicative usage of language in real-life circumstances (Farhady et al., 2006).

In accordance with various approaches, there may be various types of exercises in the classroom. They may focus on usage or utilization at first. They may
ask the learners to collect a message or to make one. They may entail all class practices, small team interplay or individual activity. They may be motivated by opinions extracted from various fields of science, particularly psychology. Anyway, whatever approach or instruction material is chosen, the student as an individual with psychological and cognitive features must not be forgotten. More current methods have attempted to concentrate on the student rather than instruction. The student as a person brings various parameters with himself to the classroom like his past knowledge, his idea about the specific language which he is learning, and his cognitive style and techniques. Several researches have been carried out to recognize types of learners and the best appropriate approach for them because identifying the learners’ differences additionally can help in choosing of a proper approach. Students have various styles. According to these scholars "cognitive, affective, and physiological traits that are relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with, and respond to the learning environment" (Keefe 1979, p.124), or in more simple mode "a general predisposition, voluntary or not, toward processing information in a particular way" (Skehan, 1991, p.282). Cognitive styles intervene between cognition and feeling. Individuals’ styles are identified through the way they internalize their total circumstance and as that internalization is not firmly cognitive we observe that cognitive domains and physical affective combine in learning styles (Brown, 2000). Different circumstances create different styles in the same person. According to the literature, there has been minor consideration to the importance of these styles in grammar instruction, some researchers attempted to study whether the atomistic and holistic approaches would cause a distinction for learning of grammar on one side and on various styles of learners on another side (Dabaghi, & Goharimehr, 2011). As claimed by these scholars, the cognitive styles of FD/I are
prominent variables influencing the learning of grammatical rules via different methods. “Since FI learners are considered to learn patterns independent of other factors we assumed that they do better with the discrete-point method which presented grammar out of context. Furthermore, the FD learners were assumed to be more dependent on the context presented for a grammatical rule, therefore they were assumed to take more advantage of an integrative method which provided them with a meaningful context for learning” (Dabaghi & Goharimehr, 2011, p.85).

There are some scholars such as Ellis (1986) who asserted that FD/I are not supposed to be a significant variable in Language Learning. But other scholars such as Naiman et al. (1996); Stansfield and Hansen (1983), Chapelle and Roberts (1986) confirm the crucial impact of these styles on learning of a second/foreign language. Briefly, as stated by Dabaghi and Goharimehr (2011), the positive impact of employing an integrative approach for FD learners and a discrete-point approach for FI learners can’t be ignored for instructors who explore the most proper and suitable approaches for learners of different styles. It is hoped that the outcomes of this research and also the review of other scholars’ studies will fascinate the teachers’ thoughts to the individual variables of learners and result in more proficiency of teaching for learners of different cognitive styles.

5.2.5. RESEARCH QUESTION 5

**Research Question 5:** Does Cognitive Style affect Lexical Knowledge of ESL Students in Essay Writing Task?

**The Fifth Hypothesis:** *Cognitive Style affects Lexical Knowledge of ESL Students in Essay Writing Task.*

Learning or cognitive style has been identified as one of the significant elements among learners’ individual features which can influence learning procedures
and performance of the learners. Accordingly, the research studied whether or not the cognitive styles of field dependence/independence could impact on ESL students’ lexical knowledge. On the other hand, it was assumed that field dependence/independence cognitive styles do not impact on the ESL students’ lexical knowledge. The outcomes revealed that the independent variable, field dependence/independence, has an influence on the dependent variable that is lexical knowledge. Therefore, it can be stated that the answer to the research question 5 is affirmative and the 5th alternative hypothesis is accepted. The outcomes of this research supported the states that field-dependent/independent cognitive styles impact on the ESL/EFL learners’ lexical knowledge (Niroomand & Rostampour, 2014; Golaghaei, 2011; Alavi & Kaivanpanah, 2009). Moreover, the outcomes are in contrast with study was carried out in this area by Yang (2006), who has realized that cognitive styles are not the efficient issues influencing learners’ performance, and asserts that the field-independent learners do not vary considerably from their peers, field-dependent learners. In addition, according to the data analysis for the difference of lexical knowledge between two groups of field dependent and field independent, it has been revealed that field independent learners have a better lexical knowledge compare to field dependent learners. However, Niroomand and Rostampour (2014) in their study about “Field Dependence/Independence Cognitive Styles: Are They Significant at Different Levels of Vocabulary Knowledge?” claimed that “the higher the scores of vocabulary knowledge test, the more field dependent the testees are” (p.2178).

Amongst various parts of a language, lexical knowledge considered as the most important nonetheless, it is the most deserted factor. One of the basic logics regarding English to be the international language (lingua franca) of the world is that
English contains the most complete store of vocabulary amongst various languages of this era. Lately only a few scholars have attempted to perceive the relevant significance of vocabulary learning in the field of language learning. Some of the latest studies that considered the different dimensions of vocabulary learning consist Huckin, Haynes, and Coady (1993), Harley (1995), Hatch and Brown (1995), Coady and Huckin (1997), Schmitt and McCarthy (1997), Atkins (1998), Wesche and Paribakht (1999), Read (2000), Schmitt (2000), Nation (2001), and Wesche and Paribakht (2010). They all presented some argues expounding about the significance of vocabulary acquisition and instruction. Although in current years there has been an increasing knowledge of the lexical knowledge necessity in second language investigations and second language instruction to study the cognitive relevance that has irrefutable impacts on language teaching and learning. It is important to mention that, if we were supposed to formulate second language acquisition theories and instructional materials that were only in accordance with efficient observations, we would be removing the most essential aspect of individual cognition like cognitive attributes.

Probably the most important feature of this study is relevant to the area of language teaching. The outcomes of this research can be of useful to all language instructors, test organizers, and teaching material developers. Since learners with different cognitive styles may differ in performing the activities in language learning, assessing learners according to such learning features, and making distinctions between them based on their lexical knowledge, would result in a more valid evaluation of their lexical proficiency, and as a consequence may lead to more advantageous language learning and teaching techniques. Practically, perceiving the aptitude of learners of language concerning cognitive styles can supply a base or
background for development of materials which is conforming the performances, changing inherent desires. On the other hand, according to these findings, strategies could be made to adapt teaching situations so as to properly answer to the learners’ requirements. Also such strategies can improve learning output.

The importance of an appropriate material in learning is something of superior significance. In suitable conditions, when it is feasible to consider such cognitive styles, language instructors can see a better level of eagerness towards the learning of various parts of language. Learners of language are more successful if they can identify the kind of cognitive style which is prevailing in them. Although one dimension of cognitive style can be prevailing in a person, it does not mean that he/she does not possess another dimension. As stated by Brown (1994), in learning a second or foreign language, it may not be right to suppose that students must be either FD or FI. Some students may be both highly FI and highly FD when they exposed to various situations. Therefore, the teacher’s responsibility is to perceive the different styles of every learner in various situations. As a summary, this research is represented in the idea that understanding and being aware of cognitive styles based on learners’ performances in a particular area of language such as lexical knowledge will result in the improvement of inherent abilities and talent and desires which supply situations for more progress and assistance impetus. As for instructors, this knowledge will bring useful impacts as well, helping in methodological selections, assisting in the identifying of individual differences, and enhancing teacher-student comprehension.

5.2.6. RESEARCH QUESTION 6

**Research Question 6:** Does Cognitive Style significantly impact on ESL Students’ Length of Essay Writing?
The Sixth Hypothesis: Cognitive Style significantly impacts on ESL Students’ Length of Essay Writing.

The sixth hypothesis examines the effect of cognitive styles, field-dependence/independence on ESL students’ length of essay writing. Therefore, the number of words which were utilized in both groups in general essay writing; were counted and the result revealed that there is statistically significance difference between field dependent and field independent students’ length of essay writing. Thus, cognitive style has an impact on length of essay writing, according to the fact that field dependent students were not able to apply sufficient words in their writing. So the answer to the research question 6 is positive and the 6th hypothesis is accepted. There are some important key elements in essay writing such as: lexical resources, cohesion and coherence, considering punctuation and length of essay. There is standardization for length of writing per essay or explaining paragraph in language proficiency exams like IELTS and TOEFL. As it is obvious there is no definitive rule to pursue for writing an essay or a paragraph. Some paragraphs probably are longer than others. Generally, a suitable paragraph ought to be around 150 words and an essay should be around 250 words that involve five paragraphs. “Writing is a phenomenon invented by humans to help in the communication process. There is a close relationship between speech and writing, each reinforce the other in the process of language development in children” (Winch et al., 2010, p.110).

Supporting students with this chance to participate in various writing experiences can reinforce to acquire the subject of a course along with to communicate their knowledge to others. The matter how professional instructors are in perceiving and managing learners’ individual differences constructs a significant; or probably even the most significant, components of the learning-teaching procedure.
In this present study consideration has been concentrated on cognitive styles that, as has formerly been discussed, should not be considered as steady features of particular people. However given methods of undertaking a task result in higher achievement to one learner than to other one, it can be possible for every person to extract suitable styles in various situations and to make a profit from them. The instructor’s role is to assist learners apply different styles based on the activities that are to be carried out. Therefore, what can be done to assist field dependent students become more field independent? What can be done to assist them gain higher achievements from writing tests? Is there any logic for changing field independent learners to more field dependent? The following solutions may avail as the responses to such questions. But, more studies should be carried out in this area to claim if the implications can be considered as valid ones or not.

The instructors can pay attention to give more scanning assignments to field dependent learners, make them to be more field independent. What may be considered as well is a cautious equivalency of total-class, small-group and individual activities. Activities which engage whole class assist every learner to be admitted as a member of a group, create collective aims, exchange information and clear up the difficulties together. Working in a small group is more convenient for various needs, abilities and interests of smaller teams inside the class as a whole. Individual activities are necessary if learners need to improve specific skills and perspectives, and learn how to perform an activity independently. It has been emphasized in this study that field dependent students like to do group works rather than individual activities. They prefer to work with each other to gain a common purpose. They are interested in helping others and they are sensitive to comments and thoughts of other individuals. Field independent learners, in contrast, like to perform activities independently. They
do not care about social situation while doing a task. They want to achieve individual recognition. Since field dependent students seem to have difficulties with certain tasks in a classroom, certain stages can be created for the purpose of helping them feel more confident and assist them to get some sort of amplification from their learning surrounding.

The aim can be gained via the assistance of so mentioned grouping in which learners are different in performances and put in the same team and help each other to clear up various difficulties. Organizing small teams with three or four members, in which both field dependent and field independent learners are placed and working jointly, probably is a good suggestion for a post task phase of the lesson. This may result in criticizes that the FD students are benefited because FI students are not interested in team work. Although, the field independent students’ group owns a particular concession as far as writing tasks are studied, some scores can be allocated to field dependent students. Other objections of making these students work jointly on a task in a group are that better learners would be barricaded by weaker learners, that most parts of the assignment would be carried out by one student and that other members of the team, particularly the FD learners, would not know how to work independently. Definitely, all these weak points are appeared when team work is badly arranged. But, if there is enough teacher-student programs such weak points can be forbearing. The learners should realize their duties in the team and in the class for performing a proper part of the group work. The matter whether better learners should assist the weaker learners has always been considered as debatable and no clear response has been presented till now.

Though, the typically agreed idea that better learners should assist the slower learners can be considered as a useful viewpoint for classroom. At the time of
working in small teams, field dependent students will feel more confident. Through the field independents’ assistance, they will perform better in writing activities and come to know how to match with unknown elements in the field of writing task. Could field-independent students be interested in the suggested learning environment? It is supposed they can as they will be made to work in a team and to match with other members in for achieving a common purpose. This mode will assist them to become more expertise in social or interpersonal activities. Such activities in the classroom may encourage them understand and admire the opinion of team work. According to Jantarska (2006), understanding cognitive abilities of learners, attempting to support their personal requirements, assisting them extracting special cognitive styles in various learning circumstances should be comprehended by current learners in present era as vital issues in an efficient teaching/learning program.

5.2.7. RESEARCH QUESTION 7

Research Question 7: Does Cognitive Style significantly impact on ESL Students’ Time of Completing Writing Task?

The Seventh Hypothesis: Cognitive Style significantly impacts on ESL Students’ Time of Completing Writing Task.

For the purpose of examining this hypothesis, at the time conducting the general essay writing test, the students were asked to take the time for starting and completing the task and the researcher also controlled the time of completing while collecting the tests. As well, they were told to write as neatly and as legibly as they could and at their own speed. According to the data analysis based on the time taken by each student in completing the writing task, it has been revealed that field-dependent students spent longer times on this task. Despite the fact that field-independent students’ essay writing length was more than field-dependent ones but
the field-independent students could complete their writing task in a shorter time compare to field-dependent students. It means, the time-management of field-independent students is better than field-dependent students. Therefore, the answer to the research question 7 is affirmative and the 7\textsuperscript{th} hypothesis is accepted. Writing essays is a challenge for students at every level. Differentiation requires that we break down the difficult task of writing extended pieces of work, giving students a ‘ladder’ up to this high-order skill.

\textbf{5.2.8. RESEARCH QUESTION 8}

\textbf{Research Question 8:} Does Cognitive Style significantly impact on ESL Students’ Attitudes towards Ownership in Writing?

\textbf{The Eighth Hypothesis:} \textit{Cognitive Style Significantly impacts on ESL Students’ Attitudes towards Ownership in Writing.}

Data collected regarding this hypothesis in present study demonstrated that field-dependent/independent cognitive style impacts on ownership in writing. According to the data analysis, the field-dependent students had more positive views to ownership in writing rather than field-independent students. It means that the field-dependent persons’ ownership tendency in writing is more than field-independent persons. Therefore, answer to the research question 8 is positive and the 8\textsuperscript{th} hypothesis is accepted.

Ownership in writing is not a newfound notion but relatively a notion which is attracting a lot of attention (Ede & Lunsford, 1985). Both the instructional experts and the educational researchers related to writing realize that writing nurtures individual, interpersonal and mental concept (Britton, 1975; King, 1988; Talbot, 1990; Applebee, 1991; Bright, 1995). Therefore in writing, chances for fostering senses of ownership appear when topics permit learners to discover their experiences, opinions, interests,
ideas, difficulties and also write about whatever crucial for them (Applebee, 1991; Barbieri, 1987; Smith, 1982). Moreover, Calkins (1986) advocates such opinions by claiming that writing should permit the learner to write with her or his own ideas therewith demonstrating that she/he is not said what to write.

The notion of ownership in writing is indicated by a person when her/his writing ideas reveal meaning concerns, worth and his/her views. But, this matter has to be stated in writing as the person’s thoughts, modes of observing and interacting, so that they can be authenticated (Buddemeier, 1982). This is the situation when a student writes as he/she feels a profound and individual affiliation to the procedure. Based on Bright (1995), permitting learners to have ownership in writing appeared to motivate learners to write with “less difficulty and more Confidence” (p. 3). Shanklin (1991) agrees that learners try to write best if they are permitted to regularly self-chosen subjects, are fascinated in a subject or are acquainted with that subject (p. 50). Thus, this claim may open a new point of view and a technique to improve the field-dependent students writing performance.

The results of this survey have created a new aspect. Learners can improve their writing performance by being conscious of style zones in which they feel less convenience, creating ways to enhance their mental development (Yarahmadi, 2011). Likewise, instructors can recognize strong style types in their writing classrooms and benefit efficiently from these findings to contrive instructional strategy that match students’ cognitive style precedencies.

5.2.9. RESEARCH QUESTION 9

Research Question 9: Does Cognitive Style significantly impact on ESL Students’ Reading Comprehension Ability?
The Ninth Hypothesis: *Cognitive Style significantly impacts on ESL Students’ Reading Comprehension Ability.*

Data analysis in this study regarding cognitive style and reading comprehension revealed that field-dependent and field-independent students are different in performing reading comprehension test and the field-independent learners outperformed the field-dependent ones. Thus, the answer to the research question 9 is affirmative and 9th hypothesis has been accepted.

The outcomes of the questions of feedback survey regarding reading comprehension demonstrated that the Field-Dependent students answered positively on the questions about comprehending the major concept, comprehending the total message conveyed in the passage, guess-making. They represented a higher level of consent with such questions and gained higher percentages. The findings illustrated that the Field-Dependent students are better in some variables, like comprehending of contexture, understanding the explicit concepts, comprehending the total message conveyed in the passage. The findings of this feedback questionnaire affirmed that ESL Field-Dependent students of intermediate level perform better in comprehending the major concepts and general message of the passage and handle reading passage as a whole. The outcomes of the research represented that the Field-Independent students answered positively on the questions about comprehending the implicit concepts, comprehending the particular data conveyed in the passage, inter-textual correlation. They represented a higher level of consent with such questions. The results indicate that the Field-Independent students perform better in some variables, like comprehending particular and special ideas, understanding the hidden concept, and inference. The outcomes of the research denoted that Iranian Field-Independent ESL
students at intermediate level perform better in comprehending the particular data, hidden ideas inside the passage, inferencing, and deal with reading passage in detail.

The results of this survey are in accordance with what was represented before by many scholars. (Witkin & Goodenough, 1981; Messick, 1976; Davis & Cochran, 1990; Witkin et al., 1977; Thompson & Thompson, 1987; Davis, 1991; Goodenough, 1976; Davey and Menke, 1989; Luk, 1998; Ahmady & Yamini, 1992). There is a correlation between Field-Dependence / Independence cognitive styles and reading comprehension. The outcomes gained in this study might be imputed to some elements. According to Messick, one of the possible reasons might be the truth that cognitive styles impact learning in learners (Messick, 1976). As for the 9th hypothesis, the ideas of field-dependent and field-independent ESL students are different concerning reading comprehension. The next opinion is that learners with various cognitive styles are different according to the reality that their psychological needs and priorities and they own various potentials. The reason for correlation is probably that, the students could have various contraptions and psychological potentials to make benefits from the facilitative and normal characteristic like aboundness, additional linguistic elements etc. of the passages to understand the concepts. In accordance with Davey & Menke (1989) and Cochran & Davis, (1987) Field-Independent students may have stronger comprehension capabilities due to their higher cognitive proficiencies in fields like formation of remembering knowledge, utilizing imagery, exploiting of text signs, and active hypotheses-test activities.

As Jones (1993) asserted, Field-Independent learners concentrate more on information in relevant with the task and disregard wackiness better than Field-Dependent learners (Davis & Cochran, 1990). Field-Independent learners who treat a field with an analytical method and evoke components from its complicated context
have better disembedding capability in conceptual activities and stronger cognitive restructuring than Field-dependent learners. In addition, another possible rationale can be concluded to connect with the influence of cognitive styles based on Witkin's description of cognitive styles. In his view, tendency to discrete parts from the field context is practically possible reasoning mode that represents a contextually proper employment of Field-Dependency and Field-Independency in the text identification and comprehension. It appears that the findings obtained from this research; shed light over the Field's assertion hereupon, as it was restated in prior researches (Davis, 1991; Goodenough, 1976; Davey & Menke, 1989; Luk, 1998). The implication of such investigation on a broader educational environment might be in conformity with Abraham’ (1982, cited in Brown, 2000) statement; asserting that field independence extremely is related to success in learning a second language. The 9th hypothesis concentrates on the correlation between FD/I cognitive style and reading comprehension performance and the outcomes of this research may not be appropriate to apply in other language skills and sub-skills, however it can be useful in guiding other scholars to probe the correlation between other language tasks and cognitive styles like field dependency. It is assumed that the most significant implication of the supremacy of FI cognitive style to FD cognitive style in educational circumstances is that program or material designer of educational contexts should highly try to contrive the most appropriate techniques of making the learners who own FD cognitive inclination change their cognitive priority from FD to FI, a job in that there is extremely plenty of investigations and numerous professionals and scholars in that area who may be hesitant regarding this issue (Behnam & Fathi, 2009).
5.3. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study supports the results of Robert Wyss’s investigations (2002) which indicated that the field-independent students outperform in learning classroom that includes paying attention to details, analyzing and mastering of drills, exercises, and other concentrated activities. In the same way, the findings of this research support the results of Simonson (1985), Yea-Ru Chuang (1999), and also Miller (1997). As asserted by these scholars, FI students, are more dynamic and commonly have a great self-concept, and have a tendency to resolve difficulties via decrement and utilize trial-and-error techniques, as in contrast with FD students, who comprehends subjects as a whole. However it seems that field dependence-independence is a subject vast in investigation and composition; it is a field that will not at all be tired of new subjects to study. Field dependence-independence has implications for a lot of officials and investigators. But, the results and its implications in the field of learning and teaching are most fascinating to me. It seems that the being aware of individual and group contrasts according to field dependence-independence is attached in the research area and has not fully been applied in the empirical world. Instructors and teacher researchers do not seem to be assessing learners for field dependence-independence preferences, and further it is very important for what happens in the class. The learners’ manner, capability of organizing data, demand for help and supervision, proficiency on specific kinds of examinations, and capability of understanding tasks are all influenced by field dependence-independence styles. As a large number of instructors have achieved educational success in learning circumstances which were teacher-oriented and depended extremely on presentation, it is comprehensible that their tended style of instruction, leastwise primarily, would be to iterate, "what worked with them." Usually such instructors are field-
independent, that is to say, they are more context-directed and tend to apply more official teaching approaches. Such style particularly has benefits for field-dependent learners who like to be notified what they should learn and offered the sources to learn the certain frame of Skills or knowledge.

Learners can improve their learning strength by being conscious of style zones in which they are less convenient and though trying to develop these, therefore, creating ways to nurture their mental progress. Likewise, instructors can recognize strong style samples in their classrooms and utilize this information effectively through mediating on lesson designs that match with learners learning styles. As a result, instructors who are conscious of their learning style and also their students’ styles, are much better capable of being assure that any contrasts between their learning styles will not barricade learning. The clue to instruct learners with various learning styles is the recognition of your own learning style in addition to the learners’ styles. It seems that the most appropriate application of such information is to assist instructors expand their selection of teaching techniques so that learners can learn leastwise part of the time in modes they are convenient, and at other times in modes which lead them to novel paths of contemplating and studying.

5.4. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study proposes some implications for ESL/EFL teaching environments. The assumptive implication of this research is that: student’s cognitive styles and differences should be taken in account in all pervasive theory of foreign or second language teaching and learning. However, cognitive procedures associated with second language learning are not simply investigated and realized; having a knowledge regarding cognitive styles enhances the comprehension of the essence of language learning procedure. The results may assist material designers and curriculum
developers in paying attention to the role of cognitive styles in second language learning. Various subjects and syllabus should be prepared for students with every type of field-dependence/independence cognitive style (Nilforooshan & Afghari, 2007). Town (as cited in Nilforooshan & Afghari, 2007) believes that field-independents tend arbitrary, impersonal, systematic, and genuine materials, while field-dependents have tendency towards materials with individual, social, creative and amusing context.

The instructors of second language can assist learners detect their own cognitive style and they can offer effective responses regarding the benefits and detriments of field-dependence/independence cognitive style (Kang, 1999). The instructors may motivate the students to be mutable about their cognitive style inclinations in various circumstances of learning so that they become more proficient learners of language. As learning approaches can be trained, second language instructors can identify approaches which are not utilized by students in an effective way with special cognitive style and offer them sufficient strategy-based training to utilize suitable approaches more efficiently. If ESL students identify their own cognitive style in that they are less convenient, they can increase their strength of language learning by working on such style zones. To do so, involving in activities that do not appear to match with the learners’ cognitive style preferences will assist them go beyond their comfort area and develop their potentials regarding language learning (Shi, 2011). As a result, by having knowledge of the cognitive style, learners may become more independent, self-oriented, and autonomic in the procedure of second language learning and they can mitigate their weak points through applying proper approaches.
Another point revealed by these outcomes is whether college syllabus emphasize and apprise either communicative or linguistic abilities in a same level, for the reorganizing competences related to field-independent learners seem to be effective in every fields of second language learning in formal teaching environments whereas the interpersonal and social communicative skills associated with the field-dependent learners do not appear to be useful in second language learning in formal teaching environments. It is the rationale of the issue which communicative skills are not being required essentially in the teaching or learning settings. For this reason, linguistic intelligence and scheming abilities may yet be represented more considerable in language class exercises, texts and evaluations than interpersonal and social communicative ability. Therefore, some suggestions may assist to create more harmony along with ideal effectiveness of teaching: adjust the teaching approach to the student’s cognitive style, teaching of problem-solving techniques in the classroom, utilization of communicating system/techniques in teaching environment. On the other hand, learners of English as a second language appear to achieve more success and to experience more convenient in the class that is harmonized with their cognitive style. Hence, if a college or school presents such kinds of syllabus associated with both of cognitive styles, for instance, inductive and deductive or process and product methodologies for ESL classes, learners can select the approach they favor freely. A fascinating method, presenting basic questions including: which type of teaching approach are you interested in? a) An analytical, consecutive representation of principles along with samples and practices, b) A synthetic, holistic representation of the second language following by comprehensive instances and practices, may work as a sign of cognitive style preference.
As many colleges do not suggest a selection of approaches, it might be essential for the ESL/EFL instructors to utilize both inductive and deductive approaches in every class for the purpose of motivating both field-independent and field-dependent students, and to patronize both cognitive styles in all learners. Thus, it can be proposed that instructors, material organizers, and syllabus designers, when structuring texts or planning class syllabus plus organizing syllabus and programs can get advantages from the outcomes of this research. Additionally, as this study illustrated, the identification of field dependency is essential to develop second language learning in the best way. Thus, more stress should be given to the harmony between learner-instructor cognitive styles to confirm a superior level of achievement in the area of language teaching and learning. Moreover, as the needs of students for the language can specify the context of a language agenda, therewith it makes the idea of cognitive style choices more important. Two explanations regarding “Learner’s need” have been observed. The first interpretation is what the student requires to do with the language while she/he has learned it that is named as "goal-oriented approach"; the second concept is that, what the student requires to do to indeed to learn the language, that is a "process-oriented approach". The distinction as well between a “goal-oriented and process-oriented approach” can be seen when the first one employs it specifically as a determinative of program material, the second one employs it as indicator of modes of thinking that may illustrate how language is to be represented in a way that to employ the proper cognitive styles. Therefore, according to the interpretations pointed out, the investigator believes, some logics exist to assert that a “process-oriented approach”, by satisfying the cognitive requirements of the students, insure the ultimate achievement of ideal academic aims.
5.5. A DISCUSSION FOR FURTHER STUDIES ABOUT COGNITIVE STYLES

Several researches in the field of second language learning still discuss for the significance of investigation about learning/cognitive styles (for example, Johnson et. al. 2000, Leaver et al., 2005; Chiang, 2006; Salmani-Nodoushan, 2007). Thus, some instructors who think it is essential to have a knowledge regarding the styles in that their students learn may still consider this subject. Former studies have indicated that varieties between types of personality and cognitive styles can cause barriers to learners learning appropriately. Oxford (1999) has done comprehensive investigation in the area of cognitive styles and recognized four kinds of situations in that an inconformity between the instructors’ classroom styles and the learners’ cognitive styles raised considerable cognitive style difficulties. Further studies could be performed to realize learners’ cognitive styles difficulties before they construct, indeed to develop techniques of changing the classroom situation to withhold cognitive styles unconformities. Treatments can be scheduled that assist learners recognize and progress their abilities. Additional studies could also assist to advise textbook organizers of the cognitive style variations between learners for updating textbook context.

This research has also demonstrated that field-dependent and field-independent learners are different from each other in their inclinations for utilizing various kinds of learning techniques. Additional studies should be managed to investigate if field-dependent learners could make advantages from teaching on learning strategies. Salmani-Nodouashan (2007) asserts that a learner’s cognitive style has tendency to create contrastive benefits and drawbacks on English tests because of the structure of the test question. He demonstrated that field-independent learners while put together with field-dependent learners of same proficiency had a different
advantage on questions of completing sentences and questions that needed scanning. Field-dependent learners outperformed on test questions including summarizing, deduction and true/false questions in contrast with field-independent learners of the same proficiency level. The present research was not able to directly investigate field-independent and field-dependent learners of same proficiency level on their strengths on particular kinds of questions structures. But this could be an essential subject for test developers. Additional researches could be directed to investigate if field-independent and field-dependent is an indicator of systematic difference on language tests that are particularly developed for ESL learners. Eventually, the other study is necessary to gather the outcomes and results of several investigations concerning the similar matter, to mix them and attain to more definitive responses.

5.6. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Several limitations in this research could influence the generalization and also the exterior reliability of this investigation:

1. The first limitation is concerning sampling. The participants in this research were limited to Iranian ESL students in India, more particularly to various universities in Mysore city, India. The universities in that the learners have been selected, were chosen according to the convenience. Therefore, they may not be absolutely indicators of all Iranian ESL students. Additionally, the ESL learners participated in this research did not actually have the similar backgrounds or majors. Hence, the outcomes should be interpreted in accordance with this issue. Additional study can consider such limitations via accurate research plan. Further investigation should consist of a wider, more representative sample of college learners. As well, background information can be gathered on the learners
consisting of their English Learning history and course subjects. Moreover a proper test being able of precisely evaluating a large number of Iranian ESL College learners should be employed to that each research participant performs the equal test. Paying attention to these points will create more feasible ways to investigate accurately in the future.

2. The second limitation of this study is that only two skills (Writing and Reading Comprehension) among four communicative skills, writing, speaking, reading and listening, were selected by the researcher. Further studies via comparing different kinds of communicative skills like speaking and listening will shed light on the differential effects of out-put pushing and input-providing techniques.

3. In this study, the researcher was aimed at to work on learners with intermediate level of language proficiency. Hence, another research is required to investigate the relationship between FD/FI cognitive styles and various levels of learners’ second language proficiency.

4. The next limitation is regarding the period of time interaction with writing approaches instructions that in this research, was relatively short. Whole data were gathered for analysis according to the learners’ contribution with process and product writing approaches instructions during three months treatment. In fact, it is obvious that a longer duration of treatment would provide great insights into the issues determined in this qualitative and quantitative research.

5. The fifth limitation of this study is that, this survey limited to two essay writings and one reading comprehension test for investigating the knowledge of writing approaches and reading comprehension and their correlation to cognitive style. While more tests and more essay writings and reading tests are necessary for enhancing English Language significantly.