CHAPTER –I
Introduction

Writing is a process of exploration and a mode of expression. It is not an end in itself; it is only a means. Writing enables people to come into contact with other minds, breaking the barriers of space and time. It can provide a privileged access to the land of ideas. It can show the radiance of a mind that fights limitations of various kinds and finds fulfillment in experiencing a kind of liberation. Writing preserves knowledge for retrieval when it is required. Business, bank transactions and examination system all depend upon the medium of writing.

Writing is one way of providing variety in classroom procedures, and it also makes possible individualized work in large classes. Writing tends to increase retention & makes available a source for later reference. Very importantly, it provides a student with physical evidence of his achievement and become a source whereby he can measure his improvement.

It’s a fact that writing has become more important over the past decade than it has been for many years. In the 60s, telephones started to dominate our personal and business communication. Instead of sitting down to pen a letter or even send a telegram, it was much easier to pick up the phone and call some one. And call people we did—to the tune of billions of dollars in phone calls every year.

But writing has made a comeback recently and the main reason writing skills are becoming so important today is the internet. We’re caught up in a powerful, technological revolution that has changed forever the way we communicate. With more and more of our activities being conducted via computers, it’s more important than ever that we’re able to use language correctly. In order to do so, learner not only needs to acquire the linguistic but pragmatic knowledge of the target language (Hedgcock, 2002). The national commission on writing in American schools and colleges issued a 44 page report on the state of writing in American Education and observes that grammar, rhetoric, and logic were foundational in early American Education.
A recent New York Times article has a discouraging title, "Writing in schools is found .... Both dismal and Neglected" Farris (2003). Both college professors and employees complain that the writing skill of most students are far below proficient. Hare and Memering (1990) are of the view that writing is not some mysterious gift, but a craft that can be learned by reasonably intelligent students. They, however, admit that writing is not just a linear process, and that there is really no "always" to writing, for it involves an almost endless series of choices, rejections and additional choices whose sequence a writer cannot predict.

Muschla (1993) assigns to writing the nature of a skill. Infact he thinks that writing is one of the most important skills a teacher can impart to his or her students. He says that writing is much more than mere scribbling of words on paper, for the ability to write well is connected with thinking. Muschla also makes a profound statement about a higher order purpose writing serves: Writing is a powerful tool for learning. It enables us to analyse and synthesize our thoughts and thereby discover new ideas. When we write we become conscious of ourselves. We define ourselves, and we come to understand our lives.

In the past, writing was considered an advanced skill, taught only after students had mastered vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax, and other mechanical language functions thought to provide the necessary foundation. This approach was particularly ineffective with LD students, for whom difficulty mastering the basics often prevented progression to the more "advanced" writing lesson (Baker et al., 2003). Process writing emerged as an entirely different way to teach writing. Now, it means different thing to different instructors, but is based on a multi-step process, including planning, composing, and revising.

In writing, it is less important for students to produce perfect compositions than to develop confidence and facility, and the first exercise should be one that allows the student to write freely, without concerns about mechanical errors. In writing instruction, the emphasis should first be on fluency-the
seamless transmission of ideas from thought to paper, and then on improving grammar, spelling and mechanics as opportunities arise (Allen, 2003). The National Commission on Writing in America’s Schools and Colleges asserts that “writing opportunities that are developmentally appropriate should be provided to every student form the earliest years through secondary school and into college” (2003)

Writing is an indispensable part of thinking and learning. The process of writing – a restless cycle of inquiry, composition, and revision pushes students towards the true goals of higher education: critical thinking, creativity, analysis, synthesis and informed judgement. Writing is more than just putting on paper what already exists in one’s head. It is not an exercise in grammar, spelling or memory. It is an exercise in thinking. In an article, Allen (2003) described its importance beyond simple composition. “Facility with writing opens students up to the pleasure of exercising their minds in ways that grinding on facts, details, and information never will. More than a way of knowing, writing is an act of discovery”. Good writers are good thinkers, equipped with an essential skill for success in school, in the workforce, and in life.

The writing skills series is based on the idea that students should not be so inhibited by grammar, spelling or handwriting skills that they neglect the larger goal of self expression. Pritchand and Marshall (1994) found that students whose teachers have special training in writing instruction perform significantly better than those with untrained teachers. Emig (1977); and Langer (2001) found that writing foster learning in all disciplines. It is a tool for thinking, which makes it integral to every subject at every scholastic level. Skill in writing is developed and refined through practice, which means students should have frequent opportunities to write across the curriculum.

The fact that people frequently have to communicate with each other in writing is not the only reason to include writing as a part of our second – language syllabus. There is an additional and very important reason: writing
helps our students learn. First, writing reinforces the grammatical structures, idioms, and vocabulary that we have been teaching our students. Second, when our students write, they also have a chance to be adventurous with the language, to go beyond what they have just learned to say, to take risk. Third, when they write, they necessarily become very involved with the new language; the effort to express ideas and the constant use of eye, hand, and brain is a unique way to reinforce learning. According to Bachman (1990), language competence consists of two components, “organizational competence” and pragmatic competence”. The former refers to grammatical competence and textual competence. The latter is made up of “illocutionary competence” and “social linguistic competence”. Illocutionary competence includes knowledge of communicative action and how to carry it out. Social linguistic competence indicates the ability to use language appropriately according to the context. Practically and briefly, pragmatic competence is the ability to use language in socially appropriate ways. Hence it follows that in order to communicate effectively in English, students have to be trained to develop their pragmatic competence.

Writing is perhaps one of the demanding skills. It has to be deliberately cultivated. Unlike listening and speaking, it is not something which is natural to humans – it is a skill which has been developed in civilized society to pass on knowledge or messages beyond the constraints of here and now.

The skill of writing includes a number of sub-skills. The sub skills of writing are:

- Mechanics: Handwriting, spelling, punctuation, etc.
- Word choice: Vocabulary, idiom, tone
- Organization: Paragraphs, topic and support, cohesion and unity.
- Syntax: Sentence structure, sentence boundaries, stylistic, etc.
In teaching writing skills, teachers concentrate on paragraph writing. This means that writing is more than good hand writing, motor – mechanical skills, knowledge of grammar etc. The emphasis is on communication of ideas. It means that focus is on the sequencing and linking of ideas and sentences, rather than on grammar. Coherence or clarity of ideas and their cohesion or linkage is what is important. Cohesion is achieved linguistically with linkers and connectives whereas coherence is the way ideas hang together, not necessarily only through linguistic devices, but essentially through an expression of clarity that exists in thinking. Both fluency and accuracy are important in writing. This means knowing what to say and writing accurately are important. So, good writing is an expression of clear thinking.

Silva (1993) said, “Although L2 writing is strategically, rhetorically, and linguistically different in many ways from L1 writing, L1 models have had a significant influence on L2 writing instruction and the development of a theory of L2 writing. Swales’s (1990) view is, writing should not be viewed solely as an individually-oriented, inner-directed cognitive process, but as much as an acquired response to the discourse conventions ... within particular communities.

Writing aims at clear and efficient communication. Raimes (1983) diagrammatically represents which clearly illustrate the complexity of sub skills that go to make a piece of writing coherent, effective and communicative. The following diagram shows what writers have to deal with as they produce a piece of writing:
PRODUCING A PIECE OF WRITING

Writing is a major form of communication that allows people to interact with, and learn from, others. Instruction in writing helps students understand how to organize ideas and construct meaning, processes, similar to those they use while writing. In fact, research indicates that writing and reading develop together (Egawa, 2001; Cooper, 1991) and instruction in both areas leads to improvements in both writing and reading (Tierney and Shanahan, 1991). Process writing is one approach to writing instruction in which modeling and guidance are provided to students at each step, allowing them to become independent writers. These steps include: pre-write, draft, revise, edit, and publish. While creating compositions, writers develop their ideas, make sense of them, and then make changes (Egawa, 2001). More recent interest Writing is a skill and in order to be a good writer one has to get mastery over writing skills. One may want to focus on any of the following areas at different times: Fluency in writing; accuracy in writing; using new
vocabulary; paragraphing; introductions and conclusions; organizing your ideas; planning an essay; using the correct style; checking and correcting your own work. General writing skills include:

- Matching the piece of writing to its audience and purpose.
- Clarity of expression.
- Accuracy of language.
- Coherence and cohesion.
- Structuring writing.

All writing is written for a reason and to a particular audience. Our reason for writing influences what we write (e.g. an email or a letter or a report), its contents and style. In many kinds of texts, we state our reason for writing e.g. in letter writing. Our audience also influences the contents of what we write and the style in which we write.

It is important to express one self clearly. This involves using language accurately and with an appropriate range, writing coherently and cohesively, following the conventions of the particular kind of writing (e.g. a letter or an essay), and writing relevantly and comprehensively. Another significant aspect of writing is using the correct forms of language i.e. language which contains no mistakes of grammar, punctuation, spelling or vocabulary use.

Writing also involves following expected sequences of discourse e.g. a greeting is usually followed by a greeting in a spoken language, or in essay writing the introduction is followed by the body then the conclusion. This linking is achieved through using our shared knowledge of these conventions and our knowledge of the world rather than through explicit language linkers. Relevance and comprehensiveness of ideas are further examples of coherence.

Cohesion involves using language to mark the links in a stretch of text. Examples of cohesive devices are conjunctions, pronouns, lexical sets, articles, possessive adjectives e.g. in the sentences, ‘The girl left the room. This surprised her friend’, ‘This’ is a pronoun linking back to the whole of the
previous sentence, and ‘her’ is a possessive adjective linking back to ‘the
girl’.

Different kind of writing follow different conventions for the order in
which they structure information (for example, introduction → body →
conclusion in essays). Structure is also given to a piece of writing through the
use of paragraphs, topic sentences and signaling phrases. Writer uses
paragraphs to signal that he is moving on to a new point or new type of
information. Topic sentences contain the theme of the paragraph. Signaling
phrases are phrases we include in our writing to signal to the reader what we
are going to talk about next.

There are six pedagogical purposes for writing. The first purpose is
writing for reinforcement. We need to reinforce something that students have
just learned to understand or say; to reinforce a grammatical concept that
has just been introduced and to drill language forms. Next step is writing for
training. This is similar to writing for reinforcement but differs in that it is not
limited to reinforcement of grammatical structures previously presented in
another mode. It presents students with patterns of linguistic and rhetorical
forms that might be new to them and gives them practice in using and
manipulating these new patterns. The students work with units of discourse
longer than the sentence, but within parameters strictly prescribed by the
teacher or text book. Here focus of training is on the manipulation of
rhetorical and grammatical structures, particularly through the use of
transformations.

Third, purpose is writing for imitation. It uses models of content or
form as a stimulus for writing. Students become familiar with rhetorical and
syntactic forms by following carefully chosen models. The purpose, relying
on models of rhetoric and syntax, is to familiarize non-native speakers with
rhetorical forms perceived as specific to the target language, weaning them
from patterns in their first language. Another purpose is writing for
communication. Here Emphasis is on more recent interest and awareness of
the importance of the writer’s purpose and audience for writing, sometimes a
context for writing is given through guidelines as to content and purpose, Journal writing is a good activity for authentic communicative writing. Coming on to the next purpose is writing for fluency. Writing assigned for developing fluency does not necessarily require certain standards of social acceptability. Students are free to generate their own ideas. Last purpose is writing for learning. Writing for learning is comprehensive and cumulative. All writing activities are seen as a way to learn a language as well as to learn more about the subject matter being written about. Our writing is wasted if we use it just for testing and skill practice. The main emphasis is on all three points of the communication triangle: writer, reader and text, the writing thus becomes truly interactive and communicative.

Mularoy (2003), author of war against Grammar, urges educators not to forget the value of direct instruction of traditional grammar. Mulroy deems formal instruction of grammar as critical and should be emphasized in K-12 education. He attributes the current negativity surrounding formal instruction to the ATFG who “take it for granted that the traditional teaching of grammar was radically flawed and that what is needed is not just a restoration of grammar but the discovery of some new way to teach it”. He also challenges studies that have been done before, and states the fact that English classes before the 1960s were not ineffective. He is insistent that the way of instruction does not need to change. Instead, instruction needs to reroute back to the way it was prior to debate. Ehrenworth (2003) confides that educators have lamented that their students are not competent in areas such as parts of speech and/or punctuation, implying that the fault inherently lies within the students. However, “if we are teaching grammar, but the students are not learning grammar from us, then there is some thing wrong in the way me are teaching it” Consequently she suggests that educators look at grammar as a transformative agent in the writing process.

The Grammar based method has its support in long use rather than as a defensible theory of language or learning. In this method the students first study the parts of speech, conjugation and syntax in detail. The rules of
grammar and the lists of exceptions were all learnt by heart and applied in translation exercises during and after the lesson. The method did not take into account the rarity or relative difficulty of any words. All of them, easy and difficult, common and rare, had to be learnt by the student under their respective word groupings. The theory of the language was taught in detail but there was very little practice in the use of the language. Moraes and Sampoia (1991) concluded that the performance of students taught by the grammar method was not high, and it is suggested that memorization and mastery of language structure through repetition should not be considered a productive way to teach language. Hillocks (1987) found that the study of traditional grammar has no effect on raising the quality of student writing. Moreover, he found that an emphasis on a grammar-based method resulted in significant losses in overall quality.

The method in practice lies in activities that specifically focus on the rules of grammar. How or how well each gets attention varies: from memorizing sentence-level rules of grammar to defining the rules followed by examples and practice and to explaining and establishing rules with support in the learner’s first or second language. Mcquade (1980) released a study for teaching grammar as a means of improving composition skills. If schools insist upon teaching the identification of parts of speech, the diagramming of sentences, or other concepts of traditional grammar (as many still do), they cannot defend it as a means of improving the quality of writing (Hillocks, 1986,P.138).

In this method the texts serve mainly as supports to the analysis of grammar and may often not be selected to suit the learner’s level of ability, her age and interests; little or no attention gets paid to pronunciation. The grammar taught is restricted to the sentence level with attention to word formation and the inflection of words. In a teacher centred class what matter is how much and what gets taught, in the belief that teaching guarantees learning. In fact, grammar based method deals with the definitions and rules of the language. These are set rules and any departure from those rules is
not allowed. The students first of all learn the rules for the formation of tenses, words etc. They learn everything else afterwards. In Grammar based method there is much larger emphasis put on teaching and understanding of grammar structures. There are studies which show no benefit from teaching grammatical analysis. Fries implied in his work (1952) that traditional grammar was not given value by modern linguists. Braddock and Schroer (1963) based on their research results concluded that, “the teaching of formal grammar has a negligible or, because it usually displaced some instruction and practice in Composition, even a harmful effect on the improvement of writing”, basically, implying that teaching grammar will hurt students’ writing.

Yau (1919) points out we should not cripple our students interest in writing through undue stress or grammatical correctness, the influence of second language factors on writing performance is something we have to reckon with and not pretend that concentrating on the process would automatically resolve the difficulty caused by these factors. Hartwell (1985) in his article summarized that traditional grammar instruction does not improve writing. Haussamen, Benjamin, Kolln, and wheeler (2003) state that traditional grammar, i.e. grammar in isolation, concentrated on “parts of speech, the dissection of sentences, correct answers to the exercises to teach foreign languages”. (Elley, 1994; Elley et al, 1979; Hillocks, 1986; O’Hare, 1973) contrasting with other studies which do show a benefit. In the latter studies the benefit can be shown in two ways: by comparing the writing of an experimental group who have received grammar teaching with that of a control group who have not, or by correlating subjects’ writing skills with their explicit knowledge. The idea that Grammar teaching improves children’s writing skills is much better supported by the available research than is commonly supposed.

Bateman and Zidonis (1966) published a study and concluded that instruction in transformational grammar along with practice in sentence combining is effective in improving writing. Hudelson (1988) reviewed
research on writing instruction of school-age children, and her finding add support to arguments in favour of a whole language approach to writing and to English Literacy in general. Einarsson (1999) states in a paper presented at the English Language Arts council of Alberta Teachers Association, “if grammar is to survive in today’s class-room, it will need to return to the text book approach. not a hand book approach, but as a fully developed subject which involves unique cognitive skills, concepts and interconnected ideas.

Hicks (1997) indicates, genre theory calls for a return to grammar instruction, but grammar instruction at the level of text, where personal intentions are filtered through the typical rhetorical forms available to accomplish social purposes. Vavra’s (1985) report concludes that results of pretests and posttests involving revising a passage of writing support the assertion that the method used to teach grammar can affect students ability to write.

In other words, the central belief is that “we don’t just write, we write something to achieve some purpose” (Hyland, 2003, p. 18).

Johansen and Shaw (2003) have implemented a process called “glossing”: “a method where by the student corrects an error identified by the teacher and then states the grammatical rule that applies. Finally, it provides the opportunity for grammar instruction to be determined based on student writing. Kolln (1996) states that the NCTE, “approved a resolution on language study, proposed by ATEG designing a task force to explore effective ways to integrating language awareness”. Therefore many educators began to participate in active research in their classrooms, yet a united front on the issue of instruction was still far from evident. In 1985, an official resolution was adopted by the National council of Teachers of English (NCTE) that urged educators to discontinue the teaching of grammar and to focus on other areas such as listening, speaking, reading and writing (Mulroy, 2003, P.6)
According to Flower’s (1994) theory of writing, in the social cognitive curriculum students are taught as apprentices in negotiating an academic community, and in the process develop strategic knowledge. Writing skills are acquired and used through negotiated interaction with real audience expectations, such as in peer group responses. Instruction should, then, afford students the opportunity to participate in transactions with their own texts and texts of others (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). By guiding students toward a conscious awareness of how an audience will interpret their work, learners then learn to write with a “readerly” sensitivity (Kern, 2000).

Xiaoju (1979) along with some other teachers started a project called communicative English for Chinese Learners. After three year’s work, he wrote a paper on the project which is a lucid presentation of an EFL situation seeking to implement principles of CLT formulated in a non-EFL context and hence holds implications for CLT in India. The project implies three conditions that must be met before any activity can be called communicative. First, the English-using situations and roles must be ‘real’. Second, there should be a need and a purpose for communication and something communicated. Third, communication means freedom and unpredictability. These three conditions mean that the target language the learner comes into contact with should be real, that is, authentic, appropriate and global (Xiaoju, 1984:62). Jallaluddin (1985) found that communicative approach in English language teaching was more effective than the existing methods of approach to language teaching.

The beginning of communicative language teaching can be traced back to the late 1960s. At that time, there was in Britain a general discontent amongst applied linguists and teachers towards the existing language teaching methodology. The structural theories of language employed then produced what Newmark (1966) called the “Structurally competent” student, able to come up with grammatically correct sentences, although “Communicatively incompetent” since the students were unable to carry out real communicative acts. So, in 1972, Wilkins, suggested a communicative
description of language. Wilkins, studied the communicative uses of language and communicative meanings the learner of any language needed to grasp and exhibit. He proposed two types of communicative meanings, “National categories” (abstract concepts such as time, quantity) and categories of “communicative function” (accounts for the actual uses given to the language). Now days communicative based method aims to a) make communicative competence the goal of language teaching and b) develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication”. It offers learners the chance to experience real language inside the classroom and to acquire it by using it.

Soumini (1984) conducted a study and found that in the case of science pre and post – test gain, Scores of the experimental group demonstrated a Significant improvement due to communicative approach. Gotelibed, Margo (1985) studied the role of communicative competence in the first and Second language achievement as demonstrated in the measure of essential communication and concept achievement. The purpose of the study was to examine the communicative and the academic proficiencies of first and second language learners with the intent of improving current student assessment practices. The findings indicate that development of entry and exit criteria for educational programmes should rest on both theoretical research and classroom practice.

Canale and Swain (1986), distinguish four dimensions of communicative competence: grammatical competence, socio-linguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence. “Grammatical competence” deals with what is formally possible and focuses on the learner’s pronunciation, knowledge of the spelling system, and knowledge of grammar, syntax and word formation. “Socio-linguistic competence” tries to account for the social situation in which communication takes place, it requires the learner’s understanding of formal, casual or intimate styles, whether in the spoken or written field, roles assumed by
interlocutors, as well as information shared by them, “Strategic competence” is the ability which enables the learner or speaker of a language to counteract mishaps and take risks when using the language. “Discourse competence” requires learners understanding of grammatical connection between different parts of a text (cohesion) as well as semantic ones (coherence).

Bose (1985) in her thesis “Language learning in structural and communicational, classes at Primary level” used communicative approach along with structural approach in English Language teaching at primary level. Her research work showed that the communicative approach would also be used at primary level basing on structures of English language. This was in contrast to the generally held opinion that the communicative approach can be adopted only after a certain level of language skills has been attained.

Communication method is based on the belief that acquiring a language means, above all, to communicate confidently and naturally. In other words, in order to communicate effectively in real life, students need more than mere knowledge about the language. Reddy (1986) Studied the role of teacher in the teaching and writing at the college level. She found that writing could be used as one of the means of making students independent learners. In addition, they must be able to use English effectively, with confidence and fluency. Health, (1987) in his study found (i) if oral language is used effectively in teaching writing, it can serve in the capacity of clarifying and checking language in the process of developing the written product. A significant relationship was found between scores on oral and written tasks and (ii) acquisition of a second language correlates significantly with creative development. The over riding goal of this approach is to develop the practical language skills needed for academic study and subsequent adult life. Gupta, (1988) conducted an experimental study to find out the efficacy of language laboratory exposure in developing language proficiency and communicative competence of tribal learners of English. Communicative competence in English developed through language exposure is more than that developed
through audio lingual method. It was also concluded that language proficiency in English helped to develop the communicative competence of tribal learners of English.

The communication based method brings together a number of ideas about the nature of language and language learning. One of the tenets of the communicative approach is the idea that language is a skill to be acquired, not merely a body of knowledge to be learnt. Acquiring a language has been compared to learning to drive. It is not enough to have only theoretical knowledge of how an engine works: you must know how to use the gears and (crucially) how to interact with other road users. Similarly, simply knowing parts of speech or how to convert the active into the passive does not mean you are proficient in a language. In language learning these are some ‘rules’ to be learnt but there is no substitute for learning by doing. Dave (1996) conducted a scientific inquiry into the effectiveness of three different approaches viz. the communicative, the structural and the conventional approaches to English language teaching (ELT) at secondary level. He compared the effectiveness of a) the communicative approach and the structural approach to ELT in terms of students’ achievement in English b) the communicative approach and the conventional approach to ELT in terms of students’ achievement in English c) the structural approach and the conventional approach to ELT in terms of Students’ achievement in English.

The major finding from the classroom experiment was that the conventional approach was most effective. Further, when communicative approach and structural approach were compared, result favored communicative approach. The students were favorable to both communicative approach and conventional approaches.

Bhasker (1991) studied writing in a Second language: a pedagogic perspective on the interactive processes in Language structuring and composition. This study concentrates on the skill of writing not in the traditional manner of treating it merely as a productive skill, but as a means for the acquisition of the meaningful use of a second or foreign language.
The study argues for an approach that writing in a second language is different from the approach to writing in a native language. Language can be described in different ways. Obviously we can label an utterance according to its grammatical structure. Consider the following:

a) “Can I open the window?”
b) “Can I carry that case?”

We would say that a) and b) have the same grammatical structure: they are both interrogative. We should also recognize that they perform different functions: a) is a ‘request’ and b) is an ‘offer’.

Another related issue is that of appropriacy. We all speak different types of languages in different circumstances to different people. For example, suppose a boy wants to open a window. To his friend he might say: "Hot in here, isn’t it? Mind if I open the window?" However, to his teacher he might say: "I’m rather hot. Would you mind if I opened the window?"

Traditional language teaching lays greater stress on accuracy – using the language correctly and without an error. The communicative approach to language teaching emphasizes both accuracy and fluency.

The goal of communication based method is to create a realistic context for language acquisition in the classroom. The focus is on functional language usage and the ability of learners to express their own ideas, feelings, attitudes, desires and needs. Eapen (1979) in her study investigated the different approaches, methods and classroom techniques used in composition classes in degree classes in south India. It was concluded that the approach presented and developed in the materials produced an improvement in communication. The students were interested in achieving functional writing accurately; they seemed to realize the purpose of writing in their Academic and professional lives. Open ended questioning and problem solving activities and exchanges of personal information are utilized as the primary means of communication. Students usually work with authentic materials in small group on communication activities, during which they practice in negotiating meaning. Hueng and Liu (2000) found the
rationale of the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach is that the teacher should act as a facilitator to create a student-centered classroom and engage learners in authentic like and meaningful communications that require meaning negotiations, with a goal to increase comprehensible language input for learners and expect them to generate more output.

Sarma (1989) found out that the communicative approach certainly developed interest and enthusiasm among the students learning English as Foreign / third language. He also explained that it was necessary to give instructional material to the English language teachers.

Buch (1989) observed that some learners manage to participate in the Target language (TL) Communication situations, where as the majority fail though they have more or less the same socio-economic, educational and linguistic background and almost the same linguistic repertoire. It increased the learner’s participation in the class room activities which enhanced TL interaction. Besides, the Task and activities interested the learners and they could involve learners in target language interaction. A positive change with regard to learner’s language behavior was also noticed towards the end of the programme. That means Strategy training helps the learners to participate in TL communicative situation effectively. Mohanraj (1980) in his study briefly reviewed the ELT situation as it exists in India and found that we need to teach writing, in a more systematic way. In order to teach writing, there is a need for special kind of material. These materials set tasks closer to life situations and motivate the learners to write. The modern movement in Language teaching methods variously referred to as oral, structural, active, audio-visual, situational, audio-lingual are all in some degree a reaction against the traditional/grammar based methods, and are directed to achieve greater success in the practical use of language. Communicative language teaching (CLT) is a cluster of approaches more than a single methodology which also grew out of dissatisfaction with the traditional methods ,structuralism and the situational methods of the 1960s. The basic principle of CLT is that learners must learn not only to make grammatically correct.
prepositional statements, but must also develop the ability to use language to get things done. The Characteristics of Traditional/Grammar and Communication based methods are enumerated in table 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grammar Based Method</th>
<th>Communication Based Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus on learning</td>
<td>focus on learning as a structured system of grammatical patterns.</td>
<td>Focus on communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How language items</td>
<td>This is done on linguistic criteria alone.</td>
<td>This is done on the basis of what language items the learner needs to know in order to get things done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How language items</td>
<td>This is determined on linguistic grounds.</td>
<td>This is determined on other grounds, with the emphasis on content, meaning and interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Degree of Coverage</td>
<td>The aim is to cover the whole picture of language structure by systematic linear progression.</td>
<td>The aim is to cover, in any particular phase, only what the learner needs and sees as important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. View of language</td>
<td>A language is seen as a unified entity with fixed grammatical pattern and a core of basic words.</td>
<td>The variety of language is accepted, and seen as determined by the character of particular communicative contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Type of language used</td>
<td>Tends to be formal and bookish.</td>
<td>Genuine, everyday language is emphasized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What is regarded as a criterion of success</td>
<td>Aim is to have students produce formally correct sentences.</td>
<td>Aim is to have students communicate effectively and in a manner appropriate to the context they are working in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Which language skills are emphasized</td>
<td>Reading and writing.</td>
<td>Spoken interactions are regarded as being as important as reading and writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Attitude to errors: Incorrect utterances are seen as deviations from the norms of standard grammar. Partially correct and incomplete utterances are seen as such rather than just ‘wrong’.

11. Similarity/dissimilarity to natural language learning: Reverses the natural language process by concentrating. Resembles the natural learning process in that the content of the utterance is emphasized rather than the form.

Durlay, Burt, and krashen (1982) indicate that more analytical field-dependent characteristics are related to the conscious learning of metalinguistic Skills, while field-dependence seems to serve the development of communication skills through subconscious acquisition. The study done by Alptekin and Atakan (1990) was designed to explore the relationship between L2 achievement and field-dependence versus field-independence and hemisphereicity. The researchers reported that the results of their study answered the first question affirmatively. Brown (1987) postulated that field-independent learners may have the advantage in classroom foreign language learning because of the formal, or structure-oriented, nature of the classroom task, as opposed to a more natural or functional use of language for communication of meaning. The implication is that the supposed superiority of a field-independent cognitive style in classroom learning may be related to a distinction between the usual formal linguistic achievement orientation of classrooms and tests and real competence, that is, functional language proficiency.

Cognitive style is a broad dimension of individual differences that extends across both perceptual and intellectual activities. Cognition covers various modes of knowing, perceiving, imaging, remembering, conceiving, judging and reasoning. The term style is used because what is at issue is the characteristic approach the individual brings with him to a wide range of
situations. Since the approach encompasses both his perceptual and intellectual activities, it is called his ‘cognitive style’.

Cognitive style refer to the modes an individual employs in perceiving, organizing and labelling various dimensions of the environment. Thus it may be said cognitive styles appear to reflect consistencies in the manner or form of cognition, as distinct from the content of cognition or the level of cognitive skill displayed. Kagan (1964) conceives cognitive styles as the preferred use of a specific class of conceptual responses, where as for Shuell (1981), cognitive style to the “Preferred ways that different individuals have for processing and organizing information and for responding to environmental stimuli”.

Cognitive style reflects aspects of personality as well as aspects of cognition. Thus they function to control and regulate the course of information – processing and are typically measured as response consistencies on cognitive tasks, their operation may be in the service of underlying personality traits for such dynamic themes as anxiety over error, expectancy of success and failure, and vulnerability to distraction which are central to many of the measures utilized in their assessment.

It has been observed that certain individuals tend to respond very quickly in most situations (impulsive cognitive style); others are more reflective and slower to respond (reflective cognitive style) even both types of individuals are equally knowledgeable about the task at hand. Cognitive styles thus suggest that individuals approach the same task in different ways but these variations don’t reflect levels of intelligence or patterns of general abilities. They are often described as falling on the borderline between mental abilities and personality traits (Shuell, 1981); are styles of thinking and thus influence and are, in turn, influenced by cognitive abilities (Brodzinsky, 1982).

Messick (1976) considers cognitive style a psychological term which refers to variations among individuals in preferred way of perceiving, organizing, analyzing or recollecting information and experience.
Cross (1976) refers to cognitive style as the characteristic ways of using the mind and is frequently considered as one element among other elements comprising learning style.

Cognitive styles are also viewed as the typical means of problem solving, thinking, perceiving and remembering.

Descriptions of cognitive style, notes Mcfadden, includes: a consistent pattern of behaviour within a range of individual variability (Cornet 1983); a student’s consistent way of responding to and using stimuli in a learning environment (Claxton and Ralston, 1978); how individuals process information and prefer to learn (Garity, 1985); the way individuals organize information and experiences (Laschinger and Boss, 1984); a person’s characteristic style of acquiring and using information (Haynsake, 1981) and an expression of psychological differentiation with in characteristic modes of information processing (Witkin and Goodenough, 1971).

The construct of cognitive styles was originally proposed by Allport (1937) referring to an individual’s habitual or typical way of perceiving, remembering, thinking and problem solving. Tennant (1988) defined cognitive styles as “an individual’s characteristic and consistent approach to organizing and processing information”.

Riding, Glass, and Donglas (1993) termed cognitive styles as “a fairly fixed characteristic of an individual” and “are static and relatively in-built features of the individual”.

Ausburn and Ausburn (1978) argued that cognitive styles were characterized by three important properties. The first important property is the generality and stability across tasks and over time. Therefore, they are resistant to training and change. The second important property is the relative independence of cognitive styles from traditional measures of general ability. The third important property is cognitive styles’ relationships with some specific abilities, characteristics and learning tasks.

The essential characteristics of cognitive styles in general have been given by Witkin et al. (1977). According to them, cognitive styles are
concerned with the form rather than the content of cognitive activity. (i) These refer to individual differences in how we perceive, think, solve problems, learn, relate to others etc; (ii) are pervasive dimensions that cut across the boundaries traditionally used in compartmentalizing the human Psyche and so help resort the Psyche to its proper status as a holistic entity; (iii) are stable over time, it is not that they are unchangeable, some may be rather easily altered. This stability makes stylistic dimensions particularly useful in large-range guidance and counseling. Additionally, with regard to value judgements, cognitive styles are bipolar and range from one extreme to the opposite extreme wherein each end of dimension has different implications for cognitive functioning. Each pole, thus, has adaptive value under specified circumstances and may be judged positively in relation to those circumstances. Therefore, conceptualized as information – processing habits that develop in harmony with underlying personality characteristics, cognitive styles appear in the form of stable preferences, attitudes or habitual strategies which characterize a person’s modes of perceiving, remembering, thinking and problem solving. As such, their influence extends to almost all human activities that implicate cognition, including social and interpersonal functioning.

There are five major dimensions of cognitive styles: field independence – dependence, holist – analytic sensory preferences, hemispheric preferences and Kolb’s learning style model. These major dimensions show that they have important influences on an individual’s Psychological factors and performance. Naiman, et. al (1978) concluded that field –independence is more important as a predicator of success in the higher stages of language learning than in the early stages. This hypothesis corresponds to the ascending importance accorded to grammatical accuracy in Higgs and Clifford’s (1982) model of the relative contribution of various factors to language proficiency. However, both in carter’s (1988) and in Hansen’s (1984) studies field-dependence/independence was found to have a significant effect even at the very early stages of language learning.
Abrahom (1985) delved into the possible relationship between field-dependence/independence and the teaching of grammar. She claims that her study provides insight into how students along one continuum of individual differences (i.e. that of cognitive style) internalize knowledge about one grammatical item in a second language.

There has been a growing body of research in the past decades since the field dependence – independence dimension was first proposed by Witkin (1962; 1979). According to Witkin, field dependence independence is value neutral and is characterized as the ability to distinguish key elements from a distracting or confusing background. Specifically field independent people tend to be more autonomous in relation to the development of interpersonal skills. Conversely, field dependent people tend to be more autonomous in relation to the development of high interpersonal skills and less autonomous in relation to the development of cognitive restructuring skills. In addition, according to Witkin, Moore, Goodenough, and Cox (1977), field independent persons tend to be intrinsically motivated and enjoy individualized learning, while field dependent ones tend to be extrinsically motivated and enjoy cooperative learning. Nodoushan (1991) conducted a study and found that the field-dependent (F.D) subjects, compared to their field independent (F.I) counterparts, performed much better on the CT. It was, therefore, concluded that test takers’ cognitive style may be viewed as a source of systematic variance in performance on communicative language tests. Chi-Hui (1993) (1) the performance of subjects can be predicted by linking structure, cognitive style and their interaction. (2) The performance of subjects cannot be predicted by the interaction of linking structure types and cognitive styles. (3) There is no difference in subjects recall of verbal information when learning from hypertext systems incorporating different linking structures. (4) Field independent subjects out performed field dependent subject overall.

Antonietti and Gioletta (1995) found that field independent participants were more likely to be analogical solvers than field dependent ones. Males
tended to use analogical solutions more frequently than females. According to Braune and Wickens (1986) field independent persons perform better in the parallel processing conditions, while field dependent ones perform better in the serial processing conditions.

According to Riding and Cheema (1991) learning styles have two basic types of independent dimensions. One is holist-analytic dimension. The holists tend to view a situation as a whole, while the analytics tend to view a situation as a collection of parts and often stress only one or two aspects of time. The other is the verbal – imagery dimension, which has two basic effects, (a) how information is represented, such as verbally, imagery, or both, as well as (b) Internal/external focus of attention. Generally, the imagers tend to be internal and passive, while the verbalizes tend to be external and stimulating.

The holist-analytical style develops even in young children, Peters (1977) conducted a study about first language learning among very young children. According to him, children employed two basically different strategies to learn their first language. One is the analytic style, which proceeds from the parts to the whole. The other is the ge-stalt style, which proceeds from the whole to the parts. In addition, peters speculated these two different language learning strategies may have neurological bases. Holist-analytical styles have relationships to the type of instructional material and learning performance. According to Riding and Smith (1992), among secondary schools or college students, types of instructional material treatment, such as abstract or pictorial presentation and cognitive styles, have very important influences on learning performance. Specifically, students on the analytic-imager dimension improve most in learning due to the inclusion of more pictorial presentations about certain types of contents.

According to Bissell, White, and Zivin (1971), a sensory modality is a system that interacts with the environment through one of the basic senses. The most important sensory modalities are visual, auditory, and kinesthetic. According to Dunn (1979), about 20% to 30% of American students are
auditory; about 40% are visual; the remaining 30% to 40% are either tactual/kinesthetic, visual/tactual, or some combinations of the above major senses.

The concept of sensory preference can be traced back to Galton (1883). According to his research, visual imagery is infrequent among scientists and seems to be incompatible with scientists’ abstract thinking. Later, Bartlett (1932) found similar results. One of Smith’s major findings is that verbal thinking is overemphasized in research and intelligence testing after neglect of spatial or visual thinking. Another major finding is gender differences. Specifically, masculinity is related to visual thinking while femininity is related to verbal thinking.

Many studies have indicated that a visual style is beneficial for some tasks. According to Vicents, Hayes, and Williges (1987), psychometric tests of vocabulary and spatial visualization are the predictors of task performance. Of these two, spatial visualization is the most influential. This was supported by Sein and Bostrom (1989), as well as Schofield and Kirby (1994).

Another term similar to verbalizer vs. visualizer is verbalizer vs. imager cognitive style, which was proposed by Riding and Buckle (1990). This dimension was supported by Riding and Cheema (1991), as well as Riding and Douglas (1993). According to these researchers, the imagers are better in performance than the verbalizers in the text-plus-text conditions. In addition, the imagers more often use diagrams to illustrate their answers than the verbalizers.

According to Sonnier (1991), hemispheric preferences might be a major contribution factor to individual differences. That is, left-hemispheric students are strong in analytical thought processing, while right-hemispheric students are visual processors. In addition, O’Boyle (1986) proposed that the difference in cognitive processing between the two hemispheric asymmetries was more quantitative than qualitative in nature. In other words, it is primarily matter of degree rather than absolute ability.
Many studies have shown that hemispheric preferences play a very important role in cognition and achievement. According to O’Boyle, and Hellige (1989), hemispheric asymmetry, such as degree of dominance, direction of dominance, characteristic arousal level, and complementarity of functioning, play an important role in individual differences in cognition. According to Gadzella and Kneipp (1990), right-hemispheric students process information nonlinearly and holistically, but left-hemispheric students process information logically and sequentially. In addition, according to Gadzella (1995), left-hemispheric students achieve higher grades than right-hemispheric ones, especially when the grades are primarily based on the objective test.

According to Kolb, the four basic learning modes are defined as active experimentation (AE), reflective observation (RO), concrete experience (CE), and abstract conceptualization (AC). In addition, the learning process is not only active and passive, but also concrete and abstract. This model can also be considered as a four-stage model: (a) concrete experience, (b) observation and reflection, (c) the formation of abstract concepts and generalization, and (d) hypothesis tested by active experimentation leading to new concrete experience.

Based on the four basic learning modes, according to Kolb (1984), there are four basic learning styles: converger, diverger, assimilator, and accommodator. Their characteristics as described below respectively: (1) Converger. The convergent learning style depends mainly on the dominant learning capacities of active experimentation and abstract conceptualization. This style has great advantages in decision making, problem solving, traditional intelligent tests, and practical applications of theories. Knowledge is organized in a way of hypothetical –deductive reasoning. Therefore, persons with this style are superior in technical tasks and problems and inferior in social and interpersonal matters. They tend to choose to specialize in physical sciences. (2) Diverger. The divergent learning style has the opposite learning advantages over converger. This style depends mainly on
concrete experience and reflective observation; it has great advantages in imaginative abilities and awareness of meaning and values. Therefore, persons with this style tend to organize concrete situations from different perspectives and to structure their relationships into a meaningful whole; they focus on adaptation by observation instead of by action; they are superior in generating alternative hypothesis and ideas, and tend to be imaginative, people- or feeling-oriented; they tend to choose to specialize in liberal arts and humanities. (3) Assimilator. The assimilative learning style depends mainly on abstract conceptualization and reflective observation. This style has great advantages in inductive reasoning, creating theoretical models, and assimilating different observations into an integrative entity. Similar to converger, persons with this style tend to be more concerned about abstract concepts and ideas, and less concerned about people. However, persons with this style tend to focus more on the logical soundness and preciseness of the ideas, rather than their practical values; they tend to soundness and preciseness of the ideas, rather than their practical values; they tend to choose to work in research and planning units. (4) Accommodator. The accommodative learning style has the opposite learning advantages over assimilation, this style depends mainly on active experimentation and concrete experience; it has great advantages in doing things, implementing plans, and engaging in new tasks. Therefore, persons with this style focus on risk taking, opportunity seeking, and action; they tend to be superior in adapting themselves to changing immediate situations in which the plan or theory does not fit the facts; they also tend to intuitively solve problems in a trial-and-error manner, depending mainly on other people for information rather than on their own thinking. Therefore, persons with this style tend to deal with people easily; they tend to specialize in action-oriented jobs, such as marketing and sales. 

According to American Psychological Association (1998) “Individual differ from one another in their ability to understand complex ideas, to adopt effectively to the environment, to learn from experiences, to engage in
various forms of reasoning, to overcome obstacles by taking thought. Although these individual differences can be substantial, they are never entirely consistent. A given person’s intellectual performance will vary on different occasions, in different domains, as judged by different criteria. Concepts of intelligence are attempts to clarify and organize this complex set of phenomena.

Intelligence is a general mental capacity that involves the ability to reason, plan, solve problems, think abstractly, comprehend ideas and language. In psychology, the study of intelligence is related to the study of personality but is not the same as creativity, personality, character, or wisdom. It’s the ability to be able to correctly see similarities and differences and recognize things that are identical. Also the ability to figure out the correct relative importance of something.

This definition of intelligence comes from “Mainstream Science on Intelligence”, which was signed by 52 intelligence researchers in 1994, a very general mental capacity that, among other things, involves the ability to reason, plan, solve problems, think abstractly, comprehend complex ideas, learn quickly and learn from experience. It is not merely book learning, a narrow academic skill, or test taking smarts. Rather, it reflects a broader and deeper capacity for comprehending our surroundings - “Catching on”, “making sense” of things, or “Figuring out” what to do.

Galton (1869) maintains that intelligence is inherited. Garry (1965) defined intelligence as the innate ability to solve problems. The innate ability is that which is present in a person from birth and not acquired through self study or as a result of class room instructions.

Binet (1905) contends that the essential characteristics of intelligence is the ability to judge well, to compare well and to reason well, viz, the adaptation or adjustment and the ability to carry on abstract thinking. Stern (1914) defined intelligence as a general capacity of an individual consciously to adjust his thinking to new requirement. It is general mental adaptability to new problems and conditions of life.
Terman (1921) defined intelligence as the capacity to carry on abstract thinking.

Thorndike (1920) contends that there are three main types of intelligence, viz.

1. Intelligence for words and abstract ideas.
2. Mother intelligence or skills with use of hands.
3. Social intelligence or ability to get on well with others.

According to Encyclopedia Britannica (1926) intelligence is described as the general ability of the organism acting as a whole to utilize understanding gained in past experience in dealing with a similar or new situation, to adjust or adapt quickly and readily to the environment; to learn without difficulty; or to form new behaviour patterns to meet a new situation by the modification or readjustment of those already acquired.

Piaget (1932) contends that intelligence is adaptation. He says that human mind and nervous system are tools which a man uses to adapt to world around him. This adaptation involves a delicate balance between two processes which Piaget calls assimilation and accommodation. Assimilation occurs when a child relates something new in his environment to his past experiences and existing view of world. Accommodation occurs when new circumstances in a child's environment force him to revise his view of the world to accommodate these new circumstances.

Spearman (1927) developed a two factor theory. He concluded that all intelligence operations were composed of a ‘G’ factor (General intellectual ability) and a large number of ‘S’ factors (Specific intellectual ability).

Thurndike (1927) opposed Spearman’s two factors theory. According to him there is no such thing as ‘general intelligence. He proposed that there are specific stimuli and specific mental responses and intelligence is just a name for an almost infinite numbers of actual or potential specific connections between these stimuli and responses.

Stoddard (1943) defines intelligence as the ability to undertake activities, that are characterised by difficulty, complexity, abstractness,
economy, speed, adaptiveness to a goal, social value and the emergence of
original and to maintain these activities under conditions that ask for
concentration of energy and resistance emotional forces.

Stephen (1952) contends that intelligence is whatever intelligence
tests measure.

Wechsler (1958) maintains that intelligence is the aggregate or global
capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally and to deal
effectively with environment.

According to Good’s Dictionary (1959) Intelligence in nothing but the
ability to learn and to criticise what is learnt.

Freeman (1962) defines intelligence in three ways:
1) Intelligence is the adaptation or adjustment of individual to his
environment.
2) Intelligence is the ability to learn.
3) Intelligence is the ability to carry on abstract thinking.

According to Garrett (1964) intelligence includes abilities demanded in
solution of problems which require comprehension and use of symbols like
words, numbers, diagrams, equations and formulas which represent ideas
and relationships.

Guilford (1967) gave a complete factorial picture of intelligence. In his
theoretical “Structure of the intellect” he suggest that the mind is composed
of three dimensions namely contents (the terms in which we think), products
(the ideas we come up with) and operations (the act of thinking). He argued
that five factors in the operation domain (cognitive, memory, divergent
thinking, convergent thinking and evaluation) operating on four factors in the
content domain (figural, symbolic, semantic and behavioral) resulting into six
factors belonging to products (units, classes, relations, systems,
transformations and implications) give rise to 120 mental factors that are
responsible for some one being intelligent.

Woodworth (1972) defines intelligence as intellect put to use.
According to Halsey and Friedman (1979) three concepts occur mostly in intelligence.

1) The ability to deal with abstract symbols, concepts and relationships.
2) Learning or the ability to profit from experience.
3) The ability to deal with new situations or problems solving in the broadest sense.

Jarial and Sharma (1980) are of the view that intelligence is an ability which involves the generation of logical imperatives.

The Columbia Encyclopedia (2001) states, Intelligence in Psychology, the general mental ability involved in calculating, reasoning, perceiving, relationships and analogies, learning quickly, storing and retrieving information, using language fluently, classifying, generalizing and adjusting to new situations.

According to new illustrated Webster's Dictionary (1992) “Intelligence is the capacity to meet situations; especially in new or unforeseen, by a rapid and effective adjustment of behaviour, also the native ability to grasp the significant factor of a complex problem or situation”.

In (1994) Gardner added naturalist intelligence (used in discriminating among plants, animal and other features of the natural world and in classifying objects in general) as an eighth intelligence and spiritual intelligence and essential intelligence as ‘candidate’ intelligence (in Dictionary of Psychology by Coleman (2001).

According to English Learner's Dictionary (1998) "Intelligence is a level of someone’s ability to learn and understand”.

According to Encarta World English Dictionary (1999), "Intelligence is an ability to think and the ability to learn facts and skills and apply them, especially when this ability is highly developed”.

According to Encyclopedia of Psychology (2000), “Intelligence may be described as one thing (a general ability) or as several differential things (a set of different ability)".
According to Dictionary of Psychology (2001), “The faculty of reasoning and understanding, as distinct from feeling wishing; the term used in general discourse for what in psychology is usually called intelligence”.

According to The Cosini Encyclopedia of Psychology and Behavioural Science (2001), “Intelligence is a term referring to Complex mental abilities of individuals. It is a term which indicated the amount of knowledge available and the speed with which the new knowledge is acquired; the ability to adopt to new situations and to handle concepts, relationships and abstract symbols”.

Legg and Hutter (2007) recently introduced a formal, non-anthropocentric and general definition of intelligence.

\[
v(\pi) = \sum_{\mu \in E} 2^{-K(\mu)} V_{\pi}^\mu
\]

Where \((m_\mu)\) ranges over all possible environment \((E)\), \([2^{\wedge}K(m_\mu)]\) is the probability of the environment \((m_\mu)\) and \((V^{\pi}\text{Pi-m}_\mu)\) measures the performance of the agent \((\text{Pi})\) in the practical environment \((m_\mu)\).

Intuitively, this formula transcripts the following hypotheses:

- Intelligence measures an individual’s general ability to succeed in a range of environments”.
- Success can be modeled by expected future reward in a reinforcement – learning ontology of the agent environment interactions.
- The probability of a given environment is function of its Kolmogorn complexity.
- Intelligence is the weighted average success over the set of all possible environments.

Hence, from the above definitions it can be concluded that intelligence provides the brain power for routine learned abilities such as vocabulary and the other for less teachable and more complex abilities like abstract reasoning.
Dixit (1985) studied on a sample of 800 students of IX classes and concluded that there was very high correlation between intelligence test score and academic achievement.

Sandhu (1985) showed that the difference between the means of the academic achievement scores of high and low intelligence group was significant, both among boys and girls.

Chadha and Chanda (1990) reported that intelligence and Scholastic achievement are significantly correlated. Intelligence and scholastic achievement were found to be highly correlated when creativity was partialled out. They concluded that intelligence is having a positive and significant correlation with scholastic achievement.

Batra (1992) revealed that students belonging to high intelligence group developed better conjunctive concepts than that of students falling in low intelligence group.

Garg and Chaturvedi (1992) studied intelligence as correlate of achievement. Results of the study showed that there appeared to be a linear relationship between IQ and academic performance. Intelligence was found to be quite significant in determining the academic achievement of students of class XII of Aligarh City.

Balasubramaniam (1993) conducted a study on pupils academic achievement in English in relation to their intelligence. He studied on 600 Class XII students from 16 High Schools and found that intelligence of pupils positively influenced on their academic achievement in English.

Sawhney (1993) conducted a study on a sample of 300 Class IX students and found that high intelligence students scored significantly high scores than the low intelligent group.

Brigham (1994) collected information about IQ test scores as well as achievement scores from students records’. Through the use of ANOVA, intelligence was found to be significantly affected on achievement in all subject areas.
Chopra (1994) conducted a study on 150 students of IX Class and found that intelligence significantly affects achievements of students in English structures. She found that high intelligence group performed better on the achievement test in English structures as compared to low intelligence group.

Kaur, Parminder and Bajwa (1995) conducted a study on intelligence (verbal and non-verbal) as a correlate of academic achievement of grade X boys and girls. They found that verbal intelligence had positive and significant relationship with Hindi, Punjabi and English, while non-verbal intelligence has positive and significant relationship with Science, Mathematics and Social Studies.

Mishra (1997) in his study, "correlates of academic achievement of high school students in India" found a positive and significant correlation between intelligence and academic achievement.

Frances (1994) studied the effect of mobility, intelligence and interaction of two variables of sixth graders achievement test scores in the area of mathematics and reading language found no significant relationship of intelligence with achievement in any of the areas.

Kaur (2002) examined the relationship between intelligence and academic achievement of senior secondary students (n = 400) and found a positive and significant relationship (r = .99) between the two variables. On gender analysis, she also found that there was significant difference between boys and girls and was in favour of girls on both intelligence and academic achievement.

Bal (1992) found that (1) The variable of intelligence had a significant effect on acquisition and retention of higher level writing Skill in English. (2) The variables of cognitive style had a non- significant effect on acquisition; a Significant effect on retention as measured by test totals and scores on supply type items but not when measured by scores on selection type items. (3) Intelligence and cognitive style had a non significant international effect on acquisition and retention of higher level writing Skills in English.
1.1 Rationale of the Study

The number of English language speakers in India is growing by leaps and bounds. We have more speakers of English (as a second language) here, than in any other country in the world. There is no doubt that English will emerge as the main language of the rapidly forming global village, and it is imperative that students and professionals alike have the requisite English Skills to communicate effectively. However, the quality of English—both spoken and written seems to be deteriorating with every batch of graduates churned out of colleges. Thus while the number of speakers is rising, the quality of the language remains questionable. As English plays the primary role in global interaction, as well as in career growth, it becomes essential to arrive at the root of this problem and realize workable solutions.

While going through the review of related literature, the investigator found out that the present standards of teaching of English prevailing in our secondary schools are not up to the mark. Our students learn the English language as a second language. In this situation the learner comes in contact with the target language more in its written form. Majority of the students even after completing their secondary school education struggle hard to find right expression in their spoken or written form of communication. An overview of the studies mentioned, by and large reveal that only a few studies have been taken upon different methods of teaching English for developing writing Skills in relation to Intelligence and cognitive style. Therefore the investigator realized the need to conduct the present investigation. The review helped in framing the objectives, and hypotheses of the study. The investigator had been obsessed with some of the puzzling queries, which were the concerns of the study: a) what are the difficulties in the Skill of writing English among Secondary School learners? b) what are the things that the learners have to learn to write well in English? c) Can the learners’ writing Skills in English be developed with the existing class room practices of teaching? d) What teaching Strategy is to be developed in order
to improve learners’ written English? e) Which teaching method is more efficacious and effective in improving learners’ written English?

While teaching English language Top to bottom approach is followed. In this approach priority is given to Listening → Speaking→Reading →Writing. Writing Skill being last one is most of the times neglected. Emphasis is on Speaking Skill but, there is lots of difference between speaking and writing Skills. The first and foremost difference is writing is formal where as speaking can be formal as well as informal. We need to be very particular while writing. It being computer age writing skills need to be well developed and practiced more. Now days almost every thing is online, so to avail this opportunity one needs to be good in writing Skills. The importance of English as a link language fits here well. You can access anywhere in the world online through good writing Skills.

The researcher found that there are studies Yau (1919), Hartwell (1985), Moraes and Sampoia (1991), Hillocks (1987), Fries (1952), Braddock Jones and Schroer (1963), Maquade (1980), NCTE (1985), Hudelson (1988), which show no benefit form teaching through grammar based method, contradiction with other studies Flower (1994), Vavra (1985), Ehrenworth (2003) Malaroy (2003), Einarsson (1999), Johansen and Shaw (2003), Haussamen, Benjamin, Kolln, and Wheeler (2003) which do show a benefit. In case of communication based method studies revealed that this method demonstrated significant improvement on teaching English Language. So the researcher tried to find out whether this method is effective than the existing methods to teach writing Skills.

The review of the literature indicated that field-independent learners had the advantage in classroom foreign language learning than field dependent learners. The researcher in the present study wanted to know whether field-independent/field-dependent learners had positive effect of the two methods of teaching writing Skills or not.

Looking at the literature intensively researcher found studies on Intelligence and English language in general, but very few studies on
intelligence and developing writing Skills in English in particular were found. It is observed that intelligence of pupils positively influenced on their academic achievement in English. So present study is to find out the efficacy of grammar based method and communication based methods in developing writing Skills among high school students in relation to cognitive style and Intelligence.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
Efficacy of grammar based and communication based method in developing writing skills among high school students in relation to cognitive style and intelligence.

1.3 Objectives of the Study
The present study was undertaken keeping in view the following objectives:

i. To develop instructional material in accordance with the procedural requirements of two instructional methods, namely Grammar based and communication based method.

ii. To construct and standardize a test on writing skills in English for measuring learning outcomes.

iii. To study the differential efficacy of Grammar based and communication based methods in developing writing skills in English.

iv. To examine the effect of intelligence on grammar based and communication based methods in developing writing skills.

v. To examine the effect of cognitive style on grammar based and communication based methods in developing writing skills.

vi. To study the first-order interaction of instructional methods x intelligence in developing writing skills.

vii. To study the first-order interaction of instructional methods x cognitive style in developing writing skills.

viii. To study the first-order interaction of intelligence x cognitive style in developing writing skills in English.
ix. To study the second-order interaction of instructional methods x intelligence x cognitive style in developing writing skills in English.

1.4 Hypotheses of the Study
1. There will be significant difference in achievement of pupils taught through different methods.
2. There will be significant difference in writing skills in English in groups made on the basis of cognitive style.
3. There will be significant difference in writing skills in English in groups made on the basis of intelligence.
4. There will be significant difference due to interaction of instructional methods x intelligence in developing writing skills in English.
5. There will be significant difference due to interaction of instructional methods x cognitive style in developing writing skills.
6. There will be significant difference of intelligence x cognitive style in developing writing skills in English.
7. There will be significant difference due to interaction of instructional methods x intelligence x cognitive style in developing writing skills in English.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study
1) The present study was delimited to only Govt. Sr. Sec. Schools of Chandigarh.
2) The present study was delimited to Grammar based and communication based method in developing writing skills in English.
3) The present study was delimited only to intelligence and cognitive style of students.