

*Chapter - 2*

*Review of Literature*

Mawlana Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University

## Chapter 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### 2.0. Overview

The main purpose of the present study is to investigate the correlation between personality traits and Critical Thinking (CT) on writing of EFL learners. This chapter, therefore reviews the available literature relating the concept of personality traits and CT, current state of Second/Foreign Language (ESL/EFL) writing research, and relationship among personality, foreign language writing & critical thinking. This discussion has been arranged under three sections, one each on personality traits, CT and EFL writing.

Besides reading books, the researcher explored the literature on personality traits, CT and writing extensively on sites like Elsevier, Science Direct, UGC approved journals of India, Master list journals and some sites which are only for thesis and dissertation like ProQuest and Shodhganga, but got no article/ research directly related to the topic of relationship between personality traits and critical thinking on writing. There were no study exactly related to current topic, but there were studies related to personality big five factors and critical thinking and different aspects of learning, which will be discussed in following sections.

#### 2.1 Studies on Big Five Personality Traits

Brown and Taylor (2014) examine the relationship between personality traits and financial decision-making focusing on unsecured debt and financial assets. Personality traits are classified according to the 'Big Five' taxonomy: openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism. They explore personality traits at the individual level and also within couples, specifically the personality traits of the head of household and personality traits averaged across the couple. They find that certain personality traits such as extraversion are generally significantly associated with household finances in terms of the levels of debt and assets held and the correlation is often relatively large. The results also suggest that the magnitude and statistical significance of the association between personality traits and household finances differs across the various types of debt and assets held in the household portfolio. Findings suggest that no relationship exists between the different types of financial assets held and personality traits. The only exception is the

relationship between personality traits and the probability of holding shares, where extraversion (openness to experience) is inversely (positively) related to the likelihood of holding this type of asset in the couples sample. In the sample of single individuals, agreeableness is inversely associated with the likelihood of holding shares.

Paunonen, and Ashton (2013) describe a large sample study that has two purposes. The first is to replicate a previous study in which they showed that lower-level personality trait measures related to achievement motivation predict the academic success of university students. The second purpose is to test our earlier conclusion that such lower-level traits are frequently superior to broader personality factors for accuracy in prediction. Both purposes are met in this study, providing more evidence for our general claim that aggregating narrow personality trait measures into broad factor measures can sometimes have negative consequences regarding the prediction and understanding of important outcomes, including academic performance. This research has two purposes for undertaking the analyses report in this study.

The first is to verify the results of an earlier parallel study in which they have found certain lower-level personality traits to be important predictors of academic performance in undergraduate university students. The results of this study has closely been replicated with the present data set specifically, correlates of good scholastic performance are behavior domains related to the motivation to achieve excellence in one's endeavors, the tendency to prefer serious activities over frivolous ones, and being in possession of a broad intellectual curiosity.

The second purpose of this study is to evaluate the recent claim that (a) common factor variance attributable to the broad personality dimensions is sufficient for predicting important criteria related to performance in different occupations, and (b) trait-specific variance associated with lower-level facets of those same factors does not add to criterion prediction. In contrast to those conclusions, they find that, at least for performance of university students working through an academic curriculum, lower-level traits can out predict broad factors. This is true not only of the lower-level trait scales themselves, which included both trait-specific variance and common factor variance, but even of those trait scales when their common factor variance had been removed statistically.

Paunonen and Hong (2001) in study support the trait theorist's view that there is something unique to say achievement motivation that makes it different from all the other traits that define the same underlying factor. That uniqueness can contribute to the prediction of important criteria, such as student or worker performance, above and beyond that affected by the factor itself. Furthermore, knowledge of such salient trait-criterion links promotes our understanding of human behavior. Ignoring lower-level personality traits by referencing only factor-level variables in the study of individual differences, therefore, will necessarily hinder empirical and theoretical advances in psychology.

Hudson and Roberts (2014) mention goals to change personality traits: Concurrent links between personality traits, daily behavior, and goals to change oneself, developed and validated a measure of people's goals to change their personality traits. In doing so, they explore the prevalence and correlates of such change goals. They find that the vast majority of people want to change aspects of their personalities, and that these desires are organized around the big-five personality dimensions. Change goals are related to theoretically relevant predictors, including life satisfaction and current personality traits. In three subsequent daily-diary studies, they discover that change goals are discriminant from more generalized trait-relevant motives, and that change goals are negatively correlated with daily behavior, to the extent that traits and behavior covered. Implications for studying people's goals and attempts to change their personality traits are discussed. These studies explicitly and systematically examine individuals' goals to change their personality traits and find that a vast majority of individuals do, in fact, have goals to change themselves. They hope that future researchers investigate the plausibility of actually attaining goals for volitional trait change using extended longitudinal designs with large sample sizes.

Miyajima, Naoki, Munenaga and Tsuyoshi (2014) state the differences in personality traits among *male-to-female*, *female-to-male* gender identity disorder subjects and non-transsexual male and female controls. Subjects have been 72 MtF and 187 FtM subjects without psychiatric comorbidities together with 184 male and 159 female non-transsexual controls. Personality traits have assessed using a short version of the Temperament and Character Inventory. Group comparisons have made by two-way ANOVA. Statistic AL significances have observed as follows: 1) lower novelty seeking in FtM than in M or MtF, 2) higher reward dependence in FtM than in M, 3)

Higher cooperativeness in FtM than in M or MtF, 4) the highest self-transcendence in MtF among all the groups. The highest self-transcendence in MtF subjects may reflect their vulnerable identity and constrained adaptation to society as the minority. Nevertheless, higher reward dependence and cooperativeness in FtM subjects can be related to more determined motivation for the treatment so might promise better social functioning and adjustment than MtF subjects. The result of their study show high reward dependence and cooperativeness in the FtM and high self-transcendence in the MtF were characteristic of personality traits subjects. These may cause differences in interpersonal relationship and social functioning/adjustment between MtF and FtM transsexuals. The MtF subjects with low persistence tend to have poor motivation for hormonal/surgical treatments.

Fabio and Donald Saklofske (2014) study investigate the role of ability and trait emotional intelligence (EI), fluid intelligence, and personality traits in career decision-making self-efficacy, career indecision and indecisiveness. The Advanced Progressive Matrices, Big Five Questionnaire, Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test, Bar-On Emotional Intelligence Inventory, Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire, and Career Decision Self- Efficacy Scale: Short Form, Career Decision-Making Difficulties Questionnaire, and Indecisiveness Scale were administered to 194 Italian high school students. These results highlight the potentially important role of self-reported EI in career decisions. This study shows the results of three different hierarchical regression analyses with career decision-making self-efficacy, career decision making difficulties, and indecisiveness as the three alternative criterion measures. The order of entering the predictor measures is fluid intelligence, personality traits, ability EI, and self-reported trait EI assessed by the EQ-i and TEIQue at the fourth step and fifth steps respectively.

Ghaemi, F., & Sabokrouh, F. (2014) study investigate the relationship between Personality Traits and Metacognitive Listening Strategies among Iranian EFL Learners. Language learning is varied depending on individual characteristics and variations of language learning outcomes was attributed to learner characteristics. On the other hand, when they study the recent research on second or foreign listening instruction, most of them have emphasized the need for assessing the effectiveness of metacognitive strategy training in order to improve second language listening comprehension. According to this goal, the research objective is to investigate the

relationships of personality traits with metacognitive awareness of listening strategies among Iranian adult learners of English utilizing the NEO PI -R and the SILL. 80 participants are students studying English in one of the institutes in drawn from four intact classes. The instruments have been used including background questionnaire, general English proficiency test; metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire consists of 21 randomly ordered items related to L2 listening comprehension and the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised developed by Costa and McCrae (1992). The analysis of the data sources from the NEO PI-R, the Metacognitive Awareness Listening provide the framework for the discussion on the correlations of each of the five domains and the 30 facets of the FFM and the metacognitive groups. NEO Personality Inventory-Revised questionnaire and Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) are administered to see whether there was any correlation between the students' use of metacognitive listening strategies and five domains of personality traits. The results display that there are relationships among variables but some subscales are related and some other are to some extent, related.

Funder (1997) mentions that, In psychology, the Big Five personality traits are five broad domains or dimensions of personality that are used to describe human personality. The theory based on the Big Five factors is called the *five-factor model* (FFM). The five factors are openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. Acronyms commonly used to refer to the five traits collectively are OCEAN, NEOAC, or CANOE. Beneath each global factor, a cluster of correlated and more specific primary factors are found; for example, extraversion includes such related qualities as gregariousness, assertiveness, excitement seeking, warmth, activity, and positive emotions.

The Big Five model is able to account for different traits in personality without overlapping. Empirical research has shown that the Big Five personality traits show consistency in interviews, self-descriptions and observations. Moreover, this five-factor structure seems to be found across a wide range of participants of different ages and of different cultures.

The Big Five Model is defined by several independent sets of researchers, These researchers begin by studying known personality traits and then factor-analyzing hundreds of measures of these traits (in self-report and questionnaire data, peer ratings, and objective measures from experimental settings) in order to find the

underlying factors of personality. The Big five personality traits are the model to comprehend the relationship between personality and academic behaviors.

Gough's (1979) believes that openness is a general appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, imagination, curiosity, and variety of experience. People who are open to experience are intellectually curious, open to emotion, sensitive to beauty and willing to try new things. They tend to be, when compared to closed people, more creative and more aware of their feelings. They are also more likely to hold unconventional beliefs. A particular individual, however, may have a high overall openness score and be interested in learning and exploring new cultures but have no great interest in art or poetry. There is a strong connection between liberal ethics and openness to experience such as support for policies endorsing racial tolerance. Another characteristic of the open cognitive style is a facility for thinking in symbols and abstractions far removed from concrete experience.

Gough (1979) also believes that people with low scores on openness tend to have more conventional, traditional interests. They prefer the plain, straightforward, and obvious over the complex, ambiguous, and subtle. They may regard the arts and sciences with suspicion or view these endeavors as uninteresting. Closed people prefer familiarity over novelty; they are conservative and resistant to change.

Flett and Hewitt (2007) state that conscientiousness is a tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement against measures or outside expectations. It is related to the way in which people control, regulate, and direct their impulses. High scores on conscientiousness indicate a preference for planned rather than spontaneous behavior. The average level of conscientiousness rises among young adults and then declines among older adults.

Some researchers find that extroversion, one of the most discussed personality variables, is significantly related to language achievement, indicating that extroverted language learners are more successful language learners (Kiany, 1998; Robinson et al., 1994), but others find that extroversion do not have a significant relationship with learning achievement (Busch, 1982).

Browne and Howarth (1977) maintain that Extraversion is characterized by breadth of activities from external activity/situations, and energy creation from external means. The trait is marked by pronounced engagement with the external world. Extraverts

enjoy interacting with people, and are often perceived as full of energy. They tend to be enthusiastic, action-oriented individuals. They possess high group visibility, like to talk, and assert themselves. Introverts have lower social engagement and energy levels than extraverts. They tend to seem quiet, low-key, deliberate, and less involved in the social world. Their lack of social involvement should not be interpreted as shyness or depression; instead they are more independent of their social world than extraverts. Introverts need less stimulation than extraverts and more time alone. This does not mean that they are unfriendly or antisocial; rather, they are reserved in social situations.

Graziano and Tobin (2009) believe that the agreeableness trait reflects individual differences in general concern for social harmony. Agreeable individual's value getting along with others. They are generally considerate, kind, generous, trusting and trustworthy, helpful, and willing to compromise their interests with others. Agreeable people also have an optimistic view of human nature. Because agreeableness is a social trait. Research has shown that one's agreeableness positively correlates with the quality of relationships with one's team members.

According to Eysencke (1967) neuroticism is the tendency to experience negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, or depression. It is sometimes called emotional instability, or is reversed and referred to as emotional stability. Theory of personality, neuroticism is interlinked with low tolerance for stress or aversive stimuli. Those who score high in neuroticism are emotionally reactive and vulnerable to stress.

They are more likely to interpret ordinary situations as threatening, and minor frustrations as hopelessly difficult. Their negative emotional reactions tend to persist for unusually long periods of time, which means they are often in a bad mood. For instance, neuroticism is connected to a pessimistic approach toward work, confidence that work impedes personal relationships, and apparent anxiety linked with work. Furthermore, those who score high on neuroticism may display more skin conductance reactivity than those who score low on neuroticism.

These problems in emotional regulation can diminish the ability of a person scoring high on neuroticism to think clearly, make decisions, and cope effectively with stress. Lacking contentment in one's life achievements can correlate with high neuroticism scores and increase one's likelihood of falling into clinical depression. Moreover,

individuals high on neuroticism tend to experience more negative life events, but neuroticism also changes in response to positive and negative life experiences.

At the other end of the scale, individuals who score low in neuroticism are less easily upset and are less emotionally reactive. They tend to be calm, emotionally stable, and free from persistent negative feelings. Freedom from negative feelings does not mean that low scorers experience a lot of positive feelings. Neuroticisms similar but not identical to being neurotic in the Freudian sense (i.e. neurosis.) Some psychologists prefer to call neuroticism by the term emotional stability to differentiate it from the term neurotic in a career test.

## **2.2 Studies on Personality Traits and Second Language Acquisition**

The potential influence of personality traits on non-linguistic, affective factors related to second language acquisition is noted early. Even in the field of psychology, most researchers agreed that Extraversion and Neuroticism are most strongly linked to affect (e.g., Eysenck, 1992; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985), and a few researchers reported on the relationship among other factors, such as Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Openness to experience and affective factors, such as confidence and self-esteem (e.g., Watson & Clark, 1992). Since affect greatly influences second or foreign language learning, SLA researchers had some reason to believe that personality would thus be key to understanding the roots of foreign language writing. However, early SLA researchers find mixed results, leading to Lalonde and Gardner's (1984) pessimistic statement that "based on such research, there is little reason to conclude that personality variables are directly implicated to any great extent in second language acquisition" (p. 225).

However, in the beginning SLA researchers may have been seeking within the inappropriate places. Several personality traits researches in investigations during the 1970s and 1980s encompassed anxiety, empathy, field dependence/independence, creativity, self-esteem, deliberateness, and analytic orientation. For these so-called traits, just anxiety was always recognized by mainstream psychology as a factor of personality. In a number of past studies of the relationship of personality variables to second language acquisition (SLA), extraversion easily drawn the highest consideration, due to this, that the success of extraverted learners at learning and communicating in a foreign language became a learning perception. Indeed, almost all

of SLA personality researchers examining the extraversion-introversion factor of personality paid specific attention to whether extraverts or introverts will be more effective at language attainment as determined either by course grades or by identical test scores; the outcomes were considerably blended.

One of the most extensively mentioned SLA investigations related to personality trait was carried out by Ehrman, who sought for traits and habits of the excellent language learner within the 1990s. Ehrman (1990) applied outcomes from numerous Likert-scale questionnaires, like the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (M/BTI), to investigate the concept that extraverts were significantly better learners and speakers of a foreign language in comparison than introverts.

In other hand, even though the huge sample size of over 1,000 learners, the investigator failed to discover any statistically considerable distinction between extraverts and introverts. The consequences guided her to anticipate that “most language use is dyadic,” or happening in pairs, “which is often as comfortable for introverts as for extraverts” (p. 418). The investigator additionally hypothesized that extraverts were more likely to have benefit in big groups, like full-classroom involvement activities.

Recently, Ehrman (2008) shows a total *N*-size of 3,145 participants culled from U.S. Foreign Service Institute databases of native English speaker students in intensive foreign language programs across the United States.

She confirms which the major number of learners ( $n = 272$ ) have been from the introversion-sensing-thinking-judging (ISTJ) personality type. Utilizing a small sub-sample of learners of undetermined *n*-size who attained Level Four of the Foreign Language Institute Oral Proficiency Interview, the investigators accomplished a series of correlations and chi-squared tests according to frequency statistics from the 16 possible M/BTI personality types. The outcomes have shown a considerable group (introverted-intuitive-thinking-judging, or INTJ), which included 16.5% of the sample.

The most significant disadvantage of the research was the small *n*-size indicated, that, in accordance to the frequency statistics and rounded-up participant numbers looked between 60 and 70. Nevertheless, the tool utilized in addition to the statistical techniques might have been dubious. First, the M/BTI is usually considered by

mainstream psychologists as indicating weak psychometric qualities because its utilization of a dichotomous responding main system (*Yes, No, and sometimes Maybe*), instead of a Likert scale, outcomes in ordinal data instead of interval data. Furthermore, chi-squared tests according to nonparametric, categorical or rank-ordered data are sample-specific and usually absence of statistical ability. Eventually, correlational analyses according to outcomes of chi-squared tests absence of external validity and cannot be generalized across sample populations.

Although researchers like Ehrman concentrates on extraversion in ESL environment of North America, a number of researchers in Asian EFL environment likewise accomplished extraversion-introversion trait-based SLA researches. Impacted by the Big Three P-E-N model, Iwawaki, Eysenck, and Eysenck (1980) applied the 86-item Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) developed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) to establish associations between extraversion-introversion and English success tests for a sample of 96 female learners at a junior college in western Japan. The researchers were unsuccessful to discover considerable differences on total test scores between extraverts and introverts recognized by the EPQ (Iwawaki, Eysenck, & Eysenck, 1980).

The outcomes have been probably because of a low *N*-size, a large range of questionnaire items, or the utilization of raw questionnaire item and test scores instead of modularized *z*-score variables.

Also, Busch tried to discover whether extraverts had any benefit more than introverts in a research of Japanese university students utilizing course grades as the result variable (Busch, 1982). To explain the causes for selecting the extraversion-introversion variable as being a possible predictor of English language learning, Busch (1982) mentioned outcomes from the excellent learner research of Naiman, Frohlich, and Stern (1975) that 31% of learners felt that extraversion was useful for communication abilities. As Griffiths (1991) identified, nevertheless, “[Busch] might have observed...that 69% of the students did not” feel that extraversion was useful (Griffiths, 1991, p. 106). In fact, Busch’s outcomes revealed no considerable differences for course grades between extraverts and introverts. However, the biggest disadvantage may have been the utilization of English course grades; grades provided by only a teacher to a number of students might not present a well enough goal measure of total English proficiency. The meaning of what founded proficiency might

also have impacted the consequences. For instance, if written quizzes or examination consist of a substantial percentage of course grades, introverted students look as likely as, or even more than, extraverted students to obtain high grades.

If personality impacts nonlinguistic aspects for instance self-competence thoughts or speaking confidence, the achievement of writing or speaking tasks that are judged by at least two or three raters is necessary for a reliable and valid assessment of English productive abilities prior to indicating correlational analysis with personality traits.

In another EFL environment research, Carrell, Prince, and Astika (1996) examined the association between extraversion-introversion and achievement tests among 75 Indonesian university learners. Following the lead of Ehrman and Oxford (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990; Oxford & Ehrman, 1993), Carrell et al. used the Myers-Briggs

Type Indicator (MBTI) personality inventory rather than a psychometric personality questionnaire such as the EPQ, NEO-PI, or Factor Markers (Carrell, Prince, & Astika, 1996). As with the Iwawaki et al. research, Carrell et al. discovered only low associations between personality types and language learning, leading them to state, "We must be circumspect in drawing implications for EFL classrooms" (p.96). Again, similar to the Iwawaki et al. research and the Busch research, Carrell et al. might have been unsuccessful to discover considerable period outcomes because of a very small *N*-size and a proportionally high number of questionnaire items, as well as the use of the generally poor psychometric characteristics of the M/BTI instrument.

MacIntyre and Charos (1996) have done one of the first researches in SLA to utilize the Big Five personality traits, and one of the first to apply the theory of Willingness to Communicate (WTC) in SLA as well. According to a model of WTC as a personality trait among native language (L1) speaker adults (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987), MacIntyre and Charos (1996) examined their concept that each of the Big Five personality traits led to language learning motivation and/or WTC in one's second language (L2) only in an indirect fashion. The investigators studied 92 participants who was learning French in a language immersion context in Ontario, Canada.

The participants took a series of measurements: (a) a 35-item version of Greenberg's (1993) Factor Markers, (b) three items for Motivation comprising Desire to Learn French, Motivational Intensity, and Attitude toward Learning French, (c) three items

for Integrativeness, (d) two items for Language Anxiety, (e) two items for Attitudes toward the Learning, (f) twelve items for Frequency of Communication in French, (g) Twelve items for Perceived Competence in French,

(i) Two items for Social Context, to measure how much French was used at work and at home. And (j) twenty items for Willingness to communicate, based on the L1 model (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). The questionnaire thus include a total of 99 items.

Before performing the interpretations, the researchers made a path model of personality, attitudes, and WTC, according to former research by Gardner (1985) and MacIntyre (1994). They recommended an approach from Extraversion to L2 Anxiety, assuming that socially oriented people would feel less anxiety speaking with members of the L2 group. Though, the investigators hypothesized that Emotional Stability would not bring directly to L2 Anxiety, stating that former research had not established a powerful association between EFL anxiety and general trait anxiety. The study that was appeared to be referred was not mentioned. Alternatively, Emotional Stability was associated to Integrativeness, according to the presumption that people who do not have constructive approaches toward the L2 language group feel uncomfortable talking with a member of that group. The studies applied a path analysis and determined that personality exerted just an indirect impact on WTC after being filtered through the latent variables. Path analysis of L2 Communication Frequency from MacIntyre and Charos (1996), containing Perceived Competence, L2 Anxiety, Integrativeness, Attitudes toward the Learning Situation, L2 Willingness to Communicate, and Motivation.

Approaches toward the Integrativeness, L2 Anxiety, Learning Situation, and Perceived Competence (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996).

Nevertheless, like prior personality researches in SLA, the methodology was inappropriate by very less participants and so many variables. Although the investigators started the interpretations with the original WTC model from McCroskey and Richmond (1987) as a pattern, the investigators were forced to include four new post-hoc paths for the data to fit the model since the number of participants ( $N = 96$ ) was outnumbered by the number of variables (99). The model had adequate fit, with a non-significant *chi*-squared of 55.75, a root mean square

residual (RMSR) of .067, and a goodness of fit (GFI) of .92; however, the adjusted GFI was .84 due to the small sample size and cross-sample confirmation with a new set of data was not conducted. Furthermore, numerous of the components, like Desire to Learn French and L2 Anxiety, contained of only two or three items and no tests of unidimensionality were carried out for any of the component.

As long as anxiety is concerned, there was no reference to the “prior research” on that the researchers’ beliefs regarding to connections among trait anxiety and L2 anxiety were based. The absence of a connection among the personality trait of Emotional Stability and L2 Anxiety was unconfirmed by evidence; alternatively, the researchers hypothesized which Extraversion by itself negatively anticipated L2 Anxiety, and additionally theorized that Emotional Stability impacted on Integrativeness according to the hypothesis which individuals who do not have the desire to become like members of the L2 community feel uncomfortable talking with them. Reasonably, this looks to be setting the cart before the horse, as personality traits are anticipated to be inherited genetic aspects instead of dependent upon external social circumstances; the researchers’ reasoning should have been that individuals with unstable emotional traits consider it problematic to imagine themselves a member of another language community.

MacIntyre and Charos’ recommended that “language anxiety is not strongly related to general trait anxiety” was unconfirmed in their literature review. Mainstream psychology theory and research specifies that social anxiety is a mixture of genetic and environmental impact; thus, both introverted tendencies (i.e., the absence of tolerance of prolonged social exposure) and absence of emotional stability (i.e., the inability to control one’s emotions) should reasonably have guide the researchers to theorize powerful negative association among Emotional Stability, Extraversion, and L2 Anxiety. Eventually, since L2 Anxiety was measured by just two items, generalizing the findings to different participant samples is problematic at the most.

Reinforced mostly from the findings of the MacIntyre and Charos (1996) research, MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels (1998) recommended a “heuristic pyramid model” of L2 WTC, in that personality was located at the lowest level of “Layer VI: Social and Individual Context.” Based on the pyramid model, rather than directly impacting language learning results, “personality helps to set the context in which the language learning occurs” (MacIntyre, Clement, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998b, p. 558).

This social context is additionally impacted by other variables, like disposition towards foreigners, linguistic self-confidence, and L1-L2 intergroup climate. The authors' perception of social context in L2 WTC has been challenged recently; the heuristic model is argued additionally in the Anxiety and Confidence segment.

In one of recent Japanese research that it has accomplished at Temple University Japan in Tokyo surveyed 320 university learners utilizing the Yawate-Guilford Personality Inventory (Y/GPI), an early pre-PEN and pre-Big Five personality trait instrument with 12 subscales including ten items each scale (Brown, Robson, & Rosenkjar, 2001). Six tools were applied in the research to measure motivation, anxiety, personality, English grammar knowledge, strategies usage, and overall English proficiency. By including the number of sub-scales of the tools, the authors claimed that a "total of 34 variables" were analyzed (p. 361); although, the authors utilized the word "variable" in the sense of "factor." Even considering only the Likert-scale items applied in the factor analyses, the total number of combined measurement instrument variables (408) was considerably bigger than the participant size ( $N = 320$ ). Thus, the statistics from the research lacked predictive power and the outcome of the correlational analyses between the factor analysis outcomes of the Likert-scale data and the proficiency data might have been of limited value.

In one of the most recently published Big Five and SLA researches to date, Verhoeven and Vermeer (2002) explored the association between the Big Five personality traits and communicative competence among 144 native Dutch-speaking children and 69 non-native Dutch-speaking children. The consequences shown considerable relationship between participants Big Five traits like Conscientiousness and Openness and different dimensions of communicative competence; however, the research encompasses a number of weaknesses. First, the personality trait measurement tool was "30 pairs of judgments," the nature of which was not mentioned, but which the researchers revealed were according to the theory of the Big Five instead of any particular existing tool (Verhoeven & Vermeer, 2002, p. 366). Second, the teachers of the children rather than the children themselves assessed the personality items; given that there were 213 children in the research, it is doubtful that the teachers could correctly judge each student's individual personality. Eventually, the small and unequally distributed participant size between the two groups of L1 and

L2 Dutch speakers might have contribute to nonparametric data distributions, and thus reduced the generalizability of the outcomes to other samples.

Some of the problems faced by SLA researchers might be an absence of understanding of the nature of personality trait and foreign language confidence constructs. Early segments talked over the numerous personality trait models existing, and the Big Five Factor model in specific, knowledge of which might support SLA researchers in future researches. The track record of confidence studies in SLA has less depth and is shorter than in other fields; hence, researcher start the next part with a summary investigation of the origins of the theory of CT in the fields of social and cognitive psychology.

### **2.3 Studies on Nature of Thinking**

Thinking is a mental movement, not typically exposed to direct perception. Thinking determined by earlier encounters yet can quickly new insights. A research accompanied by Baddeley and Andrade (2000) showed that it takes place in the working memory and restricted capability may be a controlling factor (Johnstone, 1997). The method of thinking will comprise a choice of mental operations. Griffen (2001) observed these procedures as thinking abilities while Smith (2002) regarded them as developed skills or aptitudes. Though, diverse studies have emphasized the concern of willingness to employ the abilities (Coles & Robinson, 1991).

The procedure of thinking can be portrayed in relations of dissimilar skills (Zaitoon, 2003). According to Fisher (2005), the procedures of memory, perception, language, concept formation and symbolization are recognized as the fundamental cognitive abilities underlying the capability to learn, reason and tackle issues. Reid and Yang (2002), in their evaluation of problem-solving, saw thinking in relations of a person looking for to find some results to some problem they may be facing but thinking is more than solving problems. Habib (1996) and, later, Jerwan (2009) have offered some 27 types of thinking (table 2.1).

Table 2.1

Types of thinking (based on Habib, 1996; Jerwan, 2009)

<b>Types of thinking</b>		
Analytical Thinking	Scientific Thinking	Lateral Thinking
Concrete Thinking	Verbal Thinking	Reflective Thinking
Creative Thinking	Vertical Thinking	Abstract Thinking
Deductive Thinking	Effective Thinking	Mathematical Thinking
Impulsive Thinking	Convergent Thinking	Cognitive Thinking
Ineffective Thinking	<b>Critical Thinking</b>	Sensory Thinking
Logical Thinking	Productive Thinking	Inferential Thinking
Metacognitive Thinking	Inductive Thinking	Exploratory Thinking
Synthetic Thinking	Absolute Thinking	Philosophical Thinking

As the table specifies there are 27 kinds of thinking and differentiating CT from the other kinds of thinking is not easy. In a study showed by Al-Osaimi et al. (2014), four classes of thinking were presented: CT, Creative thinking, scientific thinking, and Systems thinking.

1) *CT*: Includes asking the questions how, what and why of information, its causes and its importance (Al-Osaimi *et al.*, 2014).

2) *Scientific thinking*: 'The exclusive features of scientific thinking narrate to the nature, place and handling of experimentation, comprising the place of hypothesis formation' (Al Ahmadi & Reid, 2011).

3) *Creative thinking*: The formation of somewhat novel, valued in some way by someone. This creation may be an artefact, an idea, a new insight, or a new way of looking at some difficulty or matter (cited in Irshad, 2017).

4) *Systems thinking*: The expansion of an inclusive understanding of the systems under investigation (cited in Irshad, 2017).

It must be concentrated on that thinking is a coordinated process and coherent. Distributing into classifications is manufactured: these kinds of thinking may reflect thinking for numerous dedications. Even though the classification of Al-Osaimi *et al.* (2014) was created in a science setting, it was founded on an extensive analysis of the literature on CT and was not seen to be limited to science areas of the curriculum. The investigation has some advantages:

- (a) It suggests an increased measure of simplicity;
- (b) It agrees a stronger requirement of curriculum goals;
- (c) It supports in emerging assessment: objectives are purer in operational term

## **2.4 Studies on Critical Thinking**

Over-all, it can be expected that CT have a vital function in academic instruction because it is what learners need to be successful both in an academic environment and real-life situations. So, it seems as if mandatory to recommend precise training in the specific CT skills which learners are expected to display proficiency in. Paul, Elder, and Bartell (1997) stated that the academic origins of CT are as historical as its etymology, traceable, eventually, to the teaching practice and view of Socrates 2,500 years ago who exposed by a method of probing questioning that people could not logically validate their confident states to knowledge. In his method of questioning, Socrates highlighted the necessity of thinking for simplicity and reasonable consistency. Socrates' practice was accompanied by the CT of Plato, Aristotle, and the Greek skeptics, all of whom emphasized that things are often quite different from what they seem to be and that only the trained mind is ready to understand through the way things seem to us on the surface to the way they really are beneath the surface.

CT study exposes the confidential role which thinking plays in the creating of meaning. Kurland (2000) states understanding demanded higher-order thinking. He claims that reading is truly a problem solving procedure demanding cognition. Based on Kurland (2000), "we do not simply read the words; we read ideas, thoughts that spring from the relationships of various assertions" (p. 2). Comprehension content extremely demands creation of meaning through concoction and explanation of the author's thoughts. Balasubramaniam (1991) explains deep understanding as the capability to recognize, organize, and articulate the main idea of a content without conflating them with peripheral details.

Knowledge structuring, problem solving, logical thinking, and new understanding application depend on deep comprehension (cited by Washburn, 2006, p. 36). Byrnes (2001) believes that good readers can recognize words automatically which enables the individual to focus on higher order thinking by utilizing sentence integration and to make semantic connections. Secondly, good readers quickly recognize words. Speed is important because readers have to be able to operate information in working

memory before it disperses (Byrnes, 2001). The third characteristic of good readers is their ability to record words into phonological representations. The phonological skills help the learners to create a code and pave the pathway of the working memory to effectively access sentence meanings.

CT is a central skill that advances initial learning exercises and activities, smart teaching and learning techniques as different and various, depending on the actual educational situation (static context) and CT development stage (dynamic context). CT is created on knowledge updating (Meredith, K.S., J.L. Steele, 2011, 23), evaluating modifications and contrasts, namely the creation of resemblances and alterations, perceiving and recognizing cause-effect relationships, removing concepts from examples (inductive) backing ideas with examples and estimation on the value truth, utility, positive or negative effects (R.V.D. Brink-Budgen, 2000, 129). CT is seen to be collected of the aptitude to identify a current problem as well as an inquisitive assertiveness that pursues proof of the evidential. It includes assembly knowledge about the correctness of this proof and the capability to make use of this knowledge and assertiveness (Daly, 1998; Simpson and Courtney, 2002).

CT is a method of upcoming and solving problems founded on arguments persuasive, logical and rational, which includes evaluating, verifying and selecting the right answer to an assumed duty and analytic elimination of other alternatives solutions.

CT is a dynamic procedure, synchronized, complex, like reading and writing, speaking and listening, which contains thought processes that surprise with active accumulation of evidence that ends well reasoned decisions. Also CT is an artefact, a point touched by our thinking, we think critically, as an ordinary technique to cooperate with ideas and information. It defined as to grasp valuable and advantageous knowledge with principles and theories founded on them; to have autonomous beliefs and to admit that they are questioned to appraisal (critique); to acquiesce their own ideas and the ideas of others; build influences that support uniformity of their opinions; to display tolerance, flexibility and respect; learn how to think efficiently evaluating and testing solutions.

There are two aspects about CT. Some researchers' attitude is that CT can be widespread and some scholars propose that CT is domain-specific. For instance, Dewey (as cited in Johnson, 2003:59) advised a model of reflective thinking that

characterizes the source of comprehensive thinking skills. Instead of CT, Dewey used the term reflective thinking and defined it as active, measured and careful thinking.

Scriven and Paul (1992) defined CT as the disciplined cognitive process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, implementing, analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating information produced by observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication that can be the central to our believes and actions. Therefore, learning is a cognitive process which can be covered by CT.

CT is a reflective and reasonable thinking which is founded on being true or false final decision (Ennis, 1989). One of the most significant purpose of higher education is humanizing CT of students and formulate them to be a capable citizenship and efficient in their workplace. Consequently, some scholars and educators have been working on this area and defined CT in their views. CT is labelled by Facione (1990) as: “A purposeful and self-regulatory judgment which is determined to inference, interpretation, analysis, evaluation, and as well as explanations of different types of arguments based on logical judgment”.

Most educators approve that CT characterizes an apex of cultured thinking aptitude which schools goal to progress in students. Upcoming employers also place a high priority on seeking CT skills in prospective employees (Burbach, Matkin, & Fritz, 2004). Generally, CT talents mentioned to the capabilities to investigate, manufacture, and evaluate information as well as the disposition to smear these capabilities (Halpern, 2001). As a higher-order cognitive ability, CT is significant for individuals in demand to make decisions in their career, personal life and public life. For students, CT talents not only help them make meaning of the subject substance knowledge they learn, but also stay with them even after knowledge is elapsed (Dressel & Mayhew, 1954).

As Willingham (2007) asserted one of the elementary yet incompetently met, objective of schooling is to allow students to think unfavorably which consists of investigative both sides of an matter, being open to new affirmations that may refute your ideas, believing that claims be inferred by evidence, observation, induction and deduction and so forth. In researchers' point of view, CT can be defined as mental and cognitive activities which is a subset of three sorts of thinking: reasoning, decision making, judgment and problem solving.

Warnick and Inch (1994) outline CT as: “Including the capability to discover a problem, question or situation; assimilate all the accessible material about it; attain a solution or hypothesis; and rationalize one’s position.” (p. 11)

Based on Arum and Roska (2011): “99 percent of college faculty say that emerging students’ aptitude to think critically is a very significant or crucial area of undergraduate education”. (p. 11)

According to Facione (2007), there are mental and cognitive abilities and talents which can be put at the central of CT comprising: analysis, interpretation, evaluation, inference, self-regulation and explanation. Interpretation deals with observing and asserting the meaning or implication of a detailed situation, evidence, experience, opinions, data, rules and regulations, criteria, process and procedures. Decoding significance, categorization and express and clarifying meanings are the sub skills of interpretation. Investigation can be referred as figuring out the definite and intentional relationship among ideas, concepts, questions, beliefs, events or experiences. Identifying ideas, distinguishing arguments and analyzing them are the subs kills of analysis. Evaluation is to examine the reliability and credibility of statements or evidence based on person’s opinion, situation, and judgment and regulate the logical and rational associations concerning diversified statements in numerous situations. Inference means to differentiate and identify the elements and features to come up to the results, make hypotheses, figure out relevant information and touch the consequence of experiences, data, statements and situations. Querying evidence, speculating choices and come to the conclusions are the subs kills of inference.

Facione (2007) embraces the estimation that Explanation can be described as articulating the consequences of one’s reasoning in a logical and meaningful way and being able to current an overview and a full look at the whole procedures and evidence. The sub skills under explanation are articulating the procedures and consequences, explaining procedures, defending and assistanting the logic and rational behind the subjects.

Facione (2007) also shapes that Self-regulation means directing and observing one’s mental happenings and cognitive abilities and the structures useful in those activities by using different abilities in investigation and evaluation the presentations, making

judgments toward questioning, certifying and confirming the consequences or reasoning.

Improvement of CT skills is usually accepted as a significant feature of undergraduate education. As pointed out by Mason (2007) much of the rhetoric concerning education and its reform rotates round teaching students to reason and question critically. Surveys display that well over 90% of faculty consider CT is one of the primary objectives of higher education (Gardiner, 1994; Sax, Astin, Korn, & Gilmartin, 1999). Main definitions of CT are founded on recognizing detailed capabilities that seem to be connected with critical thinkers and afford general definitions (Dressel & Mayhew, 1954; Ennis, 1987; Facione, 1990; Iowa, 1989; Stein et al., 2010). Even though it is extensively decided that nurturing college students' CT talents is essential, discussion remains about how this can be recognized through educational determinations. Cultivating students' CT skills through instruction has been an extensively accepted methodology in reaching this aim, due to the confidence that thinking skills can be enhanced with instruction that is definitely considered for that resolve (Halpern, 2001). During the past decades, struggles to integrate CT skills into college curriculum have been increasing. Empirical studies have inspected the effects of instructional interventions on college students' CT skills development. Conversely, the consequences have been diverse some studies show that certain interventions are operative.

In today's educational reform, CT seems to be a dominant concept. The notability of this concept in education is recognized by many educators. Schafersman (1991, cited in Birjandi & Bagherkazemi, 2010) points out that all education must highlighting not only 'what to think', but also 'how to think'. Nevertheless, he doubts that most education is busier with transmitting and obtaining knowledge, rather than teaching the students how to consider and appraise information. But by the improved number of disciplines, the strength of learning and teaching techniques to obtain, apprehend and estimate information come to the fore.

Various researches have been done in the area of CT to show its significant function in education. CT is an essential issue which has a straight association with language learning and it is a very important constituent of education in this century. Huitt (1998) states that thinking shows a central character in people's life. He further adds that the programmed toward the information age has changed responsiveness to good

thinking as a chief component of life successes. So, this new tendency has paved the manner for CT to be the core emphasis of education. Incidentally, educationally successful students are not described as persons who memorize realities and learn stable procedures and processes; in its place as persons who can combine their academic knowledge to think critically particularly when they encountered problems or when they are learning something (Chaffee, 1992).

Recent developments in the education area highlight the significance of CT abilities for educational achievement and life. Carr (1990) highlights the importance of teaching higher order thinking abilities and references that students should be taught to think reasonably, compare, analyze and evaluate questions. Commeyras (1989) assumed that applying reasoning to evaluate possible explanations to determine the meaning of the text is essential for students to understand a text. Since reasoning is one of the features of CT, the necessity to apply CT strategies and its straight association to reading comprehension and translation is undoubtedly felt. He explained on the students' need to apply CT strategies as they read a text like clarifying what they mean, supporting their evidence, giving reasons, evaluating reasons, elaborating and so on.

Furthermore, Neilsen (2002) does not accept the manner teachers applied to teach students and mentions: When the teachers always create the questions and sanction the answers, there is little occasion for the learners to improve the critical spirit and to become independent learners (p. 29).

CT has been long observed as an ability for a lifetime of complex alternative which persons have to make in their academic and social lives, personal. In this fast-paced and ever-changing world we live in, CT is not a mere comfort; it has been measured by many researchers a basic survival skill (Facione and Facione, 1996; Wright, 2002; Moon, 2008). Philosophers of education challenge that CT is the essential objective of learning and chiefly essential to higher education (Paul, 1987; Ennis, 1996). In an L2 background, habits in which CT might be understood and educated have become extremely disputed questions for L2 learning scholars and practitioners more lately (Thompson, 2002). A move has happened from performance learning chiefly as rote training to conceptualizing learning as a regularly developing process of discovering, questioning, and reformulating hypotheses (Pennycook, 1994).

CT ability have been attaining consideration in investigation linked to apprentice accomplishment and approach and a dissimilar body of educational exploration has accounted the significance of encouraging higher-order thinking skills and the positive influence of CT on learners' attainment in EFL perspective (among them are Davidson and Dunham, 1997; MacBride and Bonnette, 1995). Input to this conversation is that higher-order thinking abilities improve higher-order learning skills which in turn assist in achieving higher levels of language proficiency (Renner, 1996; cited in Liaw, 2007).

In a related way, a rising body of theoretical and empirical investigation survive in which expression of the relationship of CT abilities with other constructs and facets, like metacognitive skills (Ghanizadeh, 2011) and the affective area (Ghanizadeh and Moafian, 2011). As a result of the successful function of learner's CT skill in educational success and its relationship with aspects which are beneficial for learning, it looks essential to discover the strategies, recourses, and approaches which may lead to its improvement. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) examining discourse to comprehend unknown meanings and to discover the association among discourse, ideology, and power appears to be one of such methods EFL teachers may have at their disposal to better provide learners with a permanent skill in CT.

## **2.5 Studies on Critical Thinking and Second Language Acquisition**

CT (Collins & Onwuegbuzie, 2000; Solon, 2003; Nikoopour et al., 2011) and motivation (Ushida, 2005; Pourhosein Gilakjani, Leong and Saburi 2012) have also been found as two important variables in general educational settings and language learning contexts in particular. Many researchers (Moore, 1995, Tsui, 1998, Giancarlo & Facione, 2001) have described CT as a concept that was demonstrated to serve as an excellent forecaster of educational achievement. Therefore, it is of great benefit for teachers in general and language teachers in particular to be aware of the extent to which their students enjoy CT. CT is also believed to play an important role in the acquisition of language skills in specific, writing and reading (Shaharom Abdullah, 2004; Seung-Ryul Shin, 2002; Stapleton, 2001; Moore, 1995).

Educators have attached great importance to the role of CT in the learning environment. This is because the learners can be more autonomous by developing a reflective thinking toward the issues. Scholars such as Appleby (2006) and Halpern

(2002) believe that there needs to be more studies on the effect the instruction of CT may have in the language classes. Though, there are fewer consensuses over the definition of CT. All the supporters of CT skills have argued that one of the top priorities of educational experts should be the development of CT skills among learners. The importance of providing conditions for the enhancement of learners' higher order thinking skills is reflected in Dewey's (1933) reports, who considers that nurturing reflective thinking have to be at the heart of education (Giancarlo & Facione, 2001). Brookfield (1987) found out that academic systems need to have attempts to "awaken, prompt, nurture and encourage the process of thinking critically and reflectively".

From this view point, CT is specific significance when language education is an essential part of standard educational objectives. A foreign language is consider to encourage students to increase their view point and live in a more diverse society. For instance, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) Committee on CT and the Language Arts describes CT as "a process which stresses an attitude of suspended judgment, incorporates logical inquiry and problem solving, and leads to an evaluative decision or action' (as cited in Tama, 2011). This statement resonates with the previous discussion on CT as a process of reflection on students' own values and beliefs, letting them to identify probable solutions, and make best decisions.

while the long history of CT tradition, there is no single and agreed-upon explanation for exactly what made CT. Dewey (1933), who has known the father of modern CT, described it as: "active, persistent, and careful consideration of a belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds which support it and the further conclusions to which it tends" (p. 9, cited in Fisher, 2001). More recently, Paul (1988) views CT as learning how to ask and answer questions of analysis, synthesis and evaluation and "the ability to reach sound conclusions based on observations and information" (p. 50). A review of the literature on CT adequately demonstrates that the proposed definitions of CT encompass many dimensions. To pose a more consistent definition for CT, the American Philosophical Association undertook a two-year Delphi project and conceptualized CT as purposeful, self-regulatory judgment leading to interpretation, analysis, evaluation and inference (cited in Giancarlo and Facione, 2001). The major influence of the Delphi report resides in its emphasis on disposition toward CT. Facione et al. (1995) contend that any

comprehensive conceptualization of CT focusing solely on skills is deficient in nature; rather, it must incorporate a dispositional component; i.e., the individual's inclination to use CT when needed. In their views, the disposition toward CT is an aspect of intrinsic motivation to solve problems and make decisions by using thinking. In other words, a high degree of disposition toward CT is a reliable guarantee of the application of CT skills. Although most scholars have agreed that CT engages both skills and dispositions, the most common measures and models of CT are skill-based, conceptualizing it as a higher-order thinking skill and pivoting around devising appropriate learning and instruction processes (Frijters et al., 2007). For example, Watson and Glaser (2002), the designers of the world's most widely-used measure of CT, associated it with the following abilities: discriminating among degrees of truth or falsity of inferences; recognizing unstated assumptions in a series of statements; interpreting whether conclusions are warranted or not; determining if conclusions follow from information in given statements, and evaluating arguments as being strong and relevant or weak and irrelevant.

All proponents of CT skills have argued that developing thinking skills must be a compelling priority for educationalists.

The prominence granted to higher-order thinking skills reflected in current approaches to education originates in the writings of John Dewey (1933) who has contended that nurturing reflective thinking must be at the core of education (cited in Giancarlo and Facione, 2001). Brookfield (1987) points out that educational systems should make any endeavor to "awaken, prompt, nurture and encourage the process of thinking critically and reflectively" (p. 11). In a similar vein, Meyers (1986) argues that teachers can foster CT through the activities they assign, the tasks they set, and the feedback they provide. Scholars in the field of higher education contend that CT is a standard of intellectual excellence required for full and constructive participation in academic, individual and social lives of students (Scriven and Paul, 2004).

Likewise, more recently, the tenets pertaining to CT in attaining academic objectives have become a paramount inquiry for EFL and ESL researchers and practitioners. What has emerged from these studies is compatible with the aforementioned contention that CT skills are teachable and can be reinforced via different techniques and activities implemented in the classroom setting. For instance, Dantas-Whitney (2002) indicate that the use of reflective audiotaped journals enhanced ESL university

students' CT. Yeh (2004) studies the effect of a computer simulation program on improving student teachers' reflective thinking. The findings revealed that computer simulation is an effective instrument for teaching general CT skills. Similarly, Liaw (2007) study demonstrates that the implementation of content-based approach promotes EFL learner's CT skills.

In summary, the findings of these studies confirmed Davidson and Dunham (1997) argument that CT skills could be taught as part of EFL instruction. Furthermore, the abovementioned studies conclusively demonstrate the influential role EFL teachers can play in scaffolding activities and procedures which nurture and foster EFL learners' CT abilities. Besides, as Davidson (1998) note, since "part of the English teacher's task is to prepare learners to interact with native speakers who value explicit comment, intelligent criticism, and intellectual assertion" (p. 121), introducing learners to CT is even more essential for L2 teachers than L1 teachers (Davidson, 1998). He believes that "if we do not, our students may well flounder when they are confronted with necessity of thinking critically, especially in an academic setting" (p. 121).

One of the first manners to improve CT in learning is to use the term why in the available topic. To think critically in a critical way is to question every dimension of a subject, from the reliability of the foundation to your own personal conclusions and thoughts (Pollick, 2014). In different people learning to think critically is an active and permanent train. EFL university students learn many exchangeable abilities while following their educations. CT for EFL learners help them interpret information in a manner that might anticipate a desired result and they can select the best course of action. English teachers can integrate CT abilities with their coursework in the form of active learning, where EFL students have chances to train and improve them (West, 2014).

The significant contribution of CT to students' mental and social development has recently been reflected in the ELT context. More specifically, researchers and practitioners in this domain have mainly focused on the way CT skills can be taught and reinforced through different techniques implemented in the classroom. Dantas-Whitney (2002), for example, revealed which the utilization of reflective audiotaped journals improved ESL university learners' CT.

Yeh (2004) examined the influence of a various instruction methods on enhancing learner teachers' reflective thinking. The outcomes exposed that communicative method is a successful tool for teaching standard CT abilities. Additionally, Liaw's (2007) research established that the carrying out of content-based approach develop EFL learner's CT abilities.

The ELT context, however, has documented comparatively few studies focusing on the correlates of CT. Abdi (2012) investigated the association between thinking styles and CT abilities among university learners. Finding revealed a significant relationship between them. Also, the outcomes of regression analysis showed which CT abilities have been significantly predicted by specific thinking styles. That is, learners with the judicial thinking style tend to be involve in evaluative and analytical kind of activities.

In another study, Yaghoubi (2013) investigated the relationship between the psychological constructs of goal orientation (i.e. avoiding dimension of performance goal orientation, learning goal orientation, and proving dimension of performance goal orientation) and CT. Results indicated a constructive correlation between CT and learning goal orientation and a negative association between CT and performance goal orientation.

Alizadeh, Jahandar, and Khodabandehlou (2013) examined the relationship between CT skills of Iranian EFL learners at B.A. level and their selected strategies of listening skill and the impact of gender on them as well. The participants of this study were 120, who majoring English literature or Translation from different classes junior and senior at Guilan Islamic Azad University. Result of this study showed that there was no considerable association between gender and strategies the learners select for their listening development with CT skills. According to the conclusion of the research, the level of CT skill looks to have a significant function in choosing listening strategies.

Barjasteh and Vaseghi (2012) attempted to explore the role of CT ability on EFL learners' reading comprehension efficiency utilizing Bloom's taxonomy. Thus, the function of CT strategies exercising across two language proficiency levels, high and low was considered. Then the difference between females and males concerning their CT was considered. The participants of this study were 240 male and female Iranian EFL students and were examined into two proficiency levels according to the Longman preparation course for TOEFL test. Each proficiency group was separated

into critical and non-critical group. Findings showed that CT abilities considerably influenced EFL learners' reading comprehension performance. However, the effects of CT strategy exercising didn't contrast across different language proficiency levels. Generally, the outcomes offer empirical support for the facilitative influence of CT strategy exercising on reading comprehension performance of EFL learners.

Tabatabaei and Parsafar (2012) considered impact of self-directed learning on CT of Iranian EFL student. For this purpose, after proficiency test performance, 60 female undergraduate participants have been chosen and then have been accidentally provided to the two homogeneous control and experimental groups. The authorized researcher-made questionnaire was performed as the pre-test. Then, a learning package containing materials regarding to self-directed learning was recommended to the experimental group. Later, this questionnaire has been utilized once more as the post-test. Eventual, in order to identify the impact of self-directed learning on CT in as time passes, a late post-test has been implemented. The computerized statistical interpretation of the finding revealed that teaching self-directed learning contribute to the improvement of the learners' CT. Suggestions of the outcomes have been discussed for curriculum developers, language teachers and learners.

Mirzai (2008) tried to investigate the association between CT and lexical inferencing of Iranian EFL students. The participants of the study were 130 male and female learners from one language learning institute. The instruments were a TOEFL test and Peter Honey CT questionnaire encompassing 30 statement. The outcomes of the research indicated that those learners who have high CT skill outperformed the ones with low CT skill in lexical inferencing.

NourMohammadi, Hedari and DehghanNiry (2012) studied the affiliation between CT skill and reading strategies utilized by Iranian EFL students. The participants of this research have been 75 EFL senior learners (35 males and 40 females) mainly from English Literature and English Translation at the University of Sistan and Baluchestan in Iran. For this purpose, two questionnaires have been applied to the participants: a CT questionnaire and a reading strategy questionnaire. Outcomes of the research indicated that the most frequently utilize reading strategy was meta-cognitive strategy. Additionally, the statistical investigates revealed a low constructive considerable relationship between students "CT ability and their overall use of reading strategies. The participants" CT ability moreover related positively with their use of each of

cognitive, meta-cognitive, and compensation strategies. An independent-samples t-test has been administered to investigate the difference between CT skill of males and females and the outcomes indicated a considerable difference between the male and the female learners in their CT; the males “CT ability was higher than that of females”.

Hashemi and Ghanizadeh (2012) claim the effect of critical discourse analysis (CDA) on TEFL learners’ CT (CT) skill in Reading Journalistic Texts classes. For this aim, the research performed an experimental design with 24 participants in the control group and 29 participants in the experimental group. The consequences of a pretest revealed that the participants of the two groups have been homogenous for the purpose of their proficiency level as well as their CT skill. The participants in the experimental group have been instructed to critically analyze teacher-distributed articles and devise follow-up presentations according to CDA. The outcomes of the posttest revealed that CDA has a positive and considerable impact on students’ CT skill. CDA has also shown to have the highest effect on two factors of CT, analysis and identifying unspecified assumption. The discussion and conclusions of the study are additionally provided with reference to the former results. This outcomes has indicated that the current research is, nevertheless, limited in a number of ways. First, the participants were selected based on existing sampling. Second, in this research random assignment requirement could not be observed, so the researchers utilized intact groups design. Of course, the outcomes of the pretest confirmed that the two groups were homogenous with respect to their language proficiency and CT skills. Furthermore, as with many experimental researches, this research presented more input to the experimental group and deprived the control group of a beneficial technique. The researchers, however, were fully aware of this ethical issue. Therefore, they requested other teachers who had taught the same course during previous semesters whether they had any structured instruction on CDA.

Niu, Behar-horenstein, and Garvan (2013) consider that CT skills are a significant activity of higher education. Colleges and universities have created different educational interventions to increase learners’ CT ability. Empirical researches have generated unpredictable outcomes regarding to the impact of such interventions. This meta-analysis provide a synthesis of empirical researches designed to develop measurable changes in learners’ CT ability utilizing instructional interventions.

Outcomes confirmed statistically considerable but small average effect size and evidence of heterogeneity between researches. Hierarchical linear model was adopted to discover potential predictors of the variance across effect sizes. Finding revealed that learner discipline and treatment length clarified part of the variability among treatment impacts. Additionally, outcomes indicated that this meta-analysis of empirical researches on teaching CT in college generated the outcome that, over all, CT teaching interventions are effective and contribute to development in learners' CT abilities.

This is a significant assumption for more attempt in improving CT in college. One can determine that it is probable to develop CT abilities among college learners through classroom teaching. While, we have to moreover identify that the magnitude of the average influence of CT teaching in college is small. The main question which is remaining to be replied is how can we increase the teaching as well as provide further satisfying consequences? To discover why some behaviors are more effective than others and to progress teaching techniques consequently, more empirical data are required to discover elements that impact the efficiency of teaching CT. The distinct behavior effects for different learners groups recommend that who is learning matters. This means that when creating teaching interventions for CT in college, educators have to consider the qualities of the students instead of fitting the same intervention to students who differ in discipline, academic level, age, and other essential factors. To achieve this, more study is still required in investigating how students learn and gain from instructional interventions of CT. Actually after that can customized teaching techniques for diverse students be designed. In additional, qualitative evaluations concentrating on theoretical and methodological diversity of empirical researches are required to emphasize on diverse approaches to investigate CT and to bring perception into theoretical complexities of the study area. Whereas our quantitative evaluation exposes the efficiency of teaching CT to college students, much remains to be discovered about qualitative factors of the performance of the interventions.

Pitt, Powis, Jones, and Hunter (2014) in their research investigated that “the influence of CT skills on performance and progression in a pre-registration nursing program” examined the significance of improving CT abilities in preregistration nursing students is known universal. However, there has been restricted examination of how learners' CT ability scores on entry to pre-registration nursing education effect their

academic and clinical implementation and development. Aim: The goal of this research was to: i) explain entry and exit CT scores of nursing students enrolled in a three year bachelor of nursing program in Australia in contrast to norm scores; ii) discover entry CT scores in association to demographic features, learners' implementation and development. Their results indicate that there was a considerable association between CT scores, academic implementation and students' risk of failing, particularly in the first semester of study. CT scores were predictive of program conclusion within three years. Enhance in CT scores from entry to exit was important for the 28 students measured. In contrast to norm scores, entry level CT scores were meaningfully lower, but exit scores were comparable. CT scores had no important association to clinical performance.

Saadé et al. (2012) continue that CT in E-learning environments is one of the main objectives of higher education in today's information technology permitted classroom is to make learners more active in the learning procedure. The anticipated consequence of this enhanced IT-facilitated student involvement is to raise significant ability like CT utilized in both academia and workplace situations. CT ability requires the skill of mental procedures of discernment, analysis and evaluation to attain a logical understanding. CT in the classroom in order to in the workplace is a crucial theme. Nevertheless, with the dramatic growth of IT usage the mechanisms by which CT is raised and applied has changed. This article provides the work and outcomes of CT in a virtual learning setting. Researchers consequently provide a web-based course and they measure in which parts of the course, and to what extent, CT was apparent to happen. The course include two groups of learning modules specifically resources and interactive components. CT was measured subjectively utilizing the ART scale. Outcomes show the importance of "interactivity" in what students observed to be critical-thinking-oriented versus online content as a resource. Outcomes and chances that virtual environments provide to foster CT are argued.

Mahapoonyanont (2012) claim that the causal model of some aspect affecting CT skills. The study processes include two stages as: the first stage is the study on the aspects associated to the CT skills of high school students by applying the meta-analysis, the second stage is the improvement and the confirmation of the causal model of aspects that affect the CT of students in the academies of basic education with the empirical data. The researcher uses the results of the first stage of study as

the variables for the second stage study. The research results presented some aspects that affect the CT skills of learners in the academies of basic education. Conclusion indicate The consequences of the path analysis for the relationship model of variables affecting CT abilities can be clarified as follows: the variables with direct impact on CT abilities ordered by effect size from large to small were reading ability (TE = 0.46), teacher functions in organizing student-centered learning (TE = 0.35), and democratic child-rearing (TE = 0.11).

Pucker, Trobec and Žvanut (2014) continue that, the aim of information communication technology based approach for the attainment of CT abilities was to make and test an approach which permits specific and fast acquisition of CT abilities by utilizing information and communication technology. Design: A mixture of qualitative and quantitative study design was applied. The research involved a quasi-experiment (phases 1–3): (1) pre-test discussion board, (2) use of e-contents according to the current approach, and (3) post-test discussion board. Results indicate Qualitative analysis of the discussion boards indicated a considerable ( $p < 0.001$ ) development in the percentage of posts (12.2%) for which the attitudes and results of the participants were justified with valid discussions. The survey consequences specified that participants perceived the e-contents according to the current approach as beneficial, and that they developed their CT abilities.

Sheikhi (2009) directed a research study which exposed the autonomy is meaningfully associated to CT. The learners' CT associated with their reading comprehension. The conclusions similarly discovered a strong association between autonomy and reading comprehension. Mirzai (2008) examined the association between CT and lexical inferencing of Iranian EFL learners. He determined high CT learners outperformed the low CT ones in lexical inferencing.

In addition to discover the CT correlation with the other wings of science, Khamesian (2008) tried to discover the association between CT abilities and writing in EFL Engineering students. Comparative analysis specifies that there is a meaningful dissimilarity between the males and the females in their expertise on CT abilities, but students cannot enhance CT skills ability in their writing assignment meaningfully. Moreover, there is no considerable association between the CT abilities preferred by the teacher ad applied by learners in their exams. Khamesian (2008) also establish the association between utilizing CT abilities and development in the students' grammar.

It can be established that implementing CT abilities to all areas of teaching and learning particularly inferential reading comprehension consequences in learners' development.

## **2.6 Studies on Critical Thinking, Intercultural Language Education, and General Education**

One possibility is to apply an intercultural approach, in which a 'Self' encounters an 'Other', and a consideration of 'the difference' between them emerges. Byram (1997a, 1997b), Risager (2007), and Guilherme (2002) have taken intercultural communicative competence (ICC) as a point of departure for enhancing critical cultural consciousness, which, they discuss, can be considered a reasonable objective for foreign language education. The learning objective of ICC has extended from linguistic learning to containing intercultural learning that includes CT. As Byram stated, "Only through critical cultural awareness can FLT claim to contribute to learner's general education and development" (1997a, p. 63).

Over the past two decades, such ideas have progressively influenced mainstream language education in Western societies, as observed, for instance, in the Council of Europe report on language learning (Byram, Zarate & Neuner, 1997c, p. 14 -15) and the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning (ACTFL, 1996). These national and supranational guidelines pursue to increase the capability of language learners to be open to other cultures and to reflect critically about cultural dissimilarity, so as to act as intermediaries in cross-cultural communications. In Australia, too, the National Statement for Languages Education in Australian Schools (2005) mentions that language abilities, in addition to cultural sensitivity, will be the exchange of a new world order. This statement more particularly mentions that through inter-cultural language learning, learners should be able to "...further develop their cognitive skills through thinking critically and analytically solving problems, and making connections in their learning." (ibid, p.3)

It is obvious that intercultural competence that has been improved through language learning is valued and encouraged, as it initiates critical reflection upon difference. The trends evident in Western curricular documents on language education do not really have any parallel in Taiwan, although researches which investigate the communication between CT and foreign language education for Asian students in

specific are increasing (Barnawi, 2011; Chiu, 2009; Liaw, 2007; Stapleton, 2001). Though, as mentioned above, there is often a theory that, Confucius' precepts notwithstanding, CT as created by Western curricular documents is not part of the learning repertoire of students from collectivist societies. Countries with Confucian heritage culture like China, Japan, and Taiwan are believed to share similar cultural traits, for instance, refusing struggles and being obedient and respecting hierarchy (Ho and Crookall, 1995). Asian students, for instance, are less willing to express thoughts critically and to openly reflect on their values and opinions. In the literature, two stereotypes are often presented of Far Eastern students. First, they are observed as frequently repetition learners who value knowledge increased through memorization (e.g., Cortazzi & Jin, 1997; Sowden, 2005). Second, they are observed as commonly deficient in the skill to think critically, and they appreciate collective values rather than individual initiative (e.g., Atkinson, 1997; as cited in Sowden, 2005).

Regardless of the fact that how standardized testing can assess CT as a different criterion, these concerns regarding benchmarked proficiency scores never directly address the notions of intercultural communicative competence or CT which have recently been increased in pedagogical debates about universal citizenship (e.g., Guilherme, 2002). Paul (1983) postulated that CT can be improved and confirmed in a 'weak' sense and a 'strong' sense. The former considers that CT can be "taught as a battery of atomic technical skills independent of egocentric beliefs and commitments" (p.3) while the latter encourages students to be capable to reflect, analysis, interact and engage with others and comprehend the dissimilarity and contradictions. The 'strong' sense anticipates learners to be more loyal to CT in real-life circumstances, that is, they would approach Barnett's ideal of 'critical being' already stated.

## **2.7 Writing**

Based on Rivers (1981) a specific collection of structure and vocabulary for expression of individual meaning is writing. She observes writing from two viewpoints, as a main ability and as a service ability. Gorman (1981) is similarly in the same line when he considers that composition encompasses the creation and organization of written sentences in a way suitable to the aim of the writer, the person or persons addressed and the role of what is written.

Writing is commonly believed to be a complex activity that needs numerous abilities which teachers have not yet arise with a decided technique of teaching. Widdowson (1983) studies writing as an interactive procedure and as a communicative activity of negotiation. Eventually, Zamel (1987) notifies of the complex, recursive and nonlinear nature of composing.

Seeing these diverse conceptualizations, one might determine two main lines of thinking about writing. Based on some descriptions, the focus is on the creation: the noticeable result which present us with the manifestation of the capability to interconnect by the writer, this capability, without a doubt, is the consequence of activating the knowledge of vocabulary, grammar and spelling. On the other hand, other descriptions highlight the "process". It looks that the procedure which guide writers to produce notions, establish them into a coherent sequence and put them on paper is declared to be the main aspect influencing teaching of writing skill. The two lines of thinking as stated above have contributed to two concepts or patterns in teaching writing in ESL/EFL settings: Writing as a product and writing as a Process.

### **2.7.1 Second/Foreign Language Writing**

Writing abilities and strategies are among the most significant abilities and strategies that second language learners require to improve. Therefore, the aptitude to teach writing has been vital to the expertise of a well-trained teacher (Hyland, 2003). Though the requirements and needs of learning the writing ability from the learners' side and methods to teaching it from the teachers' side have enhanced significantly, not as numerous notionally well-supported and practically suitable resources as essential have been improved and as Hyland (2003) reminds us teachers are frequently left to their own resources in the classroom.

On the significance of teaching/learning second/foreign language writing, Brown (2003) declares that not all native speakers of any language are essentially good writers in their own mother language.

Creating a well-organized piece of written language needs knowledge and abilities of composing thoughts in a reasonable coherent manner that not all speakers of a language are prepared with.

Brown asks us to consider the importance of the area where he writes:

"Every educated child in developed countries learns the rudiments of writing in his or her native language, but very few learn to express themselves clearly with logical, well developed organization that accomplishes an intended purpose. And yet we expect second language learners to write coherent essays with artfully chosen rhetorical and discourse devices!" (p 218).

So as to have an improved comprehending of L2 writing circumstances in ESL/EFL education it appears essential to investigate its theoretical background in addition to the significant study conducted. Initially, the two pretty distinctive theories of second language writing i.e. *writing as a product* vs. *writing as a process*, are presented and then some related study conducted in the area are reviewed. This is followed by more recent improvements in the discipline.

### **2.7.2 Writing as a Product**

Formerly, the approach to writing was one of drill or skill. Teachers drilled the numerous grammar shapes anticipating learners to improve the ability required to interact via written message. Both teachers and learners concentrated their consideration on the accurate use of the drilled grammar shapes. As Atwell (1985) mentioned, all writing was focused to the teacher to check the grammar and little attention or significance was involved to the content that was established.

Based on the fundamental principles of this orientation writing is observed as "a coherent arrangement of words, clauses, and sentences, structured according to a system of rules" (Hyland2003: 3). the core ideas of concern are formal text elements or grammatical characteristics of texts.

Writing as a product is an orientation towards the ability in which vocabulary selections, syntactic patterns, and cohesive strategies are taken in consideration as the building blocks of texts. Hence, learning to write in a foreign or second language mostly includes mastery over these linguistic objects. This orientation has been attributed to structural linguistics and the behaviorist learning theories of second language teaching that were dominant in the 1960s (Silva, 1990a). "Learning to write in a second language is seen as an exercise in habit formation. The writer is simply a manipulator of previously learned language structures... [And]...the text becomes a collection of sentence patterns and vocabulary items- a linguistic artefact, a vehicle for language practice" (Silva, 1990a: 13).

Within this philosophy of writing a highlighting on language structures forms the foundation for writing teaching with a four-stage procedure. These stages as defined by Hyland are as the followings:

- 1. Familiarization:** students are taught specific grammar and vocabulary, frequently within a text.
- 2. Controlled writing:** students manipulate stable patterns, commonly from substitution tables.
- 3. Guided writing:** students imitate model texts.
- 4. Free writing:** students apply the patterns they have improved to write an essay, letter, and so forth.

Teachers applying these organized stages typically employ "slot and filler" framework in which sentences with dissimilar meanings can be produced by changing the words in the slots. Writing classes include controlled activities through directed compositions where learners are provided short texts and requested to transform tenses or personal pronouns, fill in gaps, complete sentences, and complete other exercises that emphasis students on attaining accuracy and avoiding errors. According to these strategies, Hamp-Lyons and Heasley (1987) organized several substitution tables in which specific linguistic patterns are requested to work out by the learners by which they can produce risk-free sentences (Hyland, cf.) .

While this approach to teaching and learning second language writing has been applied extensively in ESL/EFL environments, two central weaknesses have been recognized within it. The first one is that the patterns and structures to be worked out in class sessions are typically designated by teachers or materials developers based on their own insight, interests and preferences not according to the investigates of the students' requirements and/or real texts created for real circumstances. This may cause some kind of misunderstanding for the learners when they need to write in a new circumstances with an unexperienced subject.

### **2.7.3 Writing as a Process**

In 1980, Donovan and McClelland seen that there is a weak association between grammar teaching and writing skill. Thus, they called for a new orientation toward composition. Later writing experts recommended a dissimilarity between the procedure of writing and written product. Their argument has been that knowledge of

grammar is not appropriate and if the teacher wants to increase the product, s/he has to assist the students in the manners that will allow them to develop the procedure they go through to produce that product. Zamel (1983: 165) supports this situation when she states, "having recognized that the investigation of students' written products tells us very little about their instructional needs, researchers are now exploring writing behaviors, convinced that by studying and understanding the process of composing, we can gain insight into how to teach it". Somewhere else she states that writing includes an endless effort to determine what it is that one wants to say (Zamel 1982).

Conner (1987), in an effort to define the improvements attained in the 1980s in writing education, declared that the process-centered pattern, emphasizes on writing procedures; teaches strategies for creation and discovery; considers audience, aim and context of writing; highlights reclusiveness in writing procedure; and differentiates between goals and modes of discourse. Connor believes that these analyses which she calls knowledge-based or process oriented text analyses emphasis on the writer's causes for choosing ideas and on how they are provided, rather than on the surface-level structures of the language.

Zamel (1987), in support of the applicability of visions taken from process studies, presents us with a diversity of methods applied in process studies containing of protocol analysis, interviews, and surveys. Moreover, she claims that they have all exposed the complex, recursive, and nonlinear nature of composing and thus challenged both methodology in composition research and formerly held concepts regarding the teaching of writing.

On an explanation of the extensively recognized model of "writing as a process" Flower and Hayes (1981) describe the original context with three correlated steps of *planning*, *writing*, and *reviewing*. This basic premise of the model was then improved by other scholars like Zamel (1983), Silva (1990), Hinkel (2003), and Hyland (2003). A process model of writing teaching with the same recursive non-linear characteristic as recommended by Zamel was improved by Hyland. The model comprises of 10 steps from 'selection' of topic by teacher or students and finishes with the 'follow-up tasks' for the aim of addressing students' weaknesses.

ESL/EFL writing teachers who adopt a process model like the one provided here play the role of students' guide while they are acting in an investigative range of activities. Teachers refuse a highlighting on form to help the learners improve strategies for writing, reviewing, and editing. To do so they formulate pre-writing activities to produce thoughts regarding delay surface corrections until the final editing, content and structure, encourage brainstorming and outlining, require multiple drafts, give extensive feedback, seek text level revisions, and facilitate peer responses (Raimes, 1992).

One of the most significant function of the teacher in this model is fulfilled when they provide their reaction to the students' submitted drafts, the answer to writing. Hyland takes in consideration this activity as a priority of teachers to improve their students' metacognitive consciousness of their procedures, their skill to reflect on the strategies they apply to write. Hyland (2003: 12) says:

"A response is potentially one of the most influential texts in a process writing class, and the point at which the teacher's intervention is most obvious and perhaps most crucial. Not only does this individual attention play an important part in motivating learners, it is also the point at which overt correction and explicit language teaching are most likely to occur. Response is crucial in assisting learners to move through the stages of the writing process and various means of providing feedback are used, including teacher-student conferences, peer response, audiotaped feedback, and reformulation".

While teachers' reaction on the students' writing activities have been recognized by most scholars and specialists of the field, the core emphasis of consideration in their reactions and corrections has been a point of controversy. Many believe that grammatical error corrections are neither essential nor supportive. Truscott (1996), for instance, discusses that grammar correction in L2 writing classes should be abandoned since it is ineffective with no motivating sense for the learners. He even goes more and concludes that grammar correction has destructive impacts and also rejects numerous opinions formerly recommended in favor of grammar correction.

Hyland (2003) analyzes the process context on two central grounds. First, he declares that although significant research into writing processes has been accomplished so far, no widespread notion of how learners go about a writing task or how they learn to

write has been attained. Knowledge of instigator with the complexity of planning and editing activities, the effect of task, and the value of investigative what writers really accomplish when they write has been considered as a main component of the writing process which would lead to the manner we teach. The problem, nevertheless, is that "process models are hampered by small-scale, often contradictory studies and the difficulties of getting inside writers' heads to report unconscious processing" (2003: 12). It is considered by the experts that these models will not tell us why writers make specific selections or how they actually make the cognitive transition to a knowledge transforming model.

The next aspect that Hyland point out is the overemphasis that process models create on "the cognitive relationship between the writer and the writer's internal world" (Swales, 1990: 220).

The consequences of this overemphasis based on Hyland is that the process models not able to provide any kind of understandable viewpoint toward the social nature of writing or toward the function of language and text organization in useful written interaction. ESL/EFL learners require understandable guidelines concerning how to generate the various sort of texts they must write and encouraging them to make their own meanings and discover their own text shapes does not offer them with these guidelines. Due to these disadvantages and the notion that process theories alone are not able to help us to confidently advice students on their writing, one may think of considering (applying) more than a single approach.

#### **2.7.4 Teaching and Learning Second Language Writing**

This section argues two matters with respect to instruction and learning a second/foreign language writing; the problems faced by second language writers and successful teacher reaction regarding student writing.

##### **2.7.4.1 Difficulties of Second Language Writers**

Numerous L2 student find writing problematic. They not only must take into account what to write regarding a topic, but also conflict to select the right terms and grammatical constructions when they write in English.

Nevertheless, writing in a L1 is not always an easy activity: it needs that native speakers apply several abilities and information regarding effective writing. Grabe and Kaplan (1996) mention that writing is problematic for both LI and L2 learners:

according to the difference between spoken and written language, they claim that writing skills are not naturally developed but culturally transmitted whether in schools or in other educational institutions and environments. They describe writing as "a set of skills which must be practiced and learned through experience" (p 6). They describe that ESL learner's conflict in writing not only due to absence of writing proficiency in English, but also due to lack of the necessary abilities that need aware endeavor and practice.

Leki (1992) declares that writing in a L2 obviously enhances the writer's cognitive load. L2 student writers are still in the procedure of learning the English language itself, whereas similarly learning about the American culture. The problem of differentiating between what is related and what is not becomes even better when the writer is not a native speaker and member of this culture (p. 4).

L2 learner writers experience problems caused by linguistic and rhetorical dissimilarities between their L1 and the target language. Silva (1993) examined 72 empirical researches comparing the writing of English native speakers and that of L2 students and establish that L1 and L2 writers display dissimilarities in writing strategies, rhetorical patterns and linguistic characteristics. He establish that L2 writings were considerably less effective because of some noticeable dissimilarities in the composing procedures of planning, transcribing (producing written texts) and reviewing. L2 writers did less planning, and conflict further to set objectives and produce and establish writing material. They reviewed their written texts less, edited more with greater struggle and were less able to edit directly. The dissimilarities in the characteristics of L1 and L2 written texts were establish in terms of fluency, accuracy, quality, and structure. L2 writers' texts were less fluent, less accurate, less effective and simpler in structure. Silva (1993), hence, states that writing teachers required to support student writers by being sensitive to sociocultural, rhetorical, and linguistic differences found in their writing and offer them with chances to become accustomed with English writing patterns.

Korean student writers also faced problems produced by the rhetorical dissimilarities between Korean and English writing patterns. Jung (2006) studied former study on Korean rhetoric and examined texts written by both Koreans and Americans in illustration of contrastive rhetoric. She recommends that it's necessary for teachers to teach EFL learners cultural dissimilarities in class that can explain the learners to the

target discourse. Especially in the Korean environment, because Korean learners do not have straight contact to the target cultures, English teachers can support them build cultural schemata in class by presenting dissimilar cultural anticipations. A research by Choi (1988) reports the need of teaching rhetorical dissimilarities to EFL students. She examined the text construction of Korean speakers' argumentative writing in English, compared with argumentative writing in Korean accomplished by native Korean speakers in addition to argumentative writing in English accomplished by native English speakers. She established that the construction of the English argumentative essays of native English speakers is frequently in the pattern of claim + justification + conclusion whereas no one pattern signifies the Korean native speakers' writing in either Korean or in English. Furthermore, she also established that Korean students' essays in English are structurally more linear than their essays in Korean, supposing that their writing might have been affected by English rhetoric over the years of studying in America.

Korean EFL learners who are not exposed to English rhetoric could belong to "eye learners" as specified by Reid (2006). Reid divides language learners into two different classifications: eye learners and ear learners. Eye learners are good at reading English than listening and speaking, because they learn mostly through their eyes also better at grammatical rules of English and Nonetheless, they have restricted information of U.S. culture and academic rhetorical patterns On the other hand, ear learners have learned English through their ears and gone through trial and error of English as a part of their daily lives. Ear learners typically have proficient oral language abilities, but conflict with structural rules of English showing low accuracy in their academic writing.

#### **2.7.4.2 Teacher Feedback on Student Writing**

Presenting effective feedback to ESL learners is maybe a challenging and significant activity for writing teachers. Most of the learners have this mentality that teacher reaction on their drafts is supportive and are interested to make use of it to develop their writing (Ferris, 2002). Straub (1997) studies college student writers' opinions about their teachers' written notes on their papers. The data presented that learners are similarly involved in getting reactions on content, aim and organization of their writing as on sentence structure, wording and correctness. The students also would

rather to comments with detailed descriptions about what to accomplish to make developments.

Similarly, Saito (1994) examines ESL students' preferences for teacher reaction and their strategies for controlling reaction on their written work. They discovered that learners preferred teacher feedback (teacher correction with notes, error identification, commentary, teacher student's conferencing) to peer feedback and self-correction. The students applied dissimilar plans for controlling feedback relying on the kind of feedback each teacher provide on their paper. When they received corrected feedback on their writing, they simply followed the corrected shapes rather than creating a lot of attempts for their correction. Nonetheless, when they only received signs leading them to create corrections on their own, they were encouraged to correct errors and edit their papers. Saito, hence, recommends that ESL teachers should clearly state the objective of their reaction, the strategies that learners could apply for controlling the reaction, and the benefits that students would derive.

The significance of clearly stated feedback is highlighted by Leki (1992) who mention that learners occasionally reject or disregard teachers' written comments. Some of the causes for this are as follows: students are sometimes not sure about what the teacher comments mean; the teacher's handwriting could be hard to read; sometimes the teacher notes seem inappropriate to the students.

Likewise, Hyland and Hyland (2001) discuss that teacher reaction can occasionally be difficult since learners frequently fail to comprehend their teachers' indirect notes. Their research presents a text investigation of the teacher's written reaction provided for ESL learners by its roles as praise, criticism, or recommendations. They discover teacher's interests to apply mitigation strategies that soften the criticisms and recommendations on student writing with the use of hedges, question forms, personal opinions. Although they identify the significance of such mitigation strategies to minimize the force of criticisms and enhance effective teacher-student associations, they state that being too indirect can contribute to students' incomprehension and miscommunication.

To make use of teacher reaction efficiently, students required to take an active function in editing their writing. Chi (1999) looks into the writing revision strategies applied by Taiwanese English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) college students. The

participants edited their drafts according to written and oral teacher feedback. The data shown that the learners went through the following three revision strategies: *revising as submission* in which students passively accept teacher feedback under the control of authority, *revising as meaning-negotiation* in which learners tend to converse with their teacher trying to make sense of teacher notes and *revising as reposition* in which students make decisions on the teacher's notes or assess the teacher's critical views on their writing. The consequences indicate that the students as critical thinkers take a critical stance to justify, negotiate, and even challenge teacher notes.

This study supports that student correction with teacher reaction is a social-cognitive procedure, and that students required to take responsibility for judging teacher's notes to be able to edit their writing confidently.

Also teacher's written feedback, researchers suggest teacher-student conferences as an effective technique of direct teacher reaction (Raimes 1983, Zamel 1985, Reid 1993). When the teacher and the student work together face-to-face, dynamic negotiation of meaning is most likely to happen (Zamel 1985, p. 97). The face-to-face conferences permit the learners to address their own problems and needs (Reid 1993).

Bichener, Young, and Cameron (2005) exposed there is a clear benefit in applying one-on-one discussions to develop students' accuracy in writing. They presented three kinds of reaction: direct, explicit written feedback along with student-teacher writing conferences; direct, explicit written feedback only; no corrective reaction to the 53 adult student take part on three kinds of errors; prepositions, the past simple tense, and the definite article. They established that the mixture of direct, explicit written feedback and one-on-one conferences had a meaningfully better influence than direct written reaction alone on development of accuracy performance in the use of the past simple tense and the definite article which are rule-governed linguistic features.

Furthermore, as the effective procedure of communication between teachers and students, Goldstein (2004) presents numerous methods of presenting effective teacher reaction. She discusses that teachers and students by communicating their aims, needs difficulties and successes can work together better. To discover how to suggest effective teacher reaction, she provided the variances between appropriation and useful intervention. Based on Goldstein: 1. ignoring a student's goal and endeavoring

to change the goal is appropriation while presenting students where they are not attaining their goal is useful intervention; 2. asking students to change a position or a point of view is appropriation while recommending students read regarding a dissimilar opinion or interview others with a dissimilar opinion is useful intervention; 3. correcting sentences without asking learners regarding their expected meaning risks appropriation while asking students regarding their intended meaning to help them discover the suitable language is useful intervention (p68).

Nonetheless, teacher reaction does not have to be always obvious to help students self-edit. Ferris and Roberts (2001) observed how obvious error reaction can help students' self-editing. They asked 72 university ESL learners with opposing skills to self-edit their texts across three reaction circumstances: (1) marking errors with codes from five dissimilar error classifications; (2) emphasizing errors in the same five classifications, but not marking or classification them; (3) no reaction at all. The consequences indicated that students who received reaction were more successful at self-editing than the students who did not receive any reaction, but whether to mark errors applying the codes or not did not make important variances in the consequences. Hence, in contrast with

Bichener, Young, and Cameron (2005)'s research, their findings is that less clear reaction is as useful as clear reaction correcting errors with the codes by error type.

Though presenting two-way reaction is recognized to be effective and useful to learner's writers, grammar correction is a mutual attention among EFL teachers. Furneaux, Paran, and Fairfax (2007) observed the reaction practices of 110 EFL teachers from five different countries; Cyprus, France, Korea, Spain, and Thailand. After they all presented feedback on the same student essay, the feedback was examined on two axes: the teacher stance when they give reaction, and the emphasis of their reaction. They discovered that most teachers took their attitude as language teachers, rather than as readers of communication, and concentrated mostly on grammar in their reaction. Among the five functions of this study (Provider, Initiator, Supporter, Adviser, Suggester), they generally considered them as a Provider, providing the correct forms for the learner, and secondly as an Initiator, representing errors to the students but expecting the student to correct the errors.

In the Korean EFL setting to be more particular, in teaching English writing teachers encounter more difficulties. Four main difficulties of writing education in Korea which prohibits Korean EFL learners from reaching their full potential has been discussed by Kim and Kim (2005): 1. Giving limited teacher feedback. 2. Overemphasis on grammatical forms. 3. Excessive focus on the final product. 4. Overlooking writing genres across the curriculum. To overcome these difficulties, they recommend that it's necessary for writing teachers to balance form and meaning to help students to interact successfully with the target language, present framework writing instruction for learners to communicate with a teacher and other learners whereas improving writing strategies, and offer genre-specific writing courses to meet students' different writing objectives. To stop teachers from being overwhelmed by presenting written reaction to every learner in big Korean classes, they encourage teachers to use substitute forms of reaction: peer feedback, in-class grammar instruction regarding Korean students' mutual writing problems in English, and teacher-student conferencing that can increase the restrictions of one-way written reaction.

### **2.7.5 Integrative Theory of Writing**

Two main lines of thinking concerning writing have been explained on up to now. These two were to some amount complementary. It looks that both are extremes. some investigators discuss for the separation of these studies, on the one hand and in another hand, others have articulated numerous supportive associations between procedure and product study and have called for theories of writing which integrate these in which the "overarching process" is the supportive enterprise where by writers and readers create meanings together.

Zamel (1983) does not reject the probability of comprehending the process from product, but she considers that product researches tell us little regarding essential procedures that writers go through while producing a piece of writing. In contrast, Connor (1987) views the point quite differently.

In her paper; while trying to create a cooperation between process and product researches, she indicates that numerous approaches to the explanation and assessment of writing products consider the process as that writers go through in creating a text. Furthermore, she establishes that whole inferences about writer's composing

processes essentially depend upon acceptable analysis of written products. Connor's idea contribute to new tendency in writing theory which is an integration of the process and product theories. Connor (1987), directing a research on the two patterns, called for the integration of the theories. She promoted that this theory would present a better descriptive power, when she specified, "an integrative theory enables us to explain the apparent paradox in some process researches. She further added while product theories have been severely condemned by some composition theorists, explanation of writing process have been mainly attained by analyzing classification of different kinds of products".

Similarly significant for the argument on behalf of an integrated theory of process and product in ESL, Raimes (1985) suggested that we have to take into count the necessity to join to product in addition to process. She recommended that our learners should be taught not only empirical devices to concentrate on meaning, but also empirical devices to emphasis on verbal and linguistic features.

In a Japanese EFL context the idea of integrating the two orientations was pursued by Kamimura (2000). In her research on examining whether product-oriented knowledge and composing process abilities are both essential or whether either one of the two is enough in order for EFL students to become experienced writers in EFL, she asked her study subjects to write an argumentative essay . After that the participants were provided a retrospective questionnaire created to investigate their composing procedure strategies. They also took a form-based test which evaluated their knowledge of English academic texts. The learners were categorized into two groups, skilled and unskilled, based on the holistic scores given to their essays. The two groups were compared in terms of the behaviours exposed in the questionnaire and the scores on the test. The consequences revealed that the skilled writers influenced more developed knowledge of formal aspects of English academic writing in addition to more sophisticated composing procedure strategies. It was also explained that both the form-oriented knowledge and process-oriented skills are essential to role as successful EFL writers. Kamimura accomplishes that L2 writing instruction should maintain a balance between process and product orientations to encounter the requirements of numerous L2 writers who come from non-English discourse communities.

## **2.7.6 Approaches to Teaching L2 Writing**

Raimes (1991), in her short-term ancient survey of methods to L2 writing teaching, postulates that four approaches have been widely applied in the field: "focus on form", "focus on the writer", "focus on content", and "focus on the reader".

### **2.7.6.1 Focus on Form**

In the approach termed as "focus on form", developed in the 1960s, the verbal and linguistic form of the text is the central focus. Since the audio-lingual method was the dominant approach to instruction in those years, to highlight oral patterns of the language writing served a subservient function. In such a context, writing has taken the form of sentence drills: fill-ins, completions, substitutions, and transformations.

Kaplan's significant 1966 paper presented the notion of contrastive rhetoric and this contributed a theoretical basis for compensatory drills that recommend exercise in identifying and applying illustrations, topic sentences, and examples. Hyland (2003) observes that the main principle in this approach is to connect constructions to meanings, that is, to make language apply a criterion for teaching entities and calls this orientation a "functional approach". The method is similar to product-oriented models because paragraphs are taken in to count as syntactic entities composed of numerous sentences in which writers can fit specific functional components into provided slots. Components of paragraphs like Introduction - Body - Conclusion are observed as structural units and text kinds like narration, explanation, and exposition are defined as organizational patterns.

In this approach writing classes are planned and directed in such a manner as to teach the learners how to arrange roles into a structural pattern and which structures explain each role.

Teachers who use this approach to L2 writing instruction are targeting at making their students to create effective paragraphs through the formation of topic sentences, supporting sentences, and transitions, and to improve diverse kind of paragraphs. Learners should start from sentence-level activities and move toward producing longer pieces of written products for gaining this aim.

Activities like rearrangement sentences in scrambled paragraphs (for instance, Kaplan and Shaw, 1983; Reid and Lindstrom, 1985), choosing proper sentences to complete gapped paragraphs and writing paragraphs from given information are usually apply

in these classes. Other formal features like the structure of introductory paragraphs (Scarcella, 1984), the form of essays in numerous languages (Eggington, 1987; Hinds, 1987), cohesion and coherence (Connor, 1984; Johns, 1984), and topical structure (Lautamatti, 1987) have been examined in this first approach. Raimes (1991: 409) accomplishes that this form-dominated approach has the main body of research to inform and support it.

#### **2.7.6.2 Focus on the Writer**

Within the 1970s and mid 1980s new concerns replaced the old. Instead of a focus on accuracy, process, meaning-making and invention became prominent in second language writing classes.

Teachers and investigators responded in contrast to the form-dominated approach by increasing an attention in what L2 writers really do as they write. Classroom tasks shifted from form-oriented activities to utilize of revision (Hall, 1990), journals (Peyton, 1990; Spack and Sadow, 1983), invention (Spack, 1984), peer collaboration (Bruffee, 1984; Long and Porter, 1985), and consideration to content before form (Raimes, 1983a; Zamel, 1976, 1982, 1983).

Hyland (2003) believes that the teachers' main concern in this approach focuses on creative expression. Here, the writers' thoughts and feelings are viewed as the main focus of attention.

The teachers defined their “classroom goals as fostering L2 students’ expressive abilities, encouraging them to find their own voices to produce writing that is fresh and spontaneous.

These classrooms are organized around students’ personal experiences and opinions, and writing is considered a creative act of self-discovery” (Hyland 2003: 9).

Teachers trying to conduct their writing classes based on this creative-oriented conceptualization will take in count their function to contain presenting students with chances to create their own meanings and transfer their thoughts, views and feelings into words. Here, writing is something learned, not taught. It is a manner of sharing personal meanings and writing courses emphasize the power of the individual to construct his or her own views on a topic. As far as L2 writers' development is concerned, teachers' response to the writings of the students is crucial.

Yet, their focus of attention in giving feedback to the students' products is the ideas presented, and feelings expressed rather than formal errors (Murray 1985). Researchers such as Cumming (1989), Friedlander (1990), Hall (1990), Jones and Tetroe (1987), Raimes (1985 and 1987), and Zamel (1982 and 1983) focused their studies on this trend towards instruction in the 1980s. However, the "lack of comparability across studies impeded the growth of knowledge in the field" (Krapels, 1990, p. 51).

### **2.7.6.3 Focus on Content**

A third approach to L2 writing instruction, focus on content, appeared in the mid-1980s. A group of L2 writing researchers perceived that the common approaches of the time were unsuitable for educational demands and for the anticipations of academic readers. Hence, attention removed from the procedures of the writer to content and to the demands of the academy. This was the era of content-based approach in which an ESL course might be attached to a content course in the adjunct model (Brinton, Snow, and Wesche, 1989; Snow and Brinton, 1988) or language courses might be grouped with courses in other disciplines (Benesch, 1988).

What learners are needed to write about is the key problem in content-oriented classes of L2 writing. Themes and topics of interest determined the aim of the course. Hence, having significant knowledge of the topics and themes is essential for the writers. Teachers' central tasks contain presenting the learners with plan improvement trainings whereby learners are anticipated to gain the necessary knowledge of the subject and vocabulary they will require to generate effective texts. By the way, diverse kind of reading activities that support the learners to create thoughts for writing and forming texts form the basic class activities.

About the thoughts in similar texts, reading to photographs, and numerous brainstorming activities are instances of the classroom tasks in this approach. Hinkel (2011) established that this model of language and writing teaching is generally found in the US-based curricula.

L2 reading and writing have a significant function, and teaching in these skills is usually combined to develop the feature of L2 style in terms of both discourse (macro) and morph syntactic and lexical (micro) properties. For instance, combined with teaching in content and language uses in thematically-selected readings, the

teaching of L2 writing can address problems of discourse structuring and information flow, in addition to the uses of grammar structures and contextualized vocabulary (Hinkel 2011).

Just as Raimes (1991) reports, within this approach, the core concentration covers the instructor's purpose of which educational material is remarkably suitable, so as to construct the entire courses or modules of reading and writing activities about that content. Therefore, this content-based approach consist of a more direct effect on the curriculum in compare to the two approaches defined above. In contrast to autonomous

ESL classes in which learners perform greater dynamic tasks in identifying the style and content of the courses within their language classes, with ESL attached in the curriculum to a content course, like flexibility is less likely.

#### **2.7.6.4 Focus on the Reader**

The fourth approach to teaching L2 writing came up in the mid-1980s, simultaneous with the Content-based approach. However, it focused on the anticipations of school readers rather than writers. Horowitz (1986c) states that a reader-dominated method views language instruction "as socialization into the academic community-not as humanistic therapy" (p. 789). More commonly, this method is known as "English for academic purposes". The teacher runs a theme-based class, uses the terms like academic demands and academic discourse community, and concentrates on the reader not like a particular person but as the provider of a discourse community, for instance, a particular discipline or academia generally (Raimes 1991).

For Hyland (2003) this kind of language class is the same as a genre-based class in which firstly a group of communicative objectives is decided. Several famous component of the classroom are teacher-student talk, various kind of writing, and meta-language information exchanges between learners indicating their understanding of the structure and grammar of the texts they are going to write or they have written.

The significance of rules and grammar within this approach is usually to the fact that it is "a way of giving learners the language they need to construct central genres and to reflect on how language is used to accomplish this" (Hyland 2003: 22). While in the text examination period of teaching particular educational tasks concentrated on analyzing written style in a collection of genres, for instance narrative, exposition, or

argumentation (Hinkel 2011: 534). The purpose of these tasks is to enhance student's consciousness of how specific grammar and vocabulary are applied in authentic written text and discourse.

## **2.8 Summary**

This chapter has made an attempt to review the available literature relating the topic. For clarity, chapter was divided into three broad sections. In the first section issues around personality traits, aspects of personality traits and personality traits in L2 acquisition in particular were discussed. The second section deals with CT and language learning. Finally in third section, writing skill in general, and second language writing in particular, have been discussed.

## References:

- Abdi, A. (2012). A study of the relationship of thinking styles of students and their critical thinking skills. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 1719-1723.
- ACTFL. (1996). *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press.
- Alizahed, H., Jahandar, Sh., & Khodabandehlou, M. (2013). The relationship between the critical thinking and the learning strategies selected for listening by Iranian EFL learners at B.A. level. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences*, 3(4), 189-195.
- Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Al-Ahmadi, F. & Reid, N., (2011). Scientific Thinking - What is it and can it be measured? *Journal of Science Education*, 11(2), 53-59.
- Al-Osaimi, K.H., Reid, N., & Rodrigues, S. (2014). Critical Thinking - Can it be measured? *Journal of Science Education*, 15(1), 30-36.
- Appleby, D. (2006). Defining, teaching, and assessing critical thinking in introductory psychology. In D. S.Dunn & S. L. Chew (Eds.), *Best practices for teaching introductory psychology* (pp. 57–69). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Arum, R., & Roska, J. (2011). *Academically Adrift; Limited Learning on College Campuses*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Atkinson, D. (1997). A critical approach to critical thinking in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly* 31(1), 71-94.
- Atwell, N. (1985). How we learned to write. *Learning*, 13, 51-53.
- Baddeley, A.D. & Andrade, J. (2000). Working memory and the vividness of imagery. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, General*, 129(1), 126-145.
- Bailin, S. (2002). Critical thinking and science education. *Science & Education*, 11(4), 361–375.
- Balasubramaniam, A. (1999). *Comprehension, critical thinking & creative thinking: A tricriterial approach to student assessment*.

- Barnawi, Osman Z. (2011). Finding a place for critical thinking and self-voice in College English as a foreign language writing classrooms. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 190-197.
- Benesch, S. (ed.). (1988). *Ending remediation: ESL and content in higher education*. Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Birjandi, p., & Bagherkazemi, M. (2010). The relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' critical thinking ability and their professional success. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 3(2), 130-16.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 191–205.
- Brink-Budgen, Roy Van Den, (2000). *Critical Thinking for Students, Learn the skills of critical assessment and effective argument 3rd Edition*, Oxford: How To Books Ltd.
- Brinton, D., Snow, M. A., and Wesche, M. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. New York: Newbury House.
- Brookfield, S. (1987). *Developing Critical Thinking*. SRHE and Open University Press, Milton Keynes.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th Ed.). New York: Longman.
- Brown, H.D. (2004). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practices*. Longman.
- Brown, J. D., Robson, G., & Rosenkjar, P. R. (2001). *Personality, motivation, anxiety, strategies, and language proficiency of Japanese students*. In Z.
- Brown, S & Taylor, Karl. (2014). Household Finances and the 'Big Five' Personality Traits. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 45.
- Bruffee, K. (1984). Collaborative learning and the conversation of mankind. *College English*, 46(7), 635-652.
- Burbach, M. E., Matkin, G. S., & Fritz, S. M. (2004). Teaching critical thinking in an introductory leadership course utilizing active learning strategies: A confirmatory study. *College Student Journal*, 38(3), 482–493.

- Busch, D. (1982). Introversion-extraversion and the EFL proficiency of Japanese students. *Language Learning*, 32, 109-132.
- Busch, D. (1982). Introversion-extroversion and the EFL proficiency of Japanese students. *Language Learning*, 25, 153-161.
- Byram, M. (1997a). Cultural studies and foreign language teaching. In S. Barnett (Eds.), *Studying British Cultures: an Introduction* (pp. 53-64). London, New York: Routledge.
- Byram, M. (1997b). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M., Zarate, G., & Neuner G. (Eds.). (1997c). *Sociocultural Competence in Language Learning and Teaching*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Byrnes, J. P. (2001). *Cognitive development and learning in instructional contexts* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Carr, K. S. (1990). How can we teach critical thinking? ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education: (online), ED 326304, Available [www.edpsycinteractive.org](http://www.edpsycinteractive.org)
- Carrell, P. L., Prince, M. S., & Astika, G. G. (1996). Personality types and language learning in an EFL context. *Language Learning*, 46(1), 75-99.
- Cattell, R. B. (1943). The description of personality: Basic traits resolved into clusters. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 38, 476-506.
- Chaffee, J. (1992). Teaching critical thinking across the curriculum. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 7(7), 25-35.
- Chi, F.-M. (1999). The writer, the teacher, and the text: Examples from Taiwanese EFL college students. *Paper presented at the 12th World Congress of Applied Linguistics*, Tokyo, Japan.
- Chiu, Y. C. (2009). Facilitating Asian students' critical thinking in online discussions. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 40(1), 42-57.
- Choi, Y. H. (1988). Text structure of Korean speakers' argumentative essays in English. *World Englishes*, 7(2), 129-142.
- Coles, W. & Robinson W.D. (1991). *Teaching Thinking*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.

- Collins, K. M. & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2000). Relationship between critical thinking and performance in research methodology courses. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Bowling Green, KY.
- Commeyras, M. (1989). Analyzing a critical-thinking reading lesson, *ERIC DIGEST*: (online), ED 304 680, Available: [www.eric.ed.gov](http://www.eric.ed.gov)
- Connor, U. (1984). A study of cohesion and coherence in English as a second language students' writing. Papers in Linguistics. *International Journal of Human Communication*, 17, 301-316.
- Connor, U. (1987). Argumentative patterns in student essays: Cross-cultural differences. In U. Connor and R.B. Kaplan (Eds.). *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text*. Reading, MA: Addison. Wesley.
- Cortazzi, M. & Jin, L. (1997). Communicating for Learning across Cultures. In D. McNamara & R. Harris (Eds.), *Overseas Students in Higher Education: issues in teaching and learning* (pp. 76-90). London: Routledge.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(6), 653-665.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 39(1), 81-141.
- Dantas-Whitney, M. (2002). Critical reflection in the second language classroom through audiotaped journals. *System*, 30 (4), 543-555.
- Daly, W. M. (1998). Critical thinking as an outcome of nursing education. What is it? Why is it important to nursing? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 28(2), 323-33
- Davidson, B., & Dunham, R. (1997). Assessing EFL student progress in critical thinking with the Ennis-Weir Critical Thinking Essay Test. *JALT Journal*, 19(1), 43-57.
- Davidson, B. (1998). A case for critical thinking in the English language classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32 (1), 119-123.

- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educational process*. D.C. Heath, Lexington, MA.
- Dressel, P. L., & Mayhew, L. B. (1954). *General education: Explorations in evaluation*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education
- Donovan, T. R., McClelland, B.W. (1980). *Eight approaches to teaching composition*. Urbana, ILL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 361-391). Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i.
- Educational Testing Service, (2003). TOEFL Actual Tests Administered in the Past by ETS: 7 Full-length Paper-based Exams for 2002-2004. Ebtada publication, Tehran.
- Eggington, W. G. (1987). Written academic discourse in Korean: Implications for effective communication. In U. Connor and R. B. Kaplan (Eds.). *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 153-168). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ehrman, M. E. (1990). Owls and doves: Cognition, personality, and learning success. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Linguistics, language teaching, and acquisition: The interdependence of theory, practice, and research* (pp.413-437). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Ehrman, M. E. (2008). Personality and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp. 61-72). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *Modern Language Journal*, 74,311-327.
- Ennis, R. H. (1996). *Critical Thinking*. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Ennis, R. H. (1987). A taxonomy of critical thinking dispositions and abilities. In J. B. Baron & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Teaching thinking skills: Theory and practice*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company
- Ennis, R. H. (1989). Critical thinking and subject specificity: Clarification and needed research. *Educational Researcher*, 18(3), 4–10.
- Eysenck H. J. (1967) *The Biogenicuf Basis of Personnlity*. Thomas, Springfield, III.

- Eysenck, H. J. (1991). Dimensions of personality: 16, 5 or 3?—Criteria for a taxonomic paradigm. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*(8), 773-790.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, M. W. (1985). *Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Fabio, Annamaria & H. Saklofske, Donald. (2014). Comparing ability and self-report trait emotional intelligence, fluid intelligence, and personality traits in career decision. *Personality and Individual Differences, 64*, 174–178.
- Facione, P. A. (1990). *Critical thinking: A statement of expert consensus for purposes of educational assessment and instruction*. Millbrae, CA: The California Academic Press.
- Facione, N.C., & Facione, P.A. (1996). Externalizing the critical thinking in knowledge development and critical judgment. *Nursing Outlook, 44* (3), 129-136.
- Facione, P. A. (2007). *Critical thinking: What it is and why it counts*. Retrieved October 5, 2012 from <http://insightassessment.com/t.html>
- Facione, P.A., Giancarlo, C.A., Facione, N.C., Gainen, J., 1995. The disposition toward critical thinking. *Journal of General Education, 44* (1), 1-25.
- Feist, G., & Feist, J. (2009). *Theories of Personality*. (7th Ed.) New York
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 161–184.
- Fisher, A. (2001). *Critical Thinking: An Introduction*. Cambridge university press, Cambridge.
- Fisher, R. (2005). *Teaching Children to Think*. London: Stanley Thomas Ltd.
- Flett, G. L., & Hewitt, P. L. (2007). Cognitive and self-regulation aspects of perfectionism and their implications for treatment: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Cognitive- Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 25*, 227-236.
- Flower, L., and Hayes, J. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*, 365–87.

- Friedlander, A. (1990). Composing in English: Effects of a first language on writing in English as a second language. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 109-125). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Frijters, S., Dam, G.T., & Rijlaarsdam, G. (2007). Effects of dialogic learning on value-loaded critical thinking. *Learning and Instruction, 18* (1), 66-82.
- Furneaux, C., Paran, A., & Fairfax, B. (2007). Teacher stance as reflected in feedback on student writing: An empirical study of secondary school teachers in five countries. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 45*, 69-94.
- Gardiner, L. F. (1994). *Redesigning higher education: Producing dramatic gains in student learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ghaemi, F., & Sabokrouh, F. (2014). The Relationship between Personality Traits and Metacognitive Listening Strategies among Iranian EFL Learners . *ELT Voices, 5* (2), 11-25.
- Ghanizadeh, A., 2011. An investigation into the relationship between self-regulation and critical thinking among Iranian EFL teachers. *The Journal of Technology & Education, 5* (3), 213-221.
- Ghanizadeh, A., Moafian, M., 2011. Critical thinking and emotional intelligence: investigating the relationship among EFL learners and the contribution of age and gender. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 14* (1), 23-48.
- Giancarlo, C. A., & Facione, P. A. (2001). A look across four years at the disposition towards critical thinking among undergraduate students. *The Journal of General Education, 50*(1), 29-55.
- Giancarlo, C. A., & Facione, P. A. (2001). A look across four years at the disposition toward critical thinking among Iranian EFL teachers. *Journal of General Education, 50*, 29-55.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 141-165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment, 4*(1), 26-42.

- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48(1), 26-34.
- Goldstein, L. M. (2004). Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and student revision: Teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1), 63–80.
- Gorman, L. (1981). A survey of attainment and progress of learners in adult literacy schemes. *Educational research* 23: 190-198.
- Gough, H. G. (1979). A creative personality scale for the Adjective Check List. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1398–1405.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. London: Longman.
- Graziano, W. G., & Tobin, R. M. (2009). Agreeableness. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 46–61). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Griffin, A. H. (2001). Thinking in education yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Education*, 106(3), 268-280.
- Griffiths, R. (1991). Personality and second-language learning: Theory, research and practice. In E. Sadtano (Ed.), *Language acquisition and the second/foreign language classroom* (pp. 103-135). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Guilherme, M. (2002). Critical citizens for an intercultural world: *Foreign language education as cultural politics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Habib, M. A. (1996). *Thinking: Theoretical Foundation and Strategy*. Cairo: Arabic Renaissance Library.
- Hall, C. (1990). Managing the complexity of revising across languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(1), 43-60.
- Halpern, D. F. (2001). Assessing the effectiveness of critical thinking instruction. *The Journal of General Education*, 50(4), 270–286.
- Halpern, D. F. (2002). Teaching for critical thinking: A four-part model to enhance thinking skills. *Language Teaching*, 56, 222-248.
- Hamp-Lyons, L., & Heasley, B. (1987). *Study writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hashemi, M.R., & Ghanizadeh, A. (2012), Critical discourse analysis and critical thinking: An experimental study in an EFL context. *System*, 40(1), 37–47.
- Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor and R. B.Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hinkel, E. (2011). What Research on Second Language Writing Tells Us and What it Doesn't. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp 523 - 538). London and New York, Routledge.
- Hinkel, G. (2003). Simplicity without elegance: Features of sentences in L1 and L2 academic texts. *TESOL Quarterly* 37: 275–301.
- Ho, J. & Crookall, D. (1995). Breaking with Chinese cultural traditions: learner autonomy in English language teaching. *system*, 23 (2), 235–243
- Hogan, R. T. (1986). *Hogan Personality Inventory*. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
- Honey, P. (2004). *Critical thinking questionnaire*. Retrieved Oct, 2004 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.PeterHoney.com>
- Horowitz, D.M. (1986c). The author responds to Liebman-Kleine. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(4), 788-790.
- Hudson, N. W., & Roberts, B. W. (2014). Goals to change personality traits: Concurrent links between personality traits, daily behavior, and goals to change oneself. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 53, 68-83.
- Huitt, W. (1998). Critical thinking: An overview. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Retrieved March, 2009, from <http://chiron.valdostaedu/whuitt/col/cogsys/critthnk.html>.
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 185-212.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Iowa. (1989). *A guide to developing higher order thinking across the curriculum* (pp. 85). Iowa: Iowa State Department of Education.
- Irshad, S. (2017). *An investigation of the concept of critical thinking in the context of a functional English course*. Unpublished thesis.

- Iwawaki, S., Eysenck, S. B. G., & Eysenck, H. J. (1980). Japanese and English personality structure. *Psychologia*, 23, 195-205.
- Jerwan, F. (2009). *Teaching Thinking: Conception and Application*, Amman: Dar Alfiker.
- Johns, A. M. (1984). Textual cohesion and the Chinese speaker of English. *Language Learning and Communication*, 3, 69-74.
- Johnson, D. C. (2003). *The effects of critical thinking instruction in music listening on fifth grade students' verbal descriptions of music* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Arizona.
- Johnstone, A.H. (2000). Teaching of Chemistry – Logical or Psychological? *Cerapie*, 1(1), 9-15.
- Jones, C. S., and Tetroe, J. (1987). Composing in a second language. In A. Matsuhashi (Ed.), *Writing in real time: Modeling production processes* (pp. 34-57). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Jung. (2006). Misunderstanding of academic monologues by nonnative speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38 (11), 1928-1942.
- Kamimura, T. (2000). Integration of Process and Product Orientations in EFL Writing Instruction. *RELC Journal*, 31(2), 1-28.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*, 16(1), 1-20.
- Kaplan, R.B., & Shaw, P.A. (1983). *Exploring academic discourse*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Khamesian, M. (2008). The relationship between critical thinking skills and writing in EFL Engineering learners, Islamic Azad University Science and Research Campus, M. A. thesis, Tehran, Iran
- kiany, G. R. (1998). English proficiency and academic achievement in relation to extraversion: A preliminary study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 113–130.
- Kim, Y., & Kim, J. (2005). Teaching Korean university writing class: Balancing the process and the genre approach. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(2), 68-89.
- Krapels, A. (1990). An overview of second language writing process research. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 37-56). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Kurland, D. J. (2000). Critical reading V. Critical thinking, In how language really works: The fundamentals of critical reading and effective writing. Retrieved 23 March 2009 from: [http://criticalreading.com/critical\\_reading\\_thinking.htm](http://criticalreading.com/critical_reading_thinking.htm)
- Lai, E. R. (2011). *Critical thinking: A literature review*. Retrieved from <http://www.pearsonassessments.com/hai/images/tmrs/CriticalThinkingReviewFINAL.pdf>.
- Lalonde, R. N., & Gardner, R. C. (1984). Investigating a causal model of second language acquisition: Where does personality fit in? *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 16(4), 224-237.
- Lautamatti, L. (1987). Observations in the development of the topic in simplified discourse. In U. Connor and R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 87-114). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Leki, Ilona. (1992). *Understanding ESL Writers: A Reference for Teachers*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Lewis, A., & Smith, D. (1993). Defining higher order thinking. *Theory into Practice*, 32(3), 131-137.
- Liaw, M. L. (2007). Content-Based Reading and Writing for Critical Thinking Skills in an EFL Context. *English Teaching and Learning*, 31(2), 45-87.
- Long, M. H., and Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 207-228.
- MacBride, R., & Bonnette, R. (1995). Teacher and at-risk students' cognitions during open-ended activities: structuring the learning environment for critical thinking. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11 (4), 373-388.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1994). Variables underlying willingness to communicate: A causal analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, 11, 135-142.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Charos, C. (1996). Personality, attitudes, and affect as predictors of second language communication. *Journal of Language & Social Psychology*, 15(1), 3-26.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 545-562.

- Mahapoonyanont, Natcha. (2012). The Causal Model of Some Factors Affecting Critical Thinking Abilities. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 146-150.
- Mason, M. (2007). Critical thinking and learning. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 39(4), 339-349.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J. McCroskey & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Personality and interpersonal communication* (pp. 129-156). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Meredith, K.S., & Steele, J.L. (2011). *Classrooms of Wonder and Wisdom: Reading, Writing, and Critical Thinking for the 21st Century*, Corwin a SAGE Company.
- Meyers, C. (1986). *Teaching Students to Think Critically*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Mirzai, Z. (2008). *The relationship between critical thinking and lexical inferencing of Iranian EFL learners* (Unpublished master's thesis). Azad University of Science and Research, Tehran, Iran.
- Miyajima, Eiichi & Taira, Naoki & Koda, Munenaga & Kondo, Tsuyoshi. (2014). *Differences in personality traits between male-to-female and female-to-male gender identity disorder subjects*. Psychiatry research.
- Moon, J. (2008). *Critical Thinking: An Exploration of Theory and Practice*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Moore, R.A. (1995). The relationship between critical thinking, global English proficiency, writing, and academic development for 60 Malaysian second language learners. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 56 (06).
- Murray, D. (1985). *A writer teaches writing* (2nd ed). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Naiman, N., Frolich, M., & Stern, H. H. (1975). *The good language learner*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Neilsen, A. R. (2002). *Critical thinking and reading: Empowering learners to think and act*. Retrieved from: [www.eric.ed.gov](http://www.eric.ed.gov)
- Nikoopour, J., Amini Farsani, M., & KashefiNeishabouri, J. (2011). Language Learning Strategy Preferences of Iranian EFL Learners. *Proceedings of ICSSH*, Singapore, 2, 360-364.

- Nikoopour, J., Amini Farsani, M., & Nasiri, M. (2011). On the relationship between critical thinking and language learning strategies among Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Technology & Education*, 5(3), 195-199.
- Niu, Lian & Behar-Horenstein, Linda & W. Garvan, Cyndi. (2013). Do instructional interventions influence college students' critical thinking skills? A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 9, 114–128.
- Nour Mohammadi, E., Heidari, F, & Dehghan Niri, N.(2010). The relationship between critical thinking ability and reading strategy by EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 5 (10), 192-201.
- Oxford, R. L., & Ehrman, M. (1993). Second language research on individual differences. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 188-205.
- Paul, R. W. (1992). Critical thinking: What, why, and how? *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 1992(77), 3–24.
- Paul, R. (1987). Dialogical thinking e critical thought essential to the acquisition of rational knowledge and passions. In: Baron, J., & Sternberg, R. (Eds.), *Teaching Thinking Skills* (pp. 127-148). Freeman, New York, F. W.
- Paul, R. (1988). *Critical thinking in the classroom*. Teaching K-8 18, 49-51.
- Paul, R., Elder, L., & Bartell, T. (1997). *California teacher preparation for instruction in critical thinking: Research findings and policy recommendations*. State of California: California Commission on Teacher on Teacher Credentialing.
- Paul, R. (1983). An agenda item for the informal logic / critical thinking movement. *Informal Logic Newsletter*, 5 (2), 23.
- Paunonen, S. V., & Hong, R. Y. (in press). On the properties of personality traits. In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *APA handbook of personality and social psychology: Vol. 3. Personality processes and individual differences*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Paunonen, S.V., & Ashton, M.C. (2013). On the prediction of academic performance with personality traits: A replication study. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47, 778–781.
- Peabody, D., & Goldberg, L. R. (1989). Some determinants of factor structures from personality-trait descriptors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 552-567.

- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Longman, London.
- Peyton, J.K. (Ed.), (1990). *Students and teachers writing together: Perspectives on journal writing*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Pitt, V., Powis, D., Levett-Jones, T., & Hunter, S. (2014). The influence of personal qualities on performance and progression in a pre-registration nursing program. *Nurse Educ Today*, 34, 866-871.
- Pollick, M. (2014, November, 1). *How can I learn to think critically?* Retrieved March 7, 2015, from <http://www.wisegeek.com/how-can-i-learn-to-think-critically.htm>
- Pourhosein Gilakjani, A., Leong, L. M., & Saburi, N. B. (2012). Study on the Role of Motivation in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching. *I.J. Modern Education and Computer Science*, 4(7), 9-16.
- Pucer, P., Trobec, I., & Žvanut, B. (2014). An information communication technology based approach for the acquisition of critical thinking skills. *Nurse Education Today*, 34(6), 964-970.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Raimes, A. (1983a). Anguish as a second language? Remedies for composition teachers. In A. Freedman, I. Pringle, and J. Yalden (Eds.), *Learning to write: First language/second language* (pp. 258-272). Harlow, England: Longman.
- Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 229-258.
- Raimes, A. (1987). Language proficiency, writing ability, and composing strategies: A study of ESL college student writers. *Language Learning*, 37(3), 439-468.
- Raimes, A. (1992). *Exploring through writing: a process approach to ESL composition* (2nd ed). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 407-430.
- Reid, J. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Reid, J. (2006). Eye learners and ear learners: identifying the language needs of international students and U.S. resident writers. In P. K. Matsuda, M. Cox, J. Jordan, & C. Ortmeier-Hooper (Eds.), *Second-language writing in the*

composition classroom: a critical sourcebook (pp. 76–88). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's

Reid, J., & Lindstrom, M. (1985). *The process of paragraph writing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Reid, N. & Yang, M-J. (2002). The Solving of Problems in Chemistry: The More Open-ended Problems. *Research in Science and Technological Education*, 20(1), pp.83-98.

Renner, C.E. (1996). Enrich learners' language production through content-based instruction. *Paper presented at a National Conference on Lingua e Nuova Didattica*, Modena, Italy, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 411 694).

Risager, K. (2007). Language and culture pedagogy: *From a national to a transnational paradigm*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Rivers, W. M. (1981). *Teaching foreign language skills*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Robinson, D., Gabriel, N., & Katchan, O. (1994) Personality and second language learning. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 16(1), 143-157.

Saadé, R., Morin, D., & Thomas, J. (2012). Critical thinking in E-learning environments. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28, 1608–1617.

Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal*, 11, 46-70.

Sax, L. J., Astin, A. W., Korn, W. S., & Gilmartin, S. K. (1999). *The American college teacher: National norms for the 1989-1999 heri faculty survey*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Scarcella, R. C. (1984). How writers orient their readers in expository essays: A comparative study of native and nonnative English writers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18(4), 671-688.

Schafersman, D. S. (1991). *An introduction to critical thinking*, Retrieved April 9, 2009 from: [www.freeinquiry.com](http://www.freeinquiry.com)

Scriven, M., & Paul, R. (2004). *Defining Critical Thinking*.

- Scriven, M., & Paul, R. (1992). Critical thinking defined. *Handout given at Critical Thinking Conference, Atlanta, GA.*
- Seung-Ryul, S. (2002). *The effects of a metacognitive art criticism teaching strategy that incorporates computer technology on critical thinking skill and art critiquing ability Dissertation Abstract International.* (UMI Number: 3072012).
- Shaharom, A. (2004). *Reading comprehension test as a measurement of critical thinking ability* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia.
- Sheikhi, B. R. (2009). The relationship between Autonomy, Critical thinking and Reading comprehension of Iranian EFL learners, unpublished M. A. thesis, Azad University of Science and Research, Tehran, Iran
- Silva, T. (1990). A comparative study of the composing of selected ESL and native English speaking freshman writers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51(10), 3397A.
- Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: developments, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11– 23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 657–677.
- Simpson, E. & Courtney, M. (2002). Critical thinking in nursing education: Literature review. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 8(2), 89-98.
- Smith, R.C. (2003). Teacher education for teacher-learner autonomy. In J. Gollin, G. Ferguson & H. Trappes-Lomax (Eds.), *Symposium for language teacher educators: Papers from three IALS symposia (CD-ROM)*. Edinburgh, UK: IALS, University of Edinburgh.
- Snow, M. A., & Brinton, D. M. (1988). The adjunct model of language instruction: An ideal EAP framework. In S. Benesch (Ed.), *Ending remediation: ESL and content in higher education* (pp. 33-52). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Solon, T. (2003). Teaching critical thinking: The more, the better! *The Community College Enterprise*, 9(2), 25-38.

- Sormunen, C. (1992). Critical Thinking in Business Education. *Paper presented at the American Vocational Association Convention, St. Louis, MO (ED 354 380)*
- Sowden, C. (2005). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in higher education abroad. *ELT Journal* 59(3), 226-233.
- Spack, R. (1984). Invention strategies and the ESL college composition student. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18(4) 649-670.
- Spack, R., and Sadow, C. (1983). Student-teacher working journals in ESL freshman composition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(4), 575-593.
- Stapleton, P. (2001). Assessing critical thinking in the writing of Japanese university students: Insights about assumptions and content familiarity. *Written Communication*, 18(4), 506-548.
- Stapleton, P. (2001). Assessing critical thinking in the writing of Japanese university students: Insights about assumptions and content familiarity. *Written Communication*, 18, 506-548.
- Stein, B., Haynes, A., Redding, M., Harris, K., Tylka, M., & Lisic, E. (2010). *Faculty driven assessment of critical thinking*: National.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). *Critical thinking: Its nature, measurement, and improvement* National Institute of Education.
- Straub, R. (1997). Students' reactions to teacher comments: An exploratory study. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 31(1), 91-119.
- Swales, J. (1971). *Writing scientific English*. Walton-on-Thames, UK: Thomas Nelson.
- Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tabatabaei, O., & Parsafar, M. (2012). The effect of self-directed learning on critical thinking of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 2(2), 55-64.
- Tama, M.C. (2011). *Critical Thinking: Promoting It in the Classroom*. Retrieved from ERIC Digest database.
- Thayer-Bacon, B. J. (2000). *Transforming critical thinking: Thinking constructively*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Thompson, C. (2002a). Teaching critical thinking in EAP courses in Australia. *TESOL Journal*, 11(4), 15-20.
- Thompson, M. (2002b). *ICT, Power, and Development Discourse: a Critical Analysis*.
- Thurstone, L. L. (1931). Measurement of social attitudes. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 26, 249-269.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-69.
- Tsui, L. (1998). A review of research on critical thinking. *ASHE Annual Meeting Paper*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED427572). University Press.
- Ushida, E., (2005). The Role of Students' Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning in Online Language Courses. *Paper presented at CALICO*, Orlando, FL.
- Vaseghi, R., & Barjesteh, H. (2012). Critical Thinking: A Reading Strategy in Developing English Reading Comprehension Performance. *Sheikhbahee EFL Journal*, 1(2), 21-34
- Vaughn, L. (2008). *The power of critical thinking: Effective reasoning about ordinary and extraordinary claims*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Verhoeven, L., & Vermeer, A. (2002). Communicative competence and personality dimensions in first and second language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 23(3), 361-374.
- Washburn, D. K. (2006). *Analysis of reading comprehension and critical thinking process achievement based on neurocognitive research* (doctoral dissertation). Liberty University.
- Warnick, B., & Inch, E. (1994). *Critical Thinking and Communication* (2nd ed.), New York: Macmillan.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1992). On traits and temperament: General and specific factors of emotional experience and their relation to the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 441-476.
- Watson, G.B., Glaser, E.M. (2002). *Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal UK*. The Psychological Corporation, London.

- Widdowson, H. G. (1983). *Explorations in applied linguistics 2*. Oxford University Press.
- Willingham, D. T. (2007). Critical thinking: Why is it so hard to teach? *American Educator*, 2(17), 8–19.
- Wiltink, S., Nelson, B., Velthorst, E., Wigman, J., Lin, A., Baksheev, G., et al. The relationship between personality traits and psychotic like experiences in a large non-clinical adolescent sample. *Person Ind Diff* 2015, 73, 92–7.
- Wright, I. (2002). *Is that Right? Critical Thinking and the Social World of the Young Learner*. Pippin Publishing, Toronto.
- Yaghoubi, A. (2013). Critical thinking and goal orientation among English language students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 77-82.
- Yeh, Y.C. (2004). Nurturing reflective teaching during critical-thinking instruction in computer simulation program. *Computers and Education* 42 (2), 181-194.
- Zaitoon, H. H. (2003). *Teaching thinking: Vision applied to the development of the thinking mind*. Amman: Dar Al Shorok.
- Zamel, V. (1976). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(1), 67-76.
- Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: the process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(2)195-209.
- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 165–87.
- Zamel, V (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79-101.
- Zamel, V (1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 697-715.