

The Comparative Impact of Visual Aids and Contextualization on Field-dependent and Field-independent EFL Learners' Vocabulary Retention

Behdokht Mall-Amiri

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Islamic Azad University, Central-Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

Masoomeh Arabgol

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Islamic Azad University, Central-Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

Abstract—This study aimed to compare the impact of two vocabulary teaching techniques, contextualization and visual aids on field dependence/independence learners' vocabulary retention among third grade students of public secondary school in Iran. 120 EFL learners studying at two secondary schools in Savojbolagh were randomly selected and were assigned to two almost homogeneous groups, based on their scores on a Nelson proficiency test. The learners were checked for their vocabulary knowledge prior to the start of the treatment. Next, the standard Group Embedded Figures Test (GEFT) developed by Witkin et al (1971) was administered to classify each participant's level of field independency. The two groups were exposed to identical vocabulary text during classes held twice a week in the four-month treatment period. The context group received vocabulary instruction through contextualization method while the other experimental group which was called visual aids group was taught through visual aids techniques of vocabulary teaching. Two weeks after the end of the treatment a delayed posttest was administered to show the differences in vocabulary retention in the two groups. The collected data was analyzed through T-Test and ANCOVA using SPSS software. The results led to the rejection of all the four null hypotheses.

Index Terms—vocabulary retention, contextualization, visual aids, field dependence, field independence

I. INTRODUCTION

The role that vocabulary knowledge plays in learning a foreign language is so crucial that many theorists and language educators believe that learning a foreign language is basically a matter of learning the vocabulary of that language (Rodriguez and Sadoski,2002;Kitajima,2001). In this line Bowen & Marks (2002, p.106) state that “Words are the basic of language, and thus the basic of communication. Without words, it is possible to know everything about the grammatical structure of a language, but yet to be unable to make a single utterance.

What students, teachers, materials writers, and researchers have all agreement upon is that learning vocabulary is an essential part of mastering a second language (de Groot, 2006). However, it is useless if the students learn a lot of words or possess a large number of vocabulary but they can't remember or retain in their long-term memory. Wei(2007) states that nowadays long-term retention has received wide attention as one of the greatest problems in learning new words. If the learners can't store and retrieve words immediately, they will forget the learned words very soon.

In order to solve This forgetting (attrition) problem, different techniques for facilitating vocabulary retention have been proposed in methodology text books each of which with its own merits and demerits. As Armstrong (2000) mentioned, due to the students' differences teachers use a broad range of teaching strategies with their students. Among the different vocabulary retention techniques which can help the students to store a large number of vocabularies in their long-term memories and recall or retrieve them, this study attempts to investigate on contextualization and visual aids techniques.

In support of the significance of context, Redouane (2004) found that the guessing-from-context technique has an impact not only on immediate recall but also on long-term retention. Nattinger (1988) also states that the most frequent way to discover the meaning of new words is going through the contexts where the new words occur to derive the most appropriate meaning of the new words .

Using visual aids is also seen as one of the most valid way of communicating the meaning of a word.. Doff (1988,14) asserts, “the use of real objects, pictures and mime for suitable vocabulary is a very effective method as it is direct, interesting, and it makes an impression on the class” Gairns and Redman (1986) points out that the most general visual aids that are displayed in the language classrooms include flashcards, photographs, blackboard drawings, wall charts, and realia and that other form of visual aids such as mimes and gestures are often used to supplement other ways of conveying meanings.

A number of theories hold that personality factors also significantly influence the degree of success that individuals achieve in learning a second language (Gass& Selinker, 1994). Investigations of individual differences have led to the

determination that there are styles of thinking called cognitive styles. Hansen and Standsfield (1982) define the cognitive style as variations among learners in performed manners of speaking, organization, analysis and recall. One of these cognitive characteristics is field dependence/ independence.

Hansen and Stansfield (1982) characterize field dependents as warm, outgoing, sociable, and highly emotional. They contend that field independents do not like social activities. According to Messick (1976,p.5) “the field independent person tends to articulates figures as discrete from their background and to easily differentiate objects from embedding context, whereas the field dependent person tends to experience events globally in an undifferentiated fashion. Field independent (or analytical) individuals have more facility with tasks required differentiation and analysis.

Regarding the points mentioned above, the purpose of this study is to answer the following four questions:

1. Is there any significant difference between FD and FID learners’ delayed vocabulary posttest scores after receiving visual aid teaching technique?
2. Is there any significant difference between FD and FID learners’ delayed vocabulary posttest scores after receiving contextualization teaching technique?
3. Is there any significant difference between FD learners’ delayed vocabulary posttest scores who receive visual aid and those who receive contextualization teaching technique?
4. Is there any significant difference between FID learners’ delayed vocabulary posttest scores who receive visual aid and those who receive contextualization teaching technique?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to (Knight, 1994) Learning words are considered as the most important aspect of second language acquisition. However, vocabulary learning is a complicated process in which several skills such as vocabulary acquisition, vocabulary retention, and vocabulary transfer are involved (Schneider et al., 2002). (Thornbury, 2008) states that the important point is that the students must be able to store and retrieve the vocabularies when they read for comprehension.

(Gairns & Redman. 1986. p. 86) mentioned that The brain has two ways of storing information. The first way is our short term memory. We can only retain information there for up to 30 seconds, and in most cases hold only up to seven items there at one time. The second is our long term memory. ‘Long term memory’ describes our ability to recall information days, weeks, and even years after the original input. In contrast to our short term memory, long term memory has the capacity to retain endless amounts of information.

Generally vocabulary can be taught in different ways to help learners remember Words more efficiently.

According to Demirel (2007) vocabulary should be taught only in the context of real situations so that meaning will be clarified and reinforced. Nattinger (1988) suggests that most appropriate meaning of new words can be discovered through the context where the words occurred. Sternberg (1987) maintained that context clues can help readers to infer the appropriate meaning of an unknown word contained in the text and these clues included definitions, examples, restatements, punctuations. However, there are some cases when it is not really feasible to include a context for every single word. In such cases, other techniques can come to our help.

Many studies in the field of recall and retention have shown the increased memory performance for picture stimuli over than word stimuli. A study by McBirde and Doshier (2002) stated that pictures are one source of information that engages deeper level of processing. Pictures represent features of objects; as a result, meaning can be gained from pictures even if one has little or no experience with the object illustrated (Hochberg & Brooks, 1962). Many studies have investigated the effects of picture method on vocabulary acquisition of a second language. Tonzar, Lotto, and Job (2009) compared two learning methods (picture and word mediated learning) in order to evaluate the vocabulary acquisition of two foreign languages in children. The study results showed that picture based method leads to a better performance than the word-based method.

According to (Gass & Selinker, 1994) there are other factors such as personality factors which significantly influence the success of individuals in learning a second language. Ausuburn and Ausburn (1978) stated that individuals have different, preferred ways of gaining, storing, processing, and using information. These types of differences in cognitive functioning are referred to as cognitive styles. (Witkin & Goodenough, 1981) state that the construct of field dependence – independence, as one of the cognitive style dimensions, is viewed as one of the most significant factors when contemplating educational problems.

researchers (Thompson & Thompson, 1987; Witkin et al.,1977) Summarized field dependent-independent characteristics as follow:

Field Independent Learners Impose organization on unstructured field. They are less dominated by the most salient cues in learning. they Internally defined goals and reinforcement and they Prefer to learn general principles and acquire them more easily, while field dependent learners Take organization of field as given. They are More dominated by salient cues in learning. They externally defined goals and reinforcement and they prefer to learn specific information and acquire it more easily.

Reaserchers (Good enough, 1976; Witkin & Goodenough, 1981; Witkin et al., 1977) have summarized the differences between these two styles in terms of psychological domain, social domain, and leering context. In the psychological domain.” FIs have a distinctive internalized frame of reference, whereas FDs rely more on external referents. In the

social domain, FDs have greater interpersonal and social skills, whereas FIs have a more interpersonal orientation and play less attention on social cues” (Jones, 1993, p. 199). This leads to implications for learning situation: “FDs are disadvantaged in understructure situations, whereas FIs tend to provide their own structure more readily; Ds prefer directions and feedback, whereas FIs are less dependent on feedback; FDs rely more on others for information, whereas FIs are less influenced by peers” (Jones, 1993, p. 199).

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

The study targeted the population of secondary public school learners in Iran. The reason for selecting the participants from a public secondary school was mainly the ease of access to a great number of learners. The participants of the present study were selected randomly from among the students from six classes of third grade students of two secondary public schools in Savejbolagh city. The total number of the participants was 180 in this study: 90 participants among six classes from Shahid Haj Hemat secondary school and 90 students among six classes from Emamat secondary school. Students in the public secondary schools start learning English when they are at grade one, and thus they had been studying English for more than two years. All the participants in the research were females; with the age of 14 and 15, and they were all native speakers of Persian. The study took place in the second semester of the 1391 school year.

B. Instrumentation

The following instruments were used in this study:

1. Homogeneity Test

A Nelson proficiency test (Nelson test 50 c, 2001) was administered to 180 subjects at the beginning of the study in order to screen the participants and homogenize them based on their level of proficiency. This general proficiency test was adopted from Nelson English Language Test for Elementary level (Fowler & Coe, 2001). The reason behind using such a test was to curtail the effect of initial proficiency level on the outcome of the study. As discussed under the limitations, the researcher chose to use this study since it had been showed already by the researcher that the target learners did not have the high test mastery over the other skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening) due to lack of exposure to those skills and were exclusively taught grammar and vocabulary. The test was used in this study consisted of fifty multiple choice items containing grammar sections. The time allocated to this test is 25 minutes and the scores are estimated out of 50. The correct answer to each item receives one point, and there is no negative point for false responses. After giving the exam, out of 180 students, 120 students whose scores were between one standard deviation above and below the mean score were selected, and divided randomly into two experimental groups, each containing 60 students. The students who were taught with contextual method were named context group and the students who were taught with visual aids method were called visual group.

2. Group Embedded Figure Test

Group Embedded Figures Test (GEFT) which was developed by Witkin et al. (1971) was used as a measure of field dependence/independence. This test comprises 25 geometrical figures embedded in more complex figures. While taking the GEFT test, participants are required to finish all the 25 items within 12 minutes. In each item students should find the simple figure within the complex one. There are three sections in this test and students cannot answer any section before the allocated time before the previous one is over. The first section is for the sake of practice. Students receive no points in this part. It has seven figures and takes two minutes. In the following ten minutes, participants complete the 18 items of section two and three that comprise the actual test. Section two comprises nine geometrical figures with one point each. Section three also comprises nine geometrical figures with one point each. The total possible score ranges from 0 to 18. Omitted items are scored as incorrect (Witkin et al, 1971). Participants in this study are classified as field dependent (FD), or field independent (FI) based on their scores on the GEFT test. Participants whose scores are greater than half a standard deviation above the mean are considered field independent, while participants whose scores are lower than half a standard deviation below the mean are considered field dependent those who may be located between the above two styles are labeled as field intermediate (FInt) (Dwyer & Moore, 1991-1992). Put simplistically, The higher scores of the students in this test, the higher the degree of their field independence.

3. Vocabulary Pretreatment Test

A researcher –made test of vocabulary containing the vocabulary items in the 3rd grade of high school course book was prepared to ensure prior to the treatment that the target vocabulary items were unknown to the learners. It has to be noted that the researcher had to confine the study to the vocabulary items included in their course books as a regulation of the school.

After the process of item analysis in pilot study, 20 vocabulary items which were too easy to the participants were deleted and 40 words were considered for the next phase of the study which is called pretest. The prepared vocabulary test included 40 vocabulary multiple-choice items, with four alternatives for each stem. The students were asked to answer the forty- item vocabulary test in thirty minutes. The test had a total of twenty points. The correct answer to each item received 0.5 point and there was no penalty for false responses. The test had a total of twenty points. The correct

answer to each item received one point and there was no penalty for false responses. The course book from which the vocabulary items were extracted English Book Three written by Birjandi, Norozi, and Mahmoodi (2011).

4. Delayed Vocabulary Posttest

Two weeks after the end of the semester, a delayed posttest was administered to the participants. It was parallel to the pre-treatment test with some changes in its arrangement and was administered to the same participants two weeks later to measure the learners' long-term vocabulary retention. The purpose of the delayed test was to check to what extent the students could remember the target words, hence their retention.

C. Procedure and Design

In order to provide answers to the questions of this study the following phases were taken.

A pilot study was carried out with one class (30 students) before the main phase of the study for selecting the vocabulary items to be employed in pretest and posttests. 60 items which seemed to be unfamiliar to the participants were selected from the school's English textbook written for third grade students of a secondary public school in Iran .this book was English Book Three written by Birjandi, Norozi, and Mahmoodi (2011). and the students were asked to answer the sixty multiple choice items. After the process of item analysis, based on the performance of the participants, the characteristics of the individual items were determined and some items were deleted. Those vocabulary items which were familiar for the participants (20 items) were excluded and those which were unknown to the participants were identified to be used in instruction and posttest. Eventually, the researcher came up with 40 items, to be used for the intended objective of the study.

In order to ensure the homogeneity of the participants regarding their grammar knowledge ,as the only skill among the others that they are given instructions on, the researcher administered a Nelson proficiency test which consisted of fifty multiple choice items The test was used in this study consisted of fifty multiple choice items containing grammar sections. The time allocated to this test was 25 minutes and the scores were estimated out of 50. After scoring the test, 120 students whose scores fell between one standard deviation (SD) above and below the mean were selected to participate in the study. These participants were divided randomly into two homogeneous groups; each consisted of 60 students, based on their proficiency level. They constituted two experimental groups. Following the proficiency test (Nelson test 50 c, 2001), the standard Group Embedded Figures Test (GEFT) which is developed by Witkin, et al. (1971) was administered to classify each participant's level of field independency. It was presented in a booklet form. During the GEFT test, participants were required to finish all 25 items within 12 minutes. They were given two minutes to work on the 7 practice items, and then ten minutes to take the actual test. The total possible score ranges from 0 to 18. Participants in this study were classified as field dependent (FD), or field independent (FI) based on their scores on the GEFT test. Participants who scored greater than one- half standard deviation above the mean were considered field independent, while participants who scored lower than one-half standard deviation below the mean were considered field dependent. The analysis of their scores led to the division of the students into equal number of FD and FID learners.

Finally, two groups were identified to participate in the study. The students taught with contextual method were named context group and the students taught with visual aids method were called visual group. Each group contained equal number of FD and FID members.

The main study was carried out in two steps: treatment, and posttest (the delayed posttest). The allocated time for teaching in both experimental groups was the same. Each step is explained briefly below: The schematic diagram can be illustrated as follows:

Experimental group 1: treatment — delayed posttest

Experimental group 2: treatment — delayed posttest

After the process of item analysis in pilot study, 10 vocabulary items which seemed familiar to the participants were deleted and 40 words were retained in the next phase of the study which was called pretest. The prepared vocabulary test included 40 vocabulary multiple-choice items, with four alternatives for each sentence. The students were asked to answer the thirty- item- vocabulary test in thirty minutes. The test has a total of twenty points. The correct answer to each item received one point and there was no penalty for false responses.

D. Treatment

After wards the every session the researcher spent about half an hour teaching these words in both classes. The treatment took 12 sessions so the 84 new words were divided into groups of seven vocabularies. According to Grains (1986:1 as cited in Moras, 2001), "Retention in short-term memory is not effective if the number of chunks of information exceeds seven. This suggests that in a given class we should not aim at teaching more than this number. However, our long term memory can hold any amount of information (p.76). The study began in spring 2012 and lasted for about 3 months, 12 sessions, twice a week, 30 minutes each session. There were 6 classes: 3 classes for each group, and 30 students in each class. The whole research project took place in three months and the students were taught four lessons of the book in all classes. The researcher spent about half an hour teaching the vocabularies of each session of the treatment to the students, and basically the teaching procedure followed the model of presentation, practice and production.

Both context and visual aids group were presented the vocabulary using Power Point and a projector.

In the first class (context group) new vocabularies were presented via contextualization teaching strategies (story or sentence in which the item occurs). While the researcher taught the words, some information about that word were provided, including how it is pronounced, it's part of speech, its count ability if it was a noun, and its past tense. In the first phase of teaching, each word was constructed with an example sentence or a short paragraph which was shown through power point so that the students would know how the word is used. After that the students were asked to repeat the word three times to facilitate remembering the word. The presentation was repeated for three times because repetition is necessary for elementary learners in order to master the oral and form of the lexical items (Gairns & Redman, 1986, as cited in Ramachandran & Rahim, 2004). After introducing the example sentences, the researcher encouraged students to make guesses at the target word by looking at the meanings of its surrounding words. This strategy needs context clues which facilitate the process of guessing meaning from context. The researcher gave feedback to their intelligent guesses and then provided them with the most appropriate meaning of the target word. To review the newly learned word, students along with the researcher read out the related example sentences again. For the production of students' works, they were divided into five groups. The students in each group were asked to create an example sentence that includes the target word.

In the second class (visual group), While teaching visually the researcher used different kinds of strategies. In this group, the English word was presented with a picture which represented the meaning of the word along with its English pronunciation. The presentation was repeated for three times because repetition is necessary for elementary learners in order to master the oral and form of the lexical items (Gairns & Redman, 1986, as cited in Ramachandran & Rahim, 2004). Then, she asked them to read out each new word by themselves. To have a solid form-image association of each word to be taught, she engaged students in the activity where one student acted out the meaning of a new word in front of the whole class and other students guessed which word was being performed. Finally, students matched words with the pictures on the papers which were given to them. Students had a picture missing and predict how the tale would end or what happened in the middle (missing picture).each session 7 new words were taught. According to Grains (1986:1 as cited in Moras, 2001), "Retention in short-term memory is not effective if the number of chunks of information exceeds seven.

Two weeks after the end of the treatment, a vocabulary posttest parallel with the pre-treatment test was administered to both groups of learners to compare their long-term vocabulary retention. The purpose of the delayed test was to check to what extent the students could remember these target words.

The design of this study was experimental. It was implemented in two phases: treatment, and delayed post-test. The independent variable was the mode of vocabulary teaching with two modalities, contextualization and visual aids. Vocabulary retention was the dependent variable. The moderator variable was personality type with two modalities, field-dependent and field independent .Gender and language proficiency were the control variables

IV. RESULTS

The First Hypothesis

Prior to the start of the treatment, the researcher made sure that the two groups of learners were the same with respect to their vocabulary knowledge through running a t-test on their vocabulary pretest mean scores. The following table shows the two mean scores were approximately the same.

TABLE 4. 1.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF PRETEST SCORES OF THE FD AND FID LEARNERS IN THE VISUAL GROUP

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
FD pretest visual group	30	3.50	10.00	6.6833	1.84990
FID pretest visual group	30	1.00	15.00	6.7333	2.85492
Valid N (listwise)	30				

As demonstrated above the difference between the two groups of learners was not significant hence a t-test was legitimate to run to compare their mean scores. the following table shows the result therefore

TABLE4. 2.
GROUP STATISTICS OF FD AND FID LEARNERS' DELAYED POSTTEST SCORES IN THE VISUAL GROUP

Field Dependence grouping	N	Mean	Std.Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Delayed VCB posttest scores of visual group	FD	9.9000	2.99252	.54636
	FID	13.2500	2.95001	.53860

Table 4.2 depicts that the FID learners in this group achieved a higher mean score in the vocabulary delayed posttest than the FD learners

The Second Hypothesis

As for the second hypothesis, the researcher had to compare the delayed posttest scores of FD and FID learners who attended the contextualization group. But, again, before the start of the treatment the researcher checked if there was any statistically significant difference between their vocabulary pretest scores. The following table shows the result of the mean scores of both sets of scores:

TABLE 4.3.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE PRETEST SCORES OF FD AND FID LEARNERS IN THE CONTEXT GROUP

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
FD pretest context group	30	3.50	13.00	7.3500	2.28997
FID pretest context group	30	5.00	12.50	8.5500	2.03567
Valid N (listwise)	30				

The above table shows that the initial difference between the FD and FID learners' pretest scores in the contextualization group was significant.

Therefore, the researcher had to run an ANCOVA to remove the effect of this initial difference on the posttest scores of the FD and FID learners in the contextualization group. the following table shows the new mean scores after removing the effect of the pretest scores

TABLE 4.4.
ESTIMATED MARGINAL MEANS FIELD DEPENDENCE GROUPING

Dependent Variable: Delayed VCB posttest scores of the context group

Field Dependence grouping	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
FD	14.059 ^a	.531	12.996	15.121
FID	16.175 ^a	.531	15.112	17.237

it is concluded that the groups were significantly different in their posttest mean scores, hence the rejection of the second null hypothesis, implying that the FID learners benefited significantly more than the FD learners receiving contextualization teaching.

The Third Hypothesis

As for the third question, the researcher compared the delayed vocabulary posttest scores of FD learners in the two experimental groups. Firstly, the homogeneity of the two groups of learners with respect to their vocabulary pretest scores had to be checked.

TABLE 4.5.
GROUP STATISTICS OF PRETEST SCORES OBTAINED BY FD LEARNERS IN BOTH EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

Grouping: Teaching Technique		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pretest, visual/contextual	Visual	30	9.9000	2.99252	.54636
	Contextual	30	7.3500	2.28997	.41809

As illustrated above, the pre-treatment difference between the FD learners in the two experimental groups concerning their vocabulary knowledge turned out to be significant

Therefore, the researcher had to compare their posttest scores through ANCOVA to remove the effect of the initial significant difference. First the assumption of linearity was checked visually through the following graph;The following table shows the mean scores after removing the effect of the covariate:

TABLE 4.6.
ESTIMATED MARGINAL MEANS GROUPING: TEACHING TECHNIQUE

Dependent Variable: Delayed Posttest, FD visual/context

Grouping: Teaching Technique	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Visual	9.986 ^a	.556	8.873	11.098
Contextual	13.781 ^a	.556	12.668	14.893

Hence the rejection of the third hypothesis. It implies that the FD learners benefited significantly more from contextualization technique than from visual aids technique.

The Fourth Hypothesis

As for the fourth hypothesis, the researcher opted for the comparisons of the delayed posttest scores of the FID learners in the two experimental groups. But firstly, she made sure about the homogeneity of their pretest scores. First the normality check was carried out on the pretest scores

Therefore, a t test was conducted to compare them.

TABLE4.7.
GROUP STATISTICS OF PRETEST SCORES OF FID LEARNERS IN THE TWO EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

Grouping: Teaching Technique		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
pretest, FID visual/context	Visual	30	6.7333	2.85492	.52123
	contextual	30	8.5500	2.03567	.37166

As the above table shows, the difference between the two FID groups of learners regarding their pretest vocabulary knowledge turned out to be significant.

Therefore, to compare their delayed posttest scores the researcher had to run an ANCOVA to control for this initial difference. The following table shows the means after controlling for the effect of the pretest scores.

TABLE4.8.
ESTIMATED MARGINAL MEANS GROUPING: TEACHING TECHNIQUE
Dependent Variable:delayed posttest, FID, visual/context

Grouping: Teaching Technique	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Visual	13.686 ^a	.490	12.705	14.666
Contextual	15.931 ^a	.490	14.951	16.912

The above table depicts that the two groups were different in their posttest scores Therefore, the fourth hypothesis is rejected implying that the FID learners benefited significantly more from contextualization teaching technique than from visual aids.

V. DISCUSSION

Based on the results of the data analyses, the first null hypothesis was rejected implying that FID group of learners benefited significantly more from visual aid techniques in their delayed vocabulary posttest compared with the FD learners.

The results of the present study challenge the views of (Thompson & Thompson, 1987; Witkin et al., 1977) who believe that Field Independent Learners are mainly less dominated by the most salient and noticeable cues in learning but Field Dependent Learners are mainly dominated by the most salient or noticeable cues in learning.

The contrast seems to be resulted from other factors such as the researcher’s cognitive style which is field dependent as the Group Embedded Figure Tests showed.According to Hayes and Alinson (1997) a cognitive style mismatch between teacher and students is beneficial for FD learners that is FD learners benefit more from FID teachers. Thus FD learners in this study didn’t benefit from the researcher who was a FD teacher.Another factor which might affect the result of the study is the type of test which was taken to the students .according to witkin etal.(1997) FID learners perform better in a multiple choice items

The second hypothesis was also rejected implying that FID learners benefited significantly more than FD learners receiving contextualization teaching techniques.

The results of this study supported the idea of Davis (1991) who reported that field dependent learners were found to be less efficient in analyzing, organizing, attending, encoding, and processing information. Thompson (1987) and Witkin et al. (1977), who state field in dependent people, are analytic and spending considerably more time on guessing, analyzing, and intentional learning of each new word.

In addition other factors might play an important role in better performance of Field Independent Learners in context method including the teacher’s cognitive style and the kind of test which was taken from the learners

Also the data analyses led to the rejection of the third hypothesis which implies that the FD learners benefited more from contextualization technique than from visual aid technique.

Likewise, as a result of the data analyses, the fourth hypothesis was rejected meaning that FID learners benefited significantly more from contextualization teaching technique than from visual aids.

The result of the third and fourth hypothesis indicated that both FD and FID learners perform better in context group. It may be resulted from some factors such as motivation, interest and anxiety. As the participants in visual aid group were going to have Math class after the English class, they were stressed to complete their homework, and they were attended the class for the last class period at school and they were tired, but the context group had English class for the first class period at school.

VI. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The findings obtained in this study may lead to a number of implications which could Possibly be beneficial for language practitioners, teachers and students in an EFL context.

The findings may encourage teachers to be aware of students' learning behaviors and use appropriate techniques for teaching vocabulary.

The findings of this study are also useful for students in demonstrating the importance of identifying their learning styles. Being aware of their cognitive styles helps the students to identify the best way(s) through which they can enjoy the act of learning a new vocabulary

Syllabus designers and textbook writers will also benefit from the results of this study; in the way that the developers can reveal which vocabulary learning technique or areas of language are most likely to meet students' approval and needs can, moreover, help them to be aware of the effect of other variables like individual differences on language learning.

REFERENCES

- [1] Armstrong, T. (2000). Multiple intelligences in the classroom. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- [2] Ausuburn, L., & Ausuburn, F.B. (1978). Cognitive styles: Some information and implications for instructional design. *Educational communications and Technology Journal*, 26 (4), 337- 354.
- [3] Bowen, T. & Marks, J. (2002). Inside Teaching: Options for English Language Teachers. Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann.
- [4] Davis, J.K., (1991). Educational implications of field dependence/independence. In: Wapner, S., Demick, J. Eds., *Field Dependence Independence: Cognitive Styles across the Life Span*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, New Jersey, pp. 149-175.
- [5] De Groot, & A. M.B. (2006). "Effects of Stimulus Characteristics and Background Music on Foreign Language Vocabulary Learning and Forgetting". *Language Learning*, 56(3), 463-506.
- [6] Demirel, Ö. (2007). *ELT Methodology*. Ankara: Pegem.
- [7] Doff, A. (1988). *Teach English: A Training Course for Teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.
- [8] Dwyer, F.M., & Moore D.M. (1991-1992). Effect of color coding on visually and verbally oriented tests with students of different field dependence level. *Journal of Educational Technology System*, 20(4), 311-320.
- [9] Fowler, W.S. & Coe, N. (2001). *Nelson English Language Tests*. Tehran: Marefat.
- [10] Gairns, R., & Redman, S. (1986). *Working with Words: A Guide to Teaching and Learning Vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Gass, S.M., & Selinker, L. (1994). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- [12] Good enough, D.R. (1976). The role of individual differences in field dependence as a Factor in learning and memory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 83(4), 675-694.
- [13] Hansen, J. & Stansfield, C. (1982). Student-teacher cognitive styles and foreign language achievement. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 263-273.
- [14] Harry, B. F. & Herbert G M. & Jeris E.S. (1970). *Vocabulary in context*. US. University of Michigan Press.
- [15] Hayes, J., & Allinson, C. W. (1997). The implications of learning styles for training and development: A discussion of the matching hypothesis. *British Journal of Management*, 7(1): 63-73.
- [16] Hochberg, J. E. & Brooks, V. (1962) Pictorial recognition as an unlearned ability: A study of one child's performance. *American Journal of Psychology*, 75, 624-628.
- [17] Jones, S. (1993). Cognitive learning style: Does awareness help? A review of selected literature *Language Awareness*, 2(4), 195-207.
- [18] Kitajima, R. (2001). The Effect of Instructional Conditions on Students' Vocabulary Retention *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(5), 470-482.
- [19] Knight, S. (1994). Dictionary use while reading: The effects on comprehension and vocabulary acquisition for students of different verbal abilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 285-299.
- [20] McBirde, D. M., & Doshier, B. A. (2002). A comparison of conscious and automatic memory processes for picture and word stimuli: A process dissociation analysis. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 11(3), 423-460.
- [21] Messick, S. (1976). Personality consistencies in cognition and creativity. In S. Messick & Associates (Eds). *Individuality in learning*. (pp 4-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [22] Moras, S. (2001). Teaching vocabulary to advanced students: A lexical approach. Karen's linguistic issues. Retrieved July 2013, from http://ucrel.lancs.uk/publications/cl2007/paper/170_paper.pdf.
- [23] Nattinger, J. (1988). Some current trends in vocabulary teaching. In: R. Carter & M. McCarthy. eds. *Vocabulary and language teaching*. Harlow: Longman.
- [24] Sternberg, R. J. (1987). Most vocabulary is learned from context. In M. G. McKeown & M. E. Curtis (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 89-105). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [25] Ramachandran, S. D. & Abdul Rahim, H. (2004). Meaning recall and retention: The impact of the translation method on elementary level learners' vocabulary learning. *RELC Journal* 3, 161-178.
- [26] Redouane, R. (2004). Assessing institutional method in L2 French vocabulary acquisition: Guessing-from-context method versus a word-list method. Retrieved August 2013 from <http://homepage.mac.com/Tefftenant/welfa/WELFA>.
- [27] Rodriguez, M. and Sadoski, M. (2002). Effects of Rote, Context, Keyword, and Context/keyword Methods on Retention of Vocabulary in EFL Classrooms. *Language Learning*, 50(2), 385-412.
- [28] Stansfield, C. and Hansen, J. (1982). Field Dependence/Independence as a Variable in Second Language Cloze Test Performance. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(1), 29-38.
- [29] Thompson, G., & Knox, A.B. (1987). Designing for diversity: Are field dependent learners less suited to distance education programs of instruction? *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 12, 17 - 29.

- [30] Thompson, M.E., & Thompson, M.E. (1987, February). Field dependence-independence and learning from instructional text. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Educational Communication and Technology, Atlanta, GA.
- [31] Thornbury, S. (2008). How to teach vocabulary. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- [32] Tonzar, C., Lotto, L., & Job, R. (2009). L2 vocabulary acquisition in children: Effects of learning method and cognate status. *Language Learning*, 59(3), 623- 646.
- [33] Wei, M. (2007). An examination of vocabulary learning of college-level learners of English in China. Retrieved August 2013, from <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com>.
- [34] Witkin, H.A., & Goodenough, D. R. (1981). Cognitive styles: Essence and origins. New York: International Universities Press.
- [35] Witkin, H. A., Moor, C. A., Goodenough, D.R., & Cox, P. N. (1977). Field dependent and field independent cognitive styles and their educational implications. *Review of Educational Research*, 47, (110) 1-64.
- [36] Witkin, H. A, Oltman P.K., Raskin, E., & Karp, S.A. (1971). A manual for the embedded figures test. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists.



Behdokht Mall-Amiri is Assistant Professor of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran. She has published several articles in domestic and foreign academic journals. She is specifically interested in research areas related to translation, language learning and teaching, cognitive and learning styles, and program evaluation.



Masoomeh Arabgol was born in Karaj, Iran in 1977 She received her MA degree in teaching English as a foreign language from Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran, Iran in 2013. Masoomeh Arabgol has been teaching EFL courses in different institutes, and she is currently teaching in Iranian public schools.