

A Study of the Bond between EFL Learners' Learning Styles, Self-Regulation, and Language Achievement

Aida Akhavan Khaleghi^{1*}, Omid Akbari², Afsane Ghanizade²

1. M.A Student, English Teaching Department, Mashhad Branch, Imam Reza International University, Mashhad, Iran.

2. PhD, English Teaching Department, Mashhad Branch, Imam Reza International University, Mashhad, Iran.

* Corresponding Author's Email: aida.akhavan1@gmail.com

Abstract – This study aims at investigating whether the reflections of different learning styles can be observed in EFL students' development of self-regulation and language achievement. One hundred and thirty-four EFL learners took part in the study. They were selected according to convenience sampling from different private language institutes in Mashhad, a city in the north-east of Iran. They were requested to complete the "Ehrman and Leaver Learning Style Questionnaire" and the "Self-Regulation Trait Questionnaire". The findings indicated a relationship between learners' learning styles, self-regulation, and their language achievement. According to Ehrman and Leaver learning style construct (2003); among the different styles, sharpener, particular, sensitive and synthetic learning styles had correlations with the learners' self-regulation, in which sharpener and particular learning styles are the positive predictors of students' self-regulation and field sensitive and synthetic learning styles are the negative indicators of self-regulation. In addition, correlations were found between learners' learning styles and their language achievement, according to Ehrman and Leaver learning style construct (2003), concrete and field insensitive learning styles had correlations with language achievement, in which concrete learning style is the positive predictor of students' language achievement and field insensitivity has a negative correlation with language achievement.

Keywords: EFL Learner; Learning style; Self-regulation; Language achievement

1. INTRODUCTION

Although much research has been conducted on learning styles, review of literature on this variable in educational research makes it clear that we still have many unanswered questions. One of these questions is the role of learning styles of learners in their level of self-regulation. This study aimed at examining the relationship between the learning styles of English as Foreign Language (EFL) students, and their level of self-regulation. Learning styles and self-regulation are two important issues in language learning. In recent decades, ample studies have been done in parallel about learning styles of learners, self-regulation. But there is a dearth of research on the relationship between these two important factors in language learning. This study is hoped to shed more lights on the relationship between learning styles of learners and their level of self-regulation and language achievement.

Recent research in the domain of language learning and teaching has paid considerable attention to the role learning styles play in successful learning and teaching. Understanding that a person learns more effectively when information is presented in a manner that matches the

individual's preferred method of obtaining and processing information is the underlying hypothesis of discovering different learning styles (Montgomery, 1995). According to Sadler-Smith (2001), the knowledge of learning styles helps the students to adjust to diverse situations. Many studies have been conducted about the influences of learning styles of language learners on their learning. Kinsella (1995) believed that learning styles continue irrespective of teaching techniques or content area.

Ramsden (1983) asserts that students who are aware of a range of methods are more successful in selecting the correct strategy for a particular task. Despite the bulk of research examining the linkage of learners' learning styles with skills and factors conducive to effectiveness, there are sparse studies, in particular in the L2 context, explore their roles in language learners' self-regulatory skills. The present study was primarily concerned with examining the role of EFL student's learning styles in their level of self-regulation. It aimed to show how different learning styles can be reflected in student's development of their self-regulation. In so doing, the following research questions were posed and addressed in this study:

Q1: Is there any significant relationship between Iranian EFL learners' learning styles and their self-regulation?

Q2: Is there any significant relationship between Iranian EFL learners' learning styles and their language achievement?

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Learning Style

It has widely been accepted that personality has decisive effects on the concepts like learning and academic achievements. According to Reid (1995), learning style refers to an individual's natural, habitual, and preferred ways of understanding, practicing, and saving new information and skills. Learning styles are important factors that influence the process and outcomes of learning. Learning styles refer to individuals' characteristics and the way they prefer to gather information, understand, organize and think about the information (Wang, 2008).

According to Cassidy (2004), research in the area of learning style is being conducted in domains outside psychology including medical and health care training, management, industry, vocational training and a vast range of settings and levels in the field of education, the disciplines from which many of the fundamental concepts and theories originate. In educational psychology, learning style generally refers to the stable individual differences in the way individuals start to learn something (Adey, Fairbrother, Wiliam, Johnson, & Jones, 1999).

According to Baneshi, Karamdoust, and Hakimzadeh (2013), learning style is the individual's preferred way of learning and studying, such as using pictures instead of books, working with others rather than working individually and learning in structured versus unstructured situations. According to Kolb (1984), learning style means the ways in which a person prefers to obtain and process the information. According to Dunn and Dunn (1993), personalized learning style is the way an individual begins to concentrate on new and difficult information, practice and internalize it. According to Grasha (1996), learning style is the student's personal ability to acquire information together with the learning experiences.

According to a study by Riding and Rayner (1997), it may be that matching is most beneficial for lower-ability students, particularly when presenting difficult material, while

higher-ability students benefit more from mismatching as it helps them to develop new approaches to learning. Naserieh and Annabi Sarab (2013) stated that, learning style is a more or less consistent way in which an individual processes information. It is defined as a term that describes the differences among learners in the way individuals use their senses to understand, organize, and retain experience (Reid, 1987). Kinsella (1995) believed that learning styles continue irrespective of teaching techniques or content area.

2.2. Self-Regulation

Self-regulation is one of the most prevalent and challenging topics in all of human behavior. It refers to the many processes by which the human psyche exercises control over its functions, states, and inner processes. According to Arabi, Ghanizadeh and Shirvan (2015), Self-regulation is one of the most exciting and challenging topics in all of human behavior. It refers to the many processes that an individual attempts to control over its functions, states, and inner processes. Self-regulation is defined as "self-regulated thoughts, feelings and actions that are planned and cyclically adapted to the attainment of personal goals" (Zimmerman, 2000, p.14).

In terms of metacognitive processes self-regulated learners plan, set goals, organize, self-monitor and self-evaluate at various points during the process of acquisition. In terms of motivational processes, these learners report high self-efficacy, self-attributions and intrinsic task interest (Schunk, 1986; Zimmerman, 1985) to observers, they are self-starters who display extraordinary effort and persistence during learning process (Zimmerman, 1990).

According to Zimmerman (2001), self-regulation process refers to the processes which are self-directed and learners can transform their mental abilities into task-related academic skills. Self-regulation is an important topic that is highly relevant to the science of the mind and human behavior. Unlike their passive classmates, self-regulated learners actively participate in their learning. Self-regulated learners view acquisition as a systematic and controllable process, and they accept greater responsibility for their achievement outcomes (Zimmerman, 1990). self-regulated learners believe that the opportunities to have challenging tasks, lead to deep and better understanding of the subject matter which lead to academic success.

Self-regulation involves "cognitive, affective, motivational, and behavioral components, and help the learners to adjust their actions and goals in order to change conditions of the environment. "Self-regulation or self-regulated learning was introduced in the educational psychological literature, and most of the research attention has turned toward examining variables that were more dynamic and process-oriented than learning or cognitive strategies." (Dorneyi, 2005, p. 195).

Pintrich (1995) maintained that, self-regulation is neither a measure of mental intelligence that is unchangeable after a certain point in life, nor a personal characteristic that is genetically based or formed early in life.

Bandura (1986), who incorporated self-regulation into his social cognitive theory of human behavior, viewed self-regulation as the process of influencing the external environment by engaging in the functions of self-observation, self-judgment, and self-reaction.

In many recent studies, it has been observed that self-regulation is straightly related to academic achievement (Ghanizadeh & Mirzaee, 2012). In concepts such as education, self-regulatory skills have been found to be associated with academic success and motivation to

achieve educational goals (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001). Self-regulated learning emphasizes autonomy and control by individual who monitors, directs and regulates actions toward goals of information acquisition, expanding expertise, and self-improvement (Paris & Paris, 2001).

According to Zimmerman (1990), self-regulated learners are aware of their academic strengths and weaknesses and they actively participate in their learning and take the necessary steps to master and control it; so, when they face obstacles, they find a way to overcome. Self-regulation involves "cognitive, affective, motivational, and behavioral components that provide the individual with the capacity to adjust his or her actions and goals to achieve desired results in light of changing environmental conditions" (Zeidner, Boekaerts, & Pintrich, 2000, p.751).

According to Ghanizadeh and Ghonsooly (2013), theories and practices related to self-regulation have been broadly applied to educational settings and school learning, leading to the development of self-regulated learning theory.

3. METHOD

3.1. Participants

A convenience sampling was used for this study. The population sample consisted of 134 Iranian EFL learners who were studying English as a second language in private institutes in Mashhad, Iran during spring and summer 2014. The learners who took part in this study were both male and female and their ages varied from 18 to 41 and their proficiency level are upper intermediate and advanced.

3.2. Instruments

In order to collect data regarding the purpose of this study, the following measurement was used:

3.2.1. *The Ehrman and Leaver Learning styles (E&L) questionnaire*

This instrument contains 30 items using a 9-point semantic differential scale format and provides rich set of data about the learner. It also consists of the advantage both of generality and specificity. E&L construct offers neutral trait descriptions. E&L is made up 10 bipolar scales (Field dependent–independent, field sensitive–insensitive, Random (non-linear)–sequential (linear), Inductive–deductive, Synthetic–analytic, Concrete–abstract, Leveling–sharpening, Impulsive–reflective).

According to Ehrman and Leaver (2003), the E&L can be denoted as follows:

Field dependent_ Field independent: Field dependence refers to the preference for selection and prioritization they refer to the preference for selection and prioritization while field independent learners treat the whole context as the same.

Field sensitive_ Field insensitive: Field sensitivity relates to foreground and background together they prefer to address material as part of the context in contrast to their field-insensitive counterparts, who make little or no use of the context.

Random (non-linear)-sequential (linear): Random learners follow their own, internally developed and idiosyncratic order of processing (which may seem random to others), whereas sequential learners prefer a step by step, externally provided order of processing (such as the units in a syllabus).

Global-particular: This dimension is well defined by the top down vs. bottom-up processing metaphor.

Inductive–deductive: Inductive learners start with the details and facts, then form hypotheses, and finally test them; deductive learners start out with rules or theories and then try to apply them to examples.

Synthetic–analytic: Synthetic learners like to use pieces to build new wholes, whereas analytic students like to disassemble wholes into parts to understand their componential structure.

Analogue–digital: Analogue learners prefer to use metaphors, analogies, and conceptual links among units and their meanings, whereas digital learners take a more surface approach, characterized by a literal and logical understanding of what they can hear or see.

Concrete–abstract: Concrete learners prefer a relationship with direct experience to the extent of sensory contact, whereas abstract learners may have more interest in the system underlying language than in the actual language of communication.

Leveling–sharpening: This dimension concerns how people perceive, store, and retrieves information. Levelers often shape things together and form a generalized image, whereas sharpeners notice small differences and store them as salient attributes in their memories.

Impulsive–reflective: Impulsive learners tend to respond rapidly, often acting on gut, whereas reflective learners prefer to think things through before they respond.

3.2.2. Self-regulation trait questionnaire

To measure self-regulation, the *self-regulation trait* (SRT) questionnaire designed by O'Neil and Herl (1998) was utilized. It consists of 32 Likert-scale questions ranging from *almost never*, to *sometimes*, *often*, and *almost always*. The scale seeks to measure metacognition and motivation dimensions. Each dimension comprises two sub-scales. Metacognition covers the constructs of planning and self-monitoring, and motivation contains effort and self-efficacy. The four scales are measured by 8 Likert-type items each. The following table depicts the subscales of the SRT:

Table 1: The subscales of SRT along with the corresponding descriptions.

Factor		Definition	Items
Metacognition	Planning	The extent to which one has an assigned or self-directed goal and a plan to achieve the goal.	1-8
	Self-monitoring	The extent to which one needs a self-checking mechanism to monitor goal achievement.	9-16
Motivation	Effort	The extent to which one works hard on a task.	17-24
	Self-efficacy	The extent to which one has confidence in being able to accomplish a particular task.	25-32

According to Herl, O'Neil, Chung, Bianchi, Wang, Lee, Choi, Suen (1999), the reliability and validity of the scale have been verified in multiple studies.

3.3. Data Collection

The process of collecting data was done in private institutes in Mashhad, Iran. There were two questionnaires to be completed by the upper-intermediate to advanced proficiency level learners. The questionnaires examined two variables of the study: Learning styles and self-regulation. After a brief explanation of the objectives of the study, self-regulation questionnaire (SRT) and Learning styles questionnaire (E&L) were given to the student. For having more reliable data, the learners were ensured that their responses would be confidential. The survey administration took approximately 20 minutes. In order to guide participants and answer the probable questions regarding questionnaires, an informant were present in that setting.

3.4. Data analysis

Raw data were collected and entered into Excel by researchers. Researchers began data analysis by examining means and, standard deviations of all the subscales of learning styles and self-regulation. To examine the relationship between learning styles and self-regulation, multiple correlations were utilized.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Descriptive Statistics of Self-regulation and learning styles

Table 2 summarizes the descriptive statistics of EFL learners' self-regulation and its components. As the table illustrated, the highest mean ($M=153.00$), while the lowest mean is ($M=58.00$).

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of EFL learners' self-regulation

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Self-regulation	134	58.00	153.00	96.0522	15.75151
Valid N (listwise)	134				

Table 3 represents the descriptive statistics of EFL learners' learning styles. As indicated in the table, sequential ($M= 21.16$, $SD=3.49$) has the highest means, while global ($M=4.64$, $SD=5.26$) obtained the lowest means ($M=28.46$, $SD= 9.82$).

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of EFL Learners' Learning styles

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Field dependent	4.00	15.00	11.5122	2.83820
Field Independent	6.00	26.00	18.5577	3.20180
Field sensitive	4.00	15.00	11.1413	2.69954
Field Insensitive	.00	27.00	5.7537	8.70004
Leveler	4.00	17.00	11.7647	2.76501
Sharpeners	14.00	27.00	19.6818	2.86710
Global	.00	20.00	4.6493	5.26195
Particular	6	27	19.44	3.527
Impulsive	3.00	21.00	9.4118	3.52913
Reflective	.00	27.00	10.4478	10.74836
Synthetic	.00	15.00	5.4104	5.51991
Analytic	15.00	27.00	19.6780	2.75706
Analogue	4.00	18.00	11.1429	3.10346
Digital	14.000	27.000	19.49231	3.368619
Concrete	3.00	15.00	9.4177	3.36119
Abstract	11.00	27.00	19.3818	3.22887
Random	3.00	21.00	9.4730	3.48076
Sequential	14.000	27.000	21.16949	3.494590
Inductive	4.00	16.00	11.6761	2.83234
Deductive	11.00	27.00	19.5469	3.21173

4.2. Results of the Relationship between Learning styles and Self-regulation

To investigate whether there is any relationship between EFL learners' learning styles and their level of self-regulation, multiple correlations were employed.

The results are displayed in Table 4. As it can be seen, among the twenty learning styles, field dependent, field independent, field insensitive, leveler, global, impulsive, reflective, analytic, analogue, digital, concrete, abstract, random, sequential, inductive and, deductive have no significant relationship with self-regulation. Self-regulation correlates positively and significantly with two learning styles as follows: sharpeners ($r = .281, p < .05$), Particular ($r = .259, p < .05$). On the other hand, self-regulation correlates negatively and significantly with the corresponding learning styles as follows: Field sensitive ($r = -.271, p < .05$) and, synthetic ($r = -.256, p < .05$).

Table 4: Descriptive statistics of Learners' Learning styles and self-regulation

Learning style	Self-regulation
Field Dependent	-.012
Field Independent	-.115
Field Sensitive	-.271**
Field Insensitive	.009
Leveler	.112
Sharpener	.281**
Global	-.033
Particular	.259**
Impulsive	.052
Reflective	.103
Synthetic	-.256**
Analytic	.143
Analogue	-.116
Digital	.081
Concrete	-.029
Abstract	.057
Random	-.100
Sequential	-.096
Inductive	-.107
Deductive	-.036

To investigate whether there is any relationship between EFL learners' learning styles and their language achievement, multiple correlations were employed.

Table 5 presents descriptive statistics of EFL learners' grade point average (GPA). As indicated in a table the number of the students is 134 and the mean is 85.3134 and the standard deviation is 6.32981.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of EFL Learners 'GPA

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
GPA	134	60.00	100.00	85.3134	6.32981
Valid (listwise)	134				

The results are displayed in Table 6. As it can be seen, among the twenty learning styles, field dependent, field independent, field sensitive, leveler, sharpener, global, particular, impulsive, reflective, synthetic, analytic, analogue, digital, abstract, random, sequential, inductive and, deductive have no significant relationship with language achievement.

Self-regulation correlates positively and significantly with one learning style as follows: concrete ($r = .274, p < .05$). On the other hand, self-regulation correlates negatively and significantly with the corresponding learning style as follows: Field insensitive ($r = -.232, p < .05$).

Table 6: Descriptive statistics of Learners' Learning styles and GPA

Learning style	GPA
Field Dependent	-.176
Field Independent	-.057
Field Sensitive	-.084
Field Insensitive	-.232**
Leveler	.074
Sharpener	-.084
Global	.009
Particular	-.160
Impulsive	-.110
Reflective	-.113
Synthetic	.055
Analytic	-.065
Analogue	-.020
Digital	-.153
Concrete	.274**
Abstract	-.220
Random	-.028
Sequential	.130
Inductive	.029
Deductive	-.225

The primary purpose of the present study was to examine the possible relationship between the EFL learners' learning styles and the level of self-regulation, and language achievement.

The findings indicated that, there was no significant relationship between self-regulation and field dependent, field independent, field insensitive, leveler, global, impulsive, reflective, analytic, analogue, digital, concrete, abstract, random, sequential, inductive and, deductive learning styles. But self-regulation correlated positively and significantly with two learning styles; Sharpener and, Particular. On the other hand, self-regulation correlated negatively and significantly with Field sensitive and, Synthetic.

The first research question hypothesized that there was a relationship between Iranian EFL learners' learning styles and their self-regulation. The results demonstrated that two learning styles; Sharpener and, Particular have a positive relationship with the self-regulation. In other words, learners who have Sharpener and, Particular styles of learning are more self-regulated.

According to Ehrman and Leaver (2003), sharpening learning style concerns with how people perceive, store, and retrieve information. Sharpeners notice small differences and store them as significant attributes in their memories.

It is clear that sharpener learners who can notice specifics and details quickly, cannot usually get much from the context unless they pay close attention to what they learn, these learners begin with the details and lead to the main points, it is important to go step-by-step as they learn. learners with sharpening learning style tend to be aware of the trees before the forest, it means that they are likely to explore differences and disparities among things, and are more successful in facing out of context situations in a way that because of their interest and their close attention to the context of their study, they have more information and have a good memory for distinctions in contrast to the other learners, who tend to be most aware of the big picture or in other words they notice the forest before the trees.

These attentions help the learners with sharpening learning style to have more information about different topics, and can recall and use them whenever they need it. These learners like to live in a planned and very orderly way and are more self-confident and they seek to regulate and manage their lives, and tend to be structured and organized. Sharpener learners decide on the basis of logic, reason, and analysis. According to Zimmerman (1998), the process of self-regulation requires students to become proactively involved in their personal, behavioral, motivational and cognitive learning activities in order to achieve important and valuable academic purposes, so sharpening learning style enables the learners to be self-aware and knowledgeable in their learning (Zimmerman, 1990). Unlike their passive classmates, self-regulated learners actively participate in their learning. According to Ghanizadeh and Ghonsooly (2013), learners have to achieve self-regulation, in order to prepare themselves for lifelong learning, and to become skillful in their abilities.

For particular learners, Ehrman and Leaver (2003) assert that, this dimension is well summarized by the bottom-up processing metaphor, in which particular learners start from details and shift to general ones. These learners tend to think about things before they do or say them, they usually have to undertake focused study before they learn new words or phrases, they understand best by disassembly of what they are learning into its component parts and also they do not react quickly but, they take their time to react because they need enough time. These characteristics help the learners with particular learning style to have detailed

information and to be able to process their activities meticulously and to be confident learners who can rely on themselves and control and manage difficult situations successfully, which lead to self-regulation in which, self-regulated learners believe that the opportunities to have challenging tasks, lead to deep and better understanding of the subject matter which lead to academic success. Self-regulation involves "cognitive, affective, motivational, and behavioral components that provide the individual with the capacity to adjust his or her actions and goals to achieve desired results in light of changing environmental conditions" (Zeidner, Boekaerts, & Pintrich, 2000, p.751). Particular learning style enables the learners to be self-aware and knowledgeable in their learning process (Zimmerman, 1990). Thinking logically, being reasonable, analyzing and having mastery over material being studied are in harmony with the definition of self-regulated learners which is in line with the characteristics of particular learning style.

Regarding the results of the research, field sensitivity and synthetic learning styles have negative correlation with self-regulation, that is; when learners are field sensitive and synthetic they are less self-regulated.

Regarding the negative correlation of field sensitive and synthetic learning styles with self-regulation, it can be understood that, according to Ehrman and Leaver (2003), field sensitivity relates to foreground and background together, field-sensitive learners prefer to address material as part of the context. When these learners are working with new material with additional subject matter around it, they comfortably find and use what is most important. They like out-of-context material like grammar rules. When they are faced with new language, they reconceptualize it so that it makes sense in their own terms, as a result they rely so much on the context material and they are dependent to the subject matter and they are less self-regulated.

Also Ehrman and Leaver (2003), assert that synthetic learners like to use pieces to build new wholes. They understand best by assembling what they are learning into a whole. They often make up new words or sentences using language they already know. These learners sometimes make up new ways to say things. These characteristics make the learners less careful with the details and they prefer to look at the subject as a whole, so they do not have enough attention to the details and as a result they cannot concentrate and they cannot remember the details and do not have close attention and as a result synthetic learners are less self-aware and knowledgeable in their learning process (Zimmerman, 1990), so they are less capable to be self-regulated in contrast to their sharpener and particular learning styles that are more self-regulated.

The findings indicated that, there was no significant relationship between language achievement and field dependent, field independent, field sensitive, leveler, sharpener, global, particular, impulsive, reflective, synthetic, analytic, analogue, digital, abstract, random, sequential, inductive and, deductive learning styles. But language achievement correlated positively and significantly with one learning style; concrete. On the other hand, language achievement correlated negatively and significantly with Field insensitive learning style.

The second research question hypothesized that there was a relationship between Iranian EFL learners' learning styles and language achievement. The results demonstrated that a concrete learning style has a positive relationship with language achievement. In other words, learners who have concrete style of learning have better results in their language achievement.

According to Ehrman and Leaver (2003), concrete learners prefer a relationship with direct experience to the extent of sensory contact. Learners with concrete learning style like it when people say what they mean directly, they like to interact with the world rather than to learn through concepts and ideas, also organized textbooks and lesson plans really help the concrete learners. They learn best from language that is in meaningful context like stories and conversations. When they face with new language, they change it so that it makes sense in their own terms. They like learning when they can touch, see, or hear.

These characteristics of concrete learning styles will help the learners to learn by using lot of associations because they like to work with direct and concrete material contrary to the learners who have more interest in the system underlying language than in the concrete and actual language of communication. The concrete learners are more successful in retaining and recalling information because they prefer to learn pictorially and assigning different associations between different parts of the study, as a result in the production process and examinations they have better performance in a way that they remember the associations better.

Regarding the results of the research, field insensitivity has a negative correlation with language achievement that is; when learners are field insensitive they have worse performance on their language achievement.

In this regard Ehrman and Leaver (2003) assert that field-insensitive learners make little or no use of the context, when there is a lot of information that comes with what they need to learn, it is hard for them to tell what is most important. It all seems to fall together sometimes, and it is a hard work for learners with insensitive learning style to sort things out. Grammar rules and pieces of language that are out of context are hard for them to work with. They accept what is presented to them and take it pretty much as presented. These learners learn things generally with less focus on the material, they do not like to spend so much time on studying details and structures, and as a result they have less creativity and they are less successful in the examinations.

5. CONCLUSION

Our proposed model highlighted the role of learning style, in achieving self-regulation and better performance on language achievement.

Also the study showed positive correlation between learning style and self-regulation and language achievement. This study contributes to better understanding of these issues and how they are related. Despite some limitations, the findings of this study will be significant in the language learning education. It has actually been suggested that some dimensions of learning styles may help individuals be self-regulated and have better performance on language achievement.

Based on the results of this study, learning styles should be developed for EFL university students and some courses for EFL students to empower self-regulation should be established.

The results of this study should encourage authorities and EFL teachers to incorporate skills and abilities associated with learning styles in their curriculum and classroom activities. In so doing, there is opportunity to increase students' self-regulation and to enhance their language achievement, as well.

In order to enable the most learners possible to learn as much as they can, we need to give them every advantage, including a program that enables them to start out in a relatively comfortable and stress-free way. That means giving them the opportunity to learn in their preferred styles according to their characteristic and personality, rather than always outside of them, which can happen in the interests of keeping classrooms paced to the majority or to a standard curriculum.

This in no way rejects good teachers and well-constructed syllabi; in fact, they are even more important than ever for the majority of learners. It is expert teachers with flexible but clear syllabi who can most systematically provide for the individual differences among their students. Thus professors and teachers should provide the situation to increase the activities related to different learning styles among their students to increase self-regulation. For example, the teachers can present some tasks which can enforce personal achievements.

The importance and advantages of English learning as a second language is continuing to increase day by day. The importance and advantages of English learning as a second language is continuing to increase day by day. Ling, Lan, Zhu-hui, and Nan (2013) also stated that many college students complain that English is not used frequently in daily life like the mother tongue, so constant interest in it is a big problem and they should pass all kinds of exams, so many of them are unwilling to spend time studying English. The importance of self-regulation and different learning styles in learning was highlighted comprehensively through the current study. This study was presented in the belief that an awareness of different learning styles of learners will allow the development of self-regulatory skills in and outside of learning environments. This knowledge will suggest areas for growth and will help learners to control and assess not only their learning, but also all the aspects of their lives. Thus, awareness about our personality is beneficial not only in our learning but also in our everyday lives.

Regarding the results of this study, it is needed to have policies in our education system in order to lead the learners to apply those learning styles which were positive indicators of self-regulation, which is one of the other keys to success in life and self-regulation includes the control over one's emotional states and feelings as well as mental processes; and this control will enable learners to feel better and suffer less on a daily life.

If we have self-regulated learners who have great control over their own time schedule, and how they approach their studying and learning (Pintrich, 1995) we can have self-regulated human beings who live in a self-regulated society and in a self-regulated world.

REFERENCES

- Adey, P., Fairbrother, R., Wiliam, D., Johnson, B., & Jones, C. (1999). *Learning styles and strategies. A review of research*. London: King's College London School of Education.
- Arabi, S., Ghanizadeh, A., & Elahi Shirvan, M. (2015). A study of the bond between EFL learners' personality types and self-regulation and the moderating role of age and gender. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching in the Islamic World*, 3(1), 5-13.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Baneshi, A., Karamdoust, N., & Hakimzadeh, R. (2013). Validity & reliability of the Persian version of Grasha-Richmann student learning styles scale. *Advances in Medical Education and Professionalism, 1*(4), 119-124.
- Cassidy, S (2004). Learning styles: an overview of theories, models and measures. *Educational Psychology, 24*(4), 419–444.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.
- Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. (1993). *Teaching secondary science students through their individual learning styles: Practical approaches for grades 7- 12*. New York: Aliyn and Bacon.
- Ehrman, M. E., Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *System, 31*(2), 313–330.
- Ghanizadeh, A., & Ghonsooly, B. (2013). A tripartite model of EFL teacher attributions, burnout, and self-regulation: toward the prospects of effective teaching. *Educ Res Policy Prac, 13*(2), 145-166.
- Ghanizadeh, A., & Mirzaee, S. (2012). EFL learners' self-regulation, critical thinking and language achievement. *International Journal of Linguistics, 4*(3), 25_35.
- Grasha, A. F. (1996). *Teaching with style: a practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles*. San Bernardino, CA: Alliance Publishers.
- Herl, H.E., O'Neil, H.F., Chung, G.K.W.K., Bianchi, C., Wang, S.L., Mayer, R., Lee, C.Y., Choi, A., Suen, T., & Tu, A. (1999). *Final report for validation of problem- solving measures*. CSE Technical Report 501. University of California, Los Angles.
- Kinsella, K. (1995). Understanding and empowering diverse learners in ESL classrooms. In J. Reid (Ed.), *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom* (pp. 170–194). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Ling, Ch., Lan, J., Zhu-hui, Y., & Nan, L. (2013). A survey on college English learning burnout. *Sino-US English Teaching, 10*(8), 608-614.
- Montgomery, S.M. (1995). *Addressing diverse learning styles through the use of multimedia*. In: Proceedings of the Frontiers in Education Conference, vol. 1. IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA.
- Naserieh, F., & Anabi Sarab, M. (2013). Perceptual learning style preferences among Iranian graduate students. *System, 41*(1), 122-133.
- O'Neil, H.F., & Herl, H.E. (1998). *Reliability and validity of a trait measure of self-regulation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Paris S. G., & Paris A. H. (2001). Classroom application of research on self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist, 36*(3), 89-101.
- Pintrich, P. R. (1995). Understanding self-regulated learning. In P. R. Pintrich (Ed.), *Understanding self-regulated learning* (pp. 3-12). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Ramsden, P. (1983). *Context and strategy: situational influences on learning*, in: N Entwistle and P Ramsden (eds), *Understanding student learning*, Croom Helm, London.
- Reid, J. M. (1995). Preface. In J. M. Reid (Ed.), *Learning styles In the ESL/EFL classroom* (pp. viii–xvii). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Riding, R.J., & Rayner, S. (1997). *Cognitive styles and learning strategies: understanding style differences in learning behaviour*, David Fulton Publishers Ltd, London.
- Sadler-Smith, E. (2001). A reply to Reynolds's critique of learning style. *Management Learning*, 32(2), 291-304.
- Schunk, D. H. (1986). Verbalization and children's self-regulated learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 11(3), 347-369.
- Wang, M. (2008). Learning styles and English teaching. *US-China Foreign Language*, 6, 30.
- Zeidner, M., Boekaerts, M., & Pintrich, R.P. (2000). Self-regulation: directions and challenges for future research. In M. Boekaerts, P.R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 749–68). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Zimmerman, B.J. (1998). Academic studying and the development of personal skill: A self-regulatory perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 33(3), 73-86.
- Zimmerman, B.J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13-39). New York: Academic Press.
- Zimmerman, B.J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational Psychologist*, 25(2), 3-17.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1985). The development of intrinsic motivation: A social learning analysis. *Annals of Child Development*, 2(3), 117-160.
- Zimmerman, B.J. (2001). Theories of self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview and analysis. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 1–37). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zimmerman, B.J., Bandura, A., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-Motivation for Academic Attainment: The Role of Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Personal Goal Setting, *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(3), 663-676.
- Zimmerman, B.J., & Schunk, D. (2001). Reflections on theories of self-regulated learning and academic achievement. In B. Zimmerman & D. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Achievement: Theoretical Perspectives* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 289-307). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.