



Match or Mismatch of EFL Students' Learning Styles and Writing Assignments

 Khalil Tazik,¹

 Mohammad Aliakbari,²

¹PhD in Applied Linguistics,
Educational Ministry, *Iran*

²Professor at the English
Department of Ilam University,
Ilam, *Iran*

Corresponding Author: Khalil Tazik

Phone: +989167261679

e-mail: khaliltazik@gmail.com

Article citation: Aliakbari, M. & Tazik, Kh. (2019). The match or mismatch of EFL learners' learning styles and writing assignments. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 3(2): 35–47.

Received Date: 2 February 2019

Accepted Date: 28 February 2019

Online Date: 7 May, 2019

Publisher: Kare Publishing

© 2018 Applied Linguistics Research Journal

E-ISSN: 2651-2629

ABSTRACT

Along with the ever-increasing attention to the learners and learning in ESL/EFL classrooms, language learning styles have been considered as the cornerstone of learners' successful achievements. Referent to this assumption, researchers often agree that accommodating teaching styles to students' learning styles and taking into account their individual differences in language classes can lead to the improved learning. Therefore, this study intended to investigate the effects of accommodating writing assignments to the learning styles of the EFL learners on their writing improvement. More specifically, the present research aimed at investigating the effect of visual style on improving EFL undergraduate students' writing. Accordingly, 22 EFL learners whose major learning styles were visual were selected as the participants of this study. To start with, a pretest was taken. Through the analysis of pretest scores, researchers commenced the instruction in about 10 sessions. During these sessions, one of the researchers instructed the participants, worked on their writings, and gave assignments and topics which matched their style. At the end of the course, a posttest was administered and two raters, familiar with writing assessment, independently scored the writings, and then the means of pre and posttests were subjected to a match t-test. Results ($t = 2.379$, $sig. = 0.04$, $p < 0.05$) showed that giving writing tasks to the visual students based on their style improved their writing. In conclusion, if teachers take individual differences into account, especially in writing classes, more promotion in EFL undergraduate students' writing can be achieved.

Keywords: Learning Styles; Visual Style; Writing Promotion; Perceptual Learning Style Preference Survey (PLSPS).

1. Introduction

As teachers, we often create classroom environments that are rewarding to us and to students who are similar to us, but these settings can be extremely frustrating for other students. The results, therefore, seem to indicate that we do need to become aware of our own teaching/learning styles as well as the learning styles of our students (Dreyer, 1998).

Today, there has been a paradigm shift from instructional-oriented to a learner-oriented approach towards language learning (Riazi & Riasati, 2007). One consequence of this shift, as Aliakbari and Mahjub (2010) have emphasized, was "an increasing awareness and interest in resources for learning styles

and language learning strategies in foreign and second language teaching and learning" (p. 41). Undoubtedly, language learners take in and understand information in different ways. Some like to see while others may like to hear. Most of the researchers, Brown (2000) in particular, believe that general approaches and preferences that language learners use in their learning are learning styles or preferences. If teachers aim at achieving a desired outcome, they are recommended to provide tasks and activities through which learners like to learn the language skills. Accordingly, Dunn, Dunn, and Price (1979) maintain that giving learning instruction in line with the learners' preferences improve their learning. In other words, when mismatches exist between learners' learning styles and the given tasks by the teacher, the learners may become disappointed in class and lose their motivation about the courses (Felder, 1996). Conversely, Dunn et al. (2009) have noted that compatibility of teachers' instructions and learners' preferences can lead to the successful learning process.

To date, many theories have been developed to increase teachers' effectiveness in teaching writing. Understanding these theories will help researchers understand the writing teachers' contributions to the learners' success in writing skill. Hyland (2003) argues that writing is a socio-cognitive activity that involves skills of writing processes such as planning, drafting, and revising as well as knowledge of language, context, and audiences. Most teachers are not aware of the ways their students prefer to write or they may pay little attention to these different preferences. Although it is generally believed that students come to the language classroom with different learning preferences in writing, teachers are still giving them the same topics and tasks in writing classes. However, it has been proved that such an approach would have failed to capture many of the learners learning preferences (Riazi & Riasati, 2007). Teachers, therefore, need to be aware of their learners' learning styles and match the class activities and tasks to their styles. Taking textbooks and teaching materials into consideration, the issue gets worse. Syllabus and material designers often think of an stereotype student and base their work on course requirements or their own experiences and pay little attention to the learners' styles of learning. Perhaps it is the time to change this trend and involve the students' learning preferences more into the learning process. In this relation, it is worth examining the effect of particular styles on the writing of English language learners, in general, and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students in particular, to know more of the benefits of these accommodations. Hence, this study aims at investigating the effects of visual style on the EFL students' essay writing.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Learning Styles

Brown (2000) refers to consistent and enduring tendencies or preferences for learning as learning styles. He believes that styles are the general characteristics of intellectual functioning that pertain to individuals. These unique features differentiate individuals from each other. For example, one may be more visually oriented, more tolerant of ambiguity, or more analytical than others. Felder and Henriques (1995) note that "the ways in which an individual characteristically acquires, retains, and retrieves information are collectively termed the individual's *learning style*" (p. 21). Peacock (2001) has emphasized that Reid's 1995 definition of learning style – "an individual's natural, habitual, and preferred way(s) of absorbing, processing, and retaining new information and skills" (p. iii) – is now the most widely accepted. Dunn et al. (2009) have pointed out that learning style, as a dimension of diversity, encourages individuals, as both learners and instructors, to respect and accept a variety of appropriate behaviors in the teaching and learning process. They found out that "learning style has become a well-known concept in the Nordic nations and a pedagogical platform for recognizing and responding to individual differences... Without learning styles as its cornerstone, no one knows how to differentiate instruction or on what to base differentiation" (p. 139). Hyland (2003) emphasizes that being aware of differences in preferred learning and teaching styles is potentially useful in L2 classrooms. He also suggested that learners have their own styles or general approaches to learning, and that these are partly shaped by their cultural backgrounds or prior experiences.

Ehrman, Leaver, and Oxford (2003) note that the literature on learning styles loosely and often interchangeably uses the terms learning style, cognitive style, personality type, sensory preference, and modality. Examples of important learning styles found in the literature are visual, auditory, hands-on, extroverted, introverted, intuitive-random, concrete-sequential, closure-oriented and open, analytic, and global (Nam & Oxford, 1998).

Among these categories of learning styles, perceptual learning style has received much more attention. Reid (1987, p. 89) states that research has demonstrated that learners have four basic perceptual learning channels (or modalities):

1. Visual learning: reading, studying charts
2. Auditory learning: listening to lectures, audiotapes
3. Kinesthetic learning: experiential learning, that is, total physical involvement with a learning situation
4. Tactile learning: "hands-on" learning, such as building models or doing laboratory experiments

Aliakbari and Tazik (2011) suggest that language instructors should gear their teaching methods to the students' variant learning styles. Likewise, many other researchers (e.g. Dreyer, 1998; Felder & Henriques, 1995; Mulalic et al., 2007) recommend the instructors to motivate their learners by presenting information in a way that accommodate their learning style. Peacock (2001), for instance, suggests that to accommodate the *Visual learners* in class, instructors use handouts, videos, encourage note-taking and reading, and write key information on the board.

2.2. Studies on Learning Styles

Studies on language learning styles have widely focused on the importance of determining the students and teachers learning and teaching styles as well as comparing the students' learning preferences with the teachers' teaching methods. Reid (1987) criticizes ESL instructors for they "often use methods and materials that have been developed with the learning needs of native speakers of English in mind" (p. 91). She believes that students and teachers are not aware that lots of the problems such as difficulty in learning class material, high frustration levels, and even failure may not rest solely in the material itself. Language learning preferences can have crucial role in this regard. Therefore, she suggests that, to have more effective results, the goals of instruction should be (1) to help students identify and assess their individual learning styles, (2) to allow students to sample unfamiliar teaching and learning styles, and (3) to devise alternative instructional situations to accommodate the variations in learning styles that may exist in a classroom. She concludes that understanding and employing different teaching styles by the instructor, and the awareness of individual learning styles by the student, may influence success in the classroom.

Felder and Henriques (1995) note that students' learning are governed by their native ability, prior preparation, compatibility of their characteristic approach to learning, and the instructor's characteristic approach to teaching. They therefore suggest that "although it can be helpful for an instructor to know the distribution of learning styles in a class, the point is not to place all students into one or another style category and to teach each student exclusively according to his or her preferred style" (p. 27). Rather, the goal is a balanced teaching style, i.e. a multistyle approach for teaching in classrooms in all classes at all levels. Nam and Oxford (1998) argue that learning style preferences help the learners to shape their learning strategies. They explain that visual learners tend to use strategies such as taking notes and outlining in language classes. Ehrman (1998), after the analysis of some students' end-of-training quotes, said that the quotes were positive if there has been a match between the students' learning styles and the teachers' teaching approaches. He believes that the relationship between students and teachers are far from a one-way proposition and, surely, teachers motivate their students to learn and support this process in many ways. Similar to students, teachers are also motivated by their interpersonal satisfactions of teaching.

According to Dreyer (1998, p. 116), "a stylistic match or mismatch between teacher and student may determine how well they get along, with important consequences for the learning

process". Dreyer (1998) argues that one of the overlooked problems of language learning is that "teachers continue to teach the same lesson to an entire class in the same way and eventually require a demonstration of mastery in exactly the same way" (p. 116). Consequently, the class is not equally productive for all the students because their minds work in different ways. He states that individuals come to the classroom with different preferences. Therefore, "what may be happening, then, is a fundamental mismatch between the preferred styles of teachers and those of students. This creates a battle between teachers and students" (Dreyer, 1998, p. 116). In his analysis of the possible mismatches between language learners in South Africa and the instructors, Dreyer (1998) found that teachers participating in the study might be at "war" with their students. He continues that it may be that teachers' preferred learning/teaching styles and the activities they provide in the classroom are not taking into account the stylistic needs of the students. He notes that although all the problems occurring in the ESL classroom cannot be put in the basket of "style wars", it does seem that style disparities indirectly contribute to a lot of problems in the classroom. Finally, he suggests that "greater awareness and knowledge of the potentially negative effects of "style wars" may help in the creation of a more conducive atmosphere for learning and teaching in the ESL classroom" (p. 123). Similarly, Bialystock (1985, cited in Hyland, 2003) offers that diagnosing the learners' style help the teachers to adapt their teaching styles to the students' preferred styles. In this way, teachers can avoid "style war" between their own and their students' styles, which can have negative effects on both attitudes and learning.

Spratt (1999) states that considerable lack of correspondence between the learner preferences and teachers' perceptions of them has been reported in the literature. He concludes that such discrepancies between learners and teachers' views suggest teachers' inability in confidently diagnosing their learners' preferences.

Peacock (2001) suggests that learning and teaching styles, and particularly the match or mismatch between them, are an important and under-researched aspect of L2 classroom life. Great deal of theoretical support illustrate that mismatches are common, and that they negatively affect learning and learner motivation and attitude. In his study, he has reported that his findings indicate that a mismatch between teaching and learning styles causes learning failure and frustration. Therefore, he suggests that EFL teachers (1) try to identify their own teaching style, (2) identify their students' learning styles, and (3) try to accommodate those learning styles. One way to achieve (3) is to match teaching style with learning style (p. 15). His conclusion is that "but as learning styles within a class generally differ, perhaps a better approach is to strive for a balanced teaching style that does not excessively favor any one learning style – or rather that tries to accommodate multiple learning styles" (p. 15).

Ehrman et al. (2003) state that learner differences include, among others, factors classified under the following three areas: Learning styles, Learning strategies, and Affective variables. They believe that in order to enable the most learners learn as much as they can, teachers need a program, which enables these learners to start out in a comfortable way, i.e. giving them the opportunity to learn in their preferred styles, rather than always outside of them.

In their study, Wintergerst, DeCapua, and Verna (2003) found that teachers who use teaching and learning strategies that correspond to their students' learning styles are more likely to reach a larger number of students'.

Mulalic et al. (2007) have stated that learning styles play a crucial role in the learning process. Language teachers and instructors should not neglect the importance of determining students' learning styles and accommodating their teaching methods for them. They contend, "students' learning styles have been ignored and have been considered an insignificant component in the learning process" (p. 10). They also discuss that language instructors enter the classroom and teach the students based on their own learning styles while their learning preferences may differ from their students.

Riazi and Riasati (2007) in a study aimed at investigating the language learning style preferences of Iranian EFL learners, and the degree of teachers' awareness of them found that teachers are aware of their students' learning preferences in a number of cases, but unaware in some others. Therefore,

there needs to be a closer cooperation between teachers and students in these instances. Their findings also reveal that most of learners in the study seem to favor a *communicative* approach, i.e. perfecting their language skills by working in pairs/ groups, actively engaging in classroom discussions, practicing their English by talking to their peers and interacting with other people. But teachers are not aware of some of these preferences.

Dunn et al. (2009) believe that education stakeholders recognize that not all learners favor one teaching approach; consequently, modifications and teaching flexibility are essential for academic success. Regarding the impact of learning style on the students' achievement, their findings revealed that learning style have had positive effect on the learners and teachers' values and positively affected their academic achievement.

Acknowledging that people are individually different, in terms of their style, and in an attempt to review how a teacher can accommodate tasks to the learners. Hyland (2003, p. 45) suggests that in writing classes students perceptual style preferences can be accommodated in certain ways: Students with an auditory preferences work best on tasks like listening to the lectures, conversations or taped materials as source for writing, visual learners respond well to reading source texts, completing gapped texts, and transferring information from graphic or video materials, and kinesthetic students like to participate in role playing activities and tactile students work better on activities that involve writing reports on building and testing models.

3. Statement of the Problem

In summary, the studies cited above seem to unanimously emphasize the importance of accommodating teaching and learning styles in EFL/ESL classrooms, they also admit the detrimental role of learning styles in positively enhancing the learners' motivation, attitudes, and achievement, as well as the negative effects of mismatching of learning and teaching styles on the students' learning. In spite of such disposition, unfortunately in currently used pedagogical programs and instructions, instructors pay little attention to the individual differences. And writing is not an exception. Teaching practices and topics for writing are the same for all the learners. Therefore, in this study, the researchers tried to indicate the extent to which the instructors take the individual differences, in terms of their style, into account, and the probable progress in their students' writing, in particular, due to establishing the match between teaching and learning styles. Therefore, this study intended to investigate whether visually oriented learners' writing would improve, if teachers give them writing tasks, which accommodate to their style. The study, therefore, sought answers to the following question:

Does compatibility of writing tasks with the students' learning style improve their writing ability?

4. Method

4.1. Participants

This study was conducted with 22 (10 males and 12 females) EFL undergraduate students studying at the faculty of Literature and Humanities at Ilam University, Iran. Their age ranged from 19 to 23. The primary population was 60 students. Since the focus of this study was on the visually oriented students, a questionnaire adopted from Reid (1987) was given to the students to determine their style. After collecting the data, those who were visually oriented were selected as the participants.

4.2. Instruments

The measuring instruments used in this research consisted of a questionnaire and the students' written texts. The questionnaire used in this study was adopted from Reid (1984). This questionnaire has been designed to help researchers identify the way(s) learners learn best (Reid, 1995). Reid's questionnaire consists of 30 items, in which there are 5 items for each learning category, i.e. visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, group learning, and individual learning. Each item has a numerical

value. Items 6, 10, 12, 24, and 29 are visual questions. If the score of the learners who answer the visual items was between 38 and 50, the learners' major style is visual. Reid's Perceptual Learning Style Preference Survey (PLSPS) has been widely used by many researchers (Hyland, 1993; Wintergerst & DeCapua, 1998; Peacock, 2001; Wintergerst et al, 2001; Mulalic et al., 2007; Riazi & Mansoorian, 2008). Wintergerst et al. (2003) note that for non-native speakers of English, Reid's (1984) Perceptual Learning Style is among the better-known learning style assessment instruments normed in the ESL/EFL field. They have also found out that, among the available instruments, the earliest and the most widely used instrument for ESL learners is Reid's PLSPQ. Mulalic et al. (2007) enumerate some reasons for choosing this instrument for their study: "it is easy to administer, easy to interpret, self-scoring and not scored by an external agent, relatively quick to administer and complete, it has easily reportable scales, and has reliability and validity supported by the research" (p. 13).

Another measuring instrument used in this research was students' written texts, which were based on the tasks that the teacher gave to them. These texts were the learners' products, which showed their strengths or weaknesses in writing. The texts were assessed according to the analytic scoring rubric adopted from Hyland (2003, Appendix B). The total score for the texts were 100. Those texts which scored 78 to 100 were ranked as excellent to very good, and those which scored 54 to 75, 28 to 50, and 3 to 25 were respectively ranked as good to average, fair to poor, and inadequate.

4.3. Procedure for Data Collection and Analysis

To observe the outcome of style-based writing instruction, the one-group pretest posttest design was used, i.e. students were assigned in an intact group, took a pretest, and after writing instruction, received a posttest. To commence the study, firstly, the original form of Reid's (1995) questionnaire was administered to students during their class sessions. Based on the results of the questionnaire, visually oriented students were selected as the intact group. Then the selected participants took part in a pretest, writing a summary of a reading passage. The scores of the pretest were collected to be compared with the post-test scores. The instruction for completing the pretest was given clearly by the teacher. The teacher gave the instruction in two steps. In step 1, he introduced the research project to the students and told them that they would be participating in a writing assessment. He also noted that two teachers would evaluate the papers and identify their strengths and weaknesses. The students were told about scoring standards which considered: Fulfillment of the task, presenting clear and interesting ideas and the proper development of those ideas; effective organization and coherence; and varied and correct sentences, correct use of conventions such as grammar, punctuation, usage, spelling, and sentence structure

In step 2, the students were asked to write a summary of a reading entitled "A day of an Iranian worker" in a paragraph of at least 150-word length. After taking the pre-test, the visual style students, with the help of their teacher, worked on the topics over 10 sessions. After those sessions, a post-test with similar form but different topic was administered. Adopting analytical scoring rubric as rating scale by Hyland (2003), all the texts were scored based on the given traits. To make the scoring process reliable, each script was scored by two raters. The reported score was the average score of two raters. The pre-test and post-test means were subjected to a match t-test in order to define the significance of the difference between them.

5. Results and Discussions

The raw data were analyzed using SPSS 14.0. Descriptive and inferential statistics were carried out for all measures in this study. The results are discussed below.

To account for the inter-rater reliability of two sets of scores, Pearson correlation was calculated for each group of scores, once for the pre-test scores and once for the post-test scores. Table 1 shows the correlation between two raters' scores for pre and posttests.

Table 1. The correlation between two raters' scores for pretest and posttest

	Pretest	Posttest
Pearson correlation	.753*	.911*
Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.000
N	22	22

*P<0.05

As it can be seen from this table, the correlation is significant at $p < 0.05$ level. It means that the inter-rater reliability for both pretest and posttest scores is high enough and acceptable. As discussed above, after administering pre and posttests, descriptive statistics were computed to compare the means obtained for pre and post tests. Results of this comparison are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Paired Samples Statistics for comparing means of pre and post tests

	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Error Mean
Pretest	22	2.11	13.30	.66
Posttest	22	2.41	15.60	.76

As Table 2 shows, the mean score for the pretest is 13.3 ($m = 13.3$). The reported mean for posttest is 15.6 ($m = 15.6$). To check whether the observed differences between the given means were significant, a match t-test was calculated.

Table 3. A match t-test for pretest and posttest means

	t	df	Sig.
Pretest-posttest	-2.37*	21	.04

*P<0.05

As can be seen from Table 3, the obtained t value is 2.37 and the significant level is .04. Therefore, it can be claimed that there was a significant difference between two means. This means that the answer to the research question is positive. In other words, if teachers give their visually oriented students writing tasks based on their style, they will observe improvement in their writing. More specifically, visually oriented students can improve their writing better when or if they are given specific tasks such as writing summaries, with topics like describing pictures, and recording what they see in a film.

6. Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

Researchers such as Brown (2000) noted that language learning is a conscious process that includes formal exposure to grammatical rules, learning instruction, receiving feedback on the correct or incorrect uses of language. This process is routinely practiced in most of the language learning classes, consecutively followed since the instructors found it to be efficient and helpful in language learning. However, static use of teaching procedures may lead to undesired outcomes. Therefore, what is expected from language teachers is the considerable use of variant activities in order to reinforce language learning, motivating language learners, and reaching all students in educational settings.

This study investigated accommodating writing tasks to the undergraduate learners' language learning styles. Results from the statistical analysis of the scripts written by the participants indicated that the learners' writing ability improved considerably. Comparing the pre and posttest means and calculating the match t-test for the possible mean differences supported this claim ($t = 2.37$, $p < 0.04$). Therefore, it is concluded that visual EFL learners prefer to write texts and work on the topics which match their style, and that they need a great deal of visual presentation in language classes. However, since in language classes, students enter the classroom with variant learning styles, it is impossible to teach in a way that favors all. So, it is highly recommended that the

instructors present variety of materials and give multi-style writing tasks in language classrooms if they like to reach all.

All in all, from the above mentioned results, the following pedagogical implications can be drawn.

1. It seems that accommodating writing tasks to the EFL learners' learning style can help them accomplish their tasks successfully. Instructors should take it into consideration and try to match their teaching style with their learners'.
2. Writing instructors should know that visually-oriented learners perform well on the tasks which they can see before writing. To motivate these students, instructors should present a great deal of simulation in language classrooms.
3. In EFL writing classes, setting a unique topic for all is not desirable. Giving learning-style-based topics to the students can help them to write about what they prefer.
4. Writing is not a mere product. In writing classes instructors can use simulations, video-tapes, and even realia to establish a background in their students' minds and help them to map out what they are writing.
5. Instructors should identify the learners' learning style at the beginning of the educational period and make the students aware of these styles. In this way, students are aware of their learning preferences and instructors know what topics should be given to which students.
6. Course and material designers should provide this opportunity to all the students to write about what they prefer more. Including the wide variety of topics and tasks in writing books can be a viable contribution in this regard.

It is worth mentioning that, this study has been done by an intact group with the same learning style. Further studies can be undergone by using a control group to make rigorous discussions on the present conclusions.

References

- Aliakbari, M., & Mahjub, E. (2010). Analytical/intuitive EFL learners and gender effect. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 6(1), 41-48.
<https://doi.org/10.5172/ijpl.6.1.41>
- Aliakbari, M., & Tazik, K. (2011). On the relationship between gender and perceptual language learning styles: The case of Iranian academic EFL learners. *Educational Psychology*, 31(6), 657-674.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2011.592275>
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language teaching and learning (4th ed)*. Addison Wesley: Longman.
- Dreyer, C. (1998). Teacher-student style wars in South Africa: The silent battle. *System*, 26, 115-126.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(97\)00068-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00068-7)
- Dunn, R., Dunn, K., & Price, G. (1979). Identifying individual learning style. In *student learning styles: Diagnosing and prescribing programs*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Dunn, R., Honigsfeld, A., Doolan, S. H., Bostrom, L., Russo, K., Schiering, M. S., Suh, B., & Tenedero, H. (2009). Impact of learning-style instructional strategies on students' achievement and attitudes: Perceptions of educators in diverse institutions. *The Clearing House*, 82(3), 135-140.
<https://doi.org/10.3200/TCHS.82.3.135-140>
- Ehrman, M. (1998). The learning alliance: Conscious and unconscious aspects of the second language teacher's role. *System*, 26, 93-106.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(97\)00066-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00066-3)
- Ehrman, M. E., Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). A brief review of individual differences in second language learning. *System*, 31, 313-330.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(03\)00045-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00045-9)
- Felder, R. M. (1996). 'Matters of styles'. *ASEE Prism*, 6(4), 18–23. Also available at <http://www2.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/LS-Prism.htm>.
- Felder, R. M., & Henriques, E. R. (1995). Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28(1), 21-31.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1995.tb00767.x>
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667251>
- Lashley, C., & Barron, P. (2006). The learning style preferences of hospitality and tourism students: Observation from an international and cross-cultural study. *Hospitality Management*, 25, 552-569.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2005.03.006>
- Mulalic, A., Shah, P. M., & Ahmad, F. (2007). Learning-style preference of ESL students. *AJTLHE*, 1(2), 9-17.
- Nam, C., & Oxford, R. L. (1998). Portrait of a future teacher: Case study of learning styles, strategies, and language disabilities. *System*, 26, 51-63.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(97\)00070-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00070-5)
- Peacock, M. (2001). Match or mismatch? Learning styles and teaching styles in EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 1-20.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00001>
- Reid, J. (1995). *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Reid, J. M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 87-111.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3586356>
- Riazi, A., & Riasati, M. J. (2007). Language learning style preferences: A case study of Shiraz EFL institutes. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(2), 87-106.
- Riazi, A., & Mansoorian, M. A. (2008). Shiraz University learning style preferences among Iranian male and female EFL students. *Iranian EFL Journal*, 2, 88-100.
- Spratt, M. (1999). How good are we at knowing what learners like? *System*, 27, 141-155.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(99\)00013-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00013-5)
- Wintergerst, A. C., DeCapua, A., & Verna, M. A. (2003). Conceptualizing learning style modalities for ESL/EFL students. *System*, 31, 85-106. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(02\)00075-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00075-1)

Appendices

Appendix A

PLSP Questionnaire (Reid, 1987)

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. When the teacher tells me the instructions I understand better.					
2. I prefer to learn by doing something in class.					
3. I get more work done when I work with others.					
4. I learn more when I study with a group.					
5. In class, I learn best when I work with others.					
6. I learn better by reading what the teacher writes on the chalkboard.					
7. When someone tells me how to do something in class, I learn it better.					
8. When I do things in class, I learn better.					
9. I remember things I have heard in class better than things I have read.					
10. When I read instructions, I remember them better.					
11. I learn more when I can make a model of something.					
12. I understand better when I read instructions.					
13. When I study alone, I remember things better.					
14. I learn more when I make something for a class project.					
15. I enjoy learning in class by doing experiments.					
16. I learn better when I make drawings as I study.					
17. I learn better in class when the teacher gives a lecture.					
18. When I work alone, I learn better.					
19. I understand things better in class when I participate in role-playing.					
20. I learn better in class when I listen to someone.					
21. I enjoy working on an assignment with two or three classmates.					
22. When I build something, I remember what I have learned better.					
23. I prefer to study with others.					

24. I learn better by reading than by listening to someone.					
25. I enjoy making something for a class project.					
26. I learn best in class when I can participate in related activities.					
27. In class, I work better when I work alone.					
28. I prefer working on projects by myself.					
29. I learn more by reading textbooks than by listening to lectures.					
30. I prefer to work by myself,					

Note. PLSP questionnaire, adopted from Reid (1984). In Reid, J. (1995). *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers. Used with permission.

Appendix B

Analytic Scoring Rubric

Mark	Format and content 40 marks
31-40 excellent to very good	Fulfills task fully; correct convention for the assignment task; features of chosen genre mostly adhered to; good ideas/good use of relevant information; substantial concept use; properly developed ideas; good sense of audience
21-30 good to average	Fulfills task quite well although details may be underdeveloped or partly irrelevant; correct genre selected; most features of chosen genre adhered to; satisfactory ideas with some development; quite good use of relevant information; some concepts use; quite good sense of audience
11-20 fair to poor	Generally adequate but some inappropriate, inaccurate, or irrelevant data; an acceptable convention for the assignment task; some features of the chosen genre are adhered to; limited ideas; little concept use; barely adequate development of ideas; poor sense of audience
1-10 inadequate	Clearly inadequate fulfillment of the task; possibly incorrect genre for the assignment; chosen genre not adhered to; omission of key information; serious irrelevance or inaccuracy; very limited ideas; no concept use; inadequate development of ideas; poor or no sense of audience
Mark	Organization and coherence 20 marks

16-20 excellent to very good	Message followed with ease; well organized and thorough development through introduction, body, and conclusion; relevant and convincing supporting details; logical progression of content contributes to fluency; unified paragraphs; effective use of transitions and reference
11-15 good to average	Message mostly followed with ease; satisfactorily organized and developed through introduction, body, and conclusion. Relevant supporting details; mostly logical progression of content; moderate to good fluency; unified paragraphs; over or under use of transitions but correctly; mostly correct references
6-10 fair to poor	Message followed but with some difficulty; some pattern of organization, introduction, body, and conclusion are evident but poorly done; some supporting details; progression of content incorrect use of reference inconsistent or repetitious; lack of focus in some paragraphs; over or under use of transitions with some incorrect use; inc
1-5 inadequate	Message difficult to follow; little evidence of organization- introduction and conclusion may be missing; few or no supporting details; no obvious progression of content; improper paragraphing; no or incorrect use of transitions; lack of reference contributes to comprehension difficulty
Mark	Sentence construction and vocabulary 40 marks
31-40 excellent to very good	Effective use of wide variety of correct sentences; variety of sentence length; effective use of transitions; no significant errors in agreement, tense, number, person, articles, pronouns, and proposition; effective use of wide variety of lexical items; word from mastery; effective choice of idioms; correct register
21-30 good to average	Effective use of a variety of correct sentences; some variety of length; use of transition with only slight errors; no serious recurring errors in agreement, tense, number, person, articles, pronouns, and propositions; almost no sentence fragment or run-ons; variety of lexical items with some problems but not causing comprehension difficulty; good control of word form; mostly effective idioms; correct register

11-20 fair to poor	A limited variety of correct sentences; little variety of sentence length; improper use of or missing transitions; recurring grammar errors are intrusive; sentence fragments or run-ons evident; a limited variety of lexical items occasionally causing comprehension problems; moderate word form control; occasional inappropriate choice of idiom; perhaps incorrect register
1-10 inadequate	A limited variety of sentences requiring considerable effort to understand; correctness only in simple short sentences; improper use of or missing transitions; many grammar errors and comprehension problems; frequent incomplete or run-on sentences; a limited variety of lexical items

Analytic Scoring rubric, adopted from Hyland (2003)