Macrothink Institute™

International Journal of English Language Education
ISSN 2325-0887
2015, Vol. 3, No. 2

Iranian EFL Learners' and Teachers' Sensory Preferences and the Learners' Speaking Ability

Shahin Vaezi

Department of Foreign Languages

Iran University of Science and Technology, Tehran, Iran

E-mail: sh_vaezi@iust.ac.ir

Hamid Reza Shahroosvand (Corresponding author)

M.A graduate in TEFL

PO Box: 7198977833, Shiraz, Iran

Tel: 98-93-5249-1146 E-mail: hamid.shahroosvand@gmail.com

Received: April 19, 2015 Accepted: May 9, 2015 Published: May 9, 2015

doi:10.5296/ijele.v3i2.7627 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v3i2.7627

Abstract

This study investigates the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' and teachers' sensory preferences (visual, auditory, and kinesthetic (VAK)) and the learners' achievement in speaking. Fifty-two Iranian EFL learners studying English participated in this study after their knowledge of English was considered homogeneous based on an English proficiency test and an IELTS interview simulation. Participants received the equivalent speaking instruction. Reid's PLSPQ was given to students to determine their sensory preferences. A teaching style questionnaire was given to their English teachers to determine their teaching style. Based on the results, two groups of matched and mismatched students were determined. After instruction, the two groups were post-tested through an oral interview test rated based on IELTS speaking band descriptors, as in the pretest. Results of the study indicated that matching Iranian EFL learners' and teachers' sensory preferences (VAK) had a significant effect on the learners' achievement in speaking.

Keywords: NLP, sensory preferences, teaching style, learning style, oral proficiency

1. Introduction

The role one considers for the learner in the process of language learning is much related to the way one defines learning. If the theory of learning adopted considers learners as passive, as in behaviorism, then little attention will be paid to the characteristics of the learner. On the other hand, when learning is considered to take place by active participation of the learner, as in cognitive psychology, then the learner and his characteristics will be considered as important.

With the shift of paradigm in learning theory from behaviorism to cognitive psychology, SLA research in the 1980s led to the more "classroom oriented studies that related various aspect of learners' psychology (attitude, anxiety, personality traits, cognitive styles, belief system) to their learning potential or achievement measures" (Chaudron 1988, p. 63). The importance of individual differences (IDs) has continued in the humanistic school of thought and has formed the basis for a lot of studies in the area of language teaching and linguistics.

The paradigm shift toward cognitive science helped "integration of two otherwise very different fields of study: language and neurobiology (Ingram, 2007: 3)" which was proposed as 'Neurolinguistics'. An area of interest in Neurolinguistics is that of Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP) which asserts a connection between the neurological processes ("neuro"), language ("linguistic"), and behavioral patterns learned through experience ("programming") that can be changed to achieve specific goals in life (Tosey and Mathison, 2006).

One of the factors highlighted by Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP) is that most people have sensory preferences (Visual, Auditory, and Kinesthetic (VAK)) when they communicate with other people. Sensory preferences have been called learning styles or cognitive styles (Brown, 2000, p. 113) and sensory modalities as well. Researchers and practitioners use learning style research with personality and cognitive styles to determine ability, predict performance, and improve classroom teaching and learning (Ehrman, et al., 2003).

Many researchers state that sensory preferences (Visual, Auditory, and Kinesthetic) can affect language learning and that matching teaching with these learning styles can improve learning and achievement (Peacock, 2001; Reid, 1987; & Rao, 2002). Therefore in this paper the authors attempt to investigate the effects of EFL student's VAK on their speaking achievement as related to teachers' teaching styles.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Much research has been done on the importance of paying attention to individuals in the language classroom. It is stated that the student's different sensory preferences can describe why the students learn differently, hence the importance of taking these preferences into account in the language classroom (Reid, 1987). However, the teacher should know how to pay attention to every individual student in the limited time he has and under other constraints available. According to Diaz Magioli (1996) teachers can dwell on how to match the personalities in their classes. On the other hand, the teachers themselves have stable preferences in their teaching which are often called teaching styles (Peacock, 2001). One

important class of these preferences is that of sensory preferences. A mismatch between teachers' and learners' preferences can cause "learning failure, frustration and demotivation" (Reid, 1987; Peacock, 2001). Therefore, it can be beneficial to determine the teachers' teaching style preferences and the way they are matched to the students' learning styles and the pattern of its effects on student's achievement in the classroom.

2. Review of Literature

Reviewing the literature on learning theories and the resulting approaches to language teaching in the past and present shows a shift of interest from teachers' teaching to the learners' learning. Unlike audiolingualism, cognitive psychology considers the learner as "an active participant in the learning process, using various mental strategies in order to sort out the system of language to be learned" (Williams and Burden, 1997, p.13). Since the emergence of this school of thought, individual learners' differences or leaner variables have become more and more important in language teaching methodology and second language acquisition (SLA) research (Chaudron, 2001).

The importance of individual differences (ID) has continued in humanistic school of thought. In what follows learning styles of the learner and the importance of paying attention to them in the classroom are discussed.

2.1 Individual Differences

There are a lot of studies on the effects of individual learner differences in second language learning. Discussing individual learner differences (IDs), Ellis (1994) points to the problem related to classifying learner variables and the choice of terms for labeling different factors. There are different classifications of learner variables by different authors. However, in most of these taxonomies (Chastain, 1988; Larsen Freeman and Long, 1991; Brown, 2000) the cognitive characteristics of the learner can be seen, although with some differences in labeling and classifications. Reid (1987, p. 90) stated that "interest and research in second language learning styles has focused on cognitive styles (with some behavioral applications) and on conscious learning strategies". However, there is no clear-cut distinction between learning styles and cognitive styles.

2.2 Learning Styles

Brown (2000, p. 113) states that "the way we learn things in general and the way we attack a problem hinge on a rather amorphous link between personality and cognition; this link is referred to as cognitive style". In the educational context "where affective and physiological factors are intermingled," cognitive styles are generally referred to as learning styles.

Different scholars have provided definitions for learning styles. Felder and Henriques (1995, p. 21) states that "the ways in which an individual characteristically acquires, retains, and retrieves information are collectively termed the individual's *learning style*". Keefe (1985: 140) relates the learning styles to the interaction between the learner and the learning environment and defines learning style as "the composite of characteristic cognitive, affective, and physiological factors that serve as relatively stable indicators of how a learner perceives,

interacts with, and responds to the learning environment". According to Keefe the basis of learning styles "lies in the structure of neural organization and personality" (p.141).

Some other scholars define learning styles in terms of just acquiring the information and not retaining and retrieving them. For example Oxford (2001, p. 359) states that "learning styles are the general approaches- for example, global or analytic, auditory or visual- that students use in acquiring a new language or in learning any other subject". This is what Reid calls sensory preferences which are "natural, habitual, and preferred way(s) of absorbing, processing, and retaining new information and skills" (Reid, 1995). She classifies learning styles into auditory (prefer listening to learn), visual (prefer seeing things to learn), tactile (prefer hands-on work), kinesthetic (prefer whole-body movement), group (like to work in group), and individual (like to work individually).

Reid (1984) developed the Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire (PLSPQ) to measure sensory preferences and her works (1987, 1995) paved the way for application of this framework to L2 learning and classrooms.

Wintergerst et al (2003) tried to explore the learning style preferences of three different populations (Russian EFL students, Russian ESL students, and Asian ESL students). Findings revealed that these three groups of language learners clearly preferred group activity above individual work, with the Russian EFL and Asian ESL students favoring group work and project work.

Using the PLSPQ, Isemonger and Sheppard (2003) surveyed the learning style preferences of 710 EFL students at a South Korean university and their relationship with a number of variables. They found a strong preference for kinesthetic learning, followed by auditory and tactile preferences. In contrast, the participants had a low preference for individual learning style. Female students indicated higher learning style preferences for kinesthetic and group learning styles.

Riazi and Mansoorian (2008) investigated the preferred learning style(s) of Iranian EFL students who were studying English at EFL institutes in different cities in Iran using Reid's Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire (PLSPQ, 1987). Findings of the study indicated that the auditory learning style, the visual learning style, the tactile learning style, and the kinesthetic learning or hands on activity learning were preferred by the students as the major styles.

Naserieh and Anani Sarab (2013) used Reid's Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire to investigate the pattern of graduate learners' perceptual learning style preferences and its possible relationship with their gender, age, discipline, and self-rated proficiency level. The results revealed that the participants favored kinesthetic and tactile modalities and disfavored group learning style.

Shabani (2012) investigated the learning style preferences (LSPs) of Iranian non-academic EFL learners and examined the differences between the LSPs of male and female learners. The results showed discrepancies between the LSPs of male and female students. He noted the "call for awareness of learners' individual differences, mainly their LSPs in the attempt to

idealize the outcomes of TEFL in language institutes in Iran".

Although much research has been done on the importance of paying attention to individuals and their unique learning styles in the language classroom, due attention has not been paid to teachers' teaching styles and the match between the two. The teachers themselves have stable preferences in their teaching which are often called teaching styles (Peacock, 2001). One important class of these preferences is that of sensory preferences. A mismatch between teachers' and learners' preferences can cause "learning failure, frustration and demotivation" (Reid, 1987; Peacock, 2001). Therefore, it can be beneficial to determine the teachers' teaching style preferences and the way they are matched to the students' learning styles and the pattern of its effects on student's achievement in the classroom.

2.3 Teaching Style

Peacock (2001) defines teaching style as "natural, habitual, and preferred way(s) of teaching new information and skills in the classroom" (p.7). Hyman and Rosoff (1984), however, argue that teaching style does not refer to the inherent characteristics of a teacher; rather it refers to *how* he or she teaches. Instruments measuring teaching styles mostly determine the teacher's activity preferences and the way they address the students' learning style preferences.

Felder and Silverman (1988) proposed a 'teaching-style model', which "classifies instructional methods according to how well they address the proposed learning style components" (p.674). They state that most of the learning and teaching style components parallel one another.

Peacock (2001) pays attention to another aspect of teaching preferences, i.e. sensory preferences, and determines five teaching styles (visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, group, and individual) parallel to the learning styles measured by Reid's (1987) perceptual learning style preference questionnaire. Therefore, there is a possibility that students' achievement will be affected if teaching and learning styles are matched (Peacock, 2001; Reid, 1987; and Rao, 2002). This is investigated in this study.

A number of studies have been conducted to attempt to determine the learning style preference of students, but do not investigate the effect of their match with teaching styles on learners' achievement. These include large-scale studies, such as Reid's (1987) study of the perceptual and sociological learning style preferences of 1388 NS and NNS (non-native speaker) students, as well as some smaller-scale studies of ESL/EFL students, and a number of studies looking at the learning style preferences of native speakers.

In a study by Zhenhui (2001), the impact of culture on the learning styles of learners and how mismatches between this and the dominant teaching styles of teachers foreign to the culture can cause learning problems, is investigated. The conclusion reached is that the gap between teacher intention and learner interpretation should be reduced if desired outcomes want to be achieved. A similar conclusion is reached by Felder and Henriques (1995) in a study on teaching and learning styles in foreign and second language education.

In his study Peacock (2001) found that 72% of the students were frustrated by a mismatch between teaching and learning styles and 76% said it affected their learning (p. 1).

Akbari, Mirhassani, & Bahri (2005) investigated the relationship between teaching style and personality type of a sample of Iranian EFL teachers. They found that each personality type represented a particular teaching style. They reported a relationship between students' perceptions of their teachers' success or failure based on the teachers' personality types. They also found that Introverting, Intuitive, Thinking, Perceiving (INTP), Extroverting, Intuitive, Thinking, Judging (ENTJ), and Extroverting, Intuitive, Thinking, Perceiving (ENTP) teacher types were more successful than others.

The focus of this study is on the match between learning and teaching styles in terms of sensory preferences and its relationship with learners' speaking ability.

Considering the importance of learners' and teachers' sensory preferences discussed above, the research question and hypothesis are stated as follows.

Research Question

Does matching Iranian EFL learners' sensory preferences (visual, auditory, and kinesthetic) with their teachers' teaching styles (visual, auditory, and kinesthetic) have a significant effect on the learners' speaking ability?

Research Hypothesis

Matching Iranian EFL learners' sensory preferences (visual, auditory, and kinesthetic) with their teachers' teaching styles (visual, auditory, and kinesthetic) has no significant effect on the learners' speaking ability.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

For the purpose of this study, 52 elementary Iranian EFL learners studying English in Iranian institutes and their English teachers there took part in the study. Nelson English Language Test was administered to ensure homogeneity of participants in terms of English language proficiency. To ensure the homogeneity of the students in terms of speaking ability, they were interviewed and rated using IELTS band scores. The selected students formed two groups of 26: a matched and a mismatched group based on the results of sensory preference questionnaire and teaching style questionnaire. All of the students received the same instruction, i.e., units 1-8 of Interchange 1, third edition by Richards which lasted 30 sessions, each an hour and a half. Then they were post-tested and the mean scores of the two groups were compared using t-test.

3.2 Instruments

Before and after treatment, the students were interviewed and IELTS rating scale for speaking assessment was used to measure their speaking ability. In this scale detailed performance descriptors have been developed which describe spoken performance including Fluency and

Coherence, Lexical Resource, Grammatical Range and Accuracy and Pronunciation at nine IELTS bands.

To determine the sensory preferences of the teachers and the students, the Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire (PLSPQ) was used (Reid, 1987). It is a reliable 30-item self-report questionnaire with a Likert-style response format and has been widely used in learning style studies. It divides the learning styles into five categories: visual, auditory, tactile, kinesthetic, group and individual.

The survey instrument that was used to collect data on teachers' preferences, or teaching styles as called by some researchers, was an adaptation of Reid's (1987) Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire (PLSPQ). This teaching style preference questionnaire was adapted on the basis of Reid's PLSPQ, validated and used by Tai (1999) with permission from Reid. The questionnaire consists of 30 items which aim at identifying six teaching style preferences: visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, group instruction and individual instruction.

4. Results

4.1 T-tests

The correlation between scores given by rater 1&2 on post-test is 0.515 which is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). So it can be concluded that there was a good inter-rater reliability in the average speaking scores of the students on post-test.

In order to test the hypothesis of this study, a t-test was run for the speaking scores of matched and mismatched groups on the post-test. Table 1 presents independent t-test for post-test speaking scores.

Table 1. Independent t-test for post-test speaking scores

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Post-test Speaking scores	Equal variances assumed	.029	.866	2.202	50	.032	.32077	.14570	.02811	.61342
	Equal variances not assumed			2.202	49.832	.032	.32077	.14570	.02809	.61345

As table 1 shows, the value of *t* observed (2.20) was greater than the critical value of *t* (2.01). Therefore the difference between the mean scores was significant at the $p<0.05$ level. It can be claimed that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the matched and mismatched groups on the posttest. Thus, the null hypothesis as matching up Iranian EFL learners' sensory preferences with their teachers' teaching styles has no significant effect on the learners' speaking ability, is rejected. In other words, matching up students' sensory preference with their teacher's teaching style positively affected the performance of the participants on the posttest.

In order to determine the relationship between matching up students' sensory preferences with their teachers' teaching style and the students' scores on different components of speaking, independent t-tests were run to compare the mean scores of the matched and mismatched groups on each speaking component on the posttest. The results are shown in table 2.

According to the analysis, the difference between mean scores of the matched and mismatched groups is significant on two components (fluency and coherence and lexical resource). However, the difference between mean scores of the matched and mismatched groups is not significant on two components (pronunciation and grammatical range and accuracy). Considering these findings, it can be concluded that although the difference between the mean score of the matched and mismatched group on some components is not significant in comparison, the sum of the differences is indeed that much enough to make the average gain score of the matched group significantly higher than the that of the mismatched group.

Table 2. Independent t-test for post-test speaking components scores

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Fluency and coherence	Equal variances assumed	.14	.705	2.053	50	.045	.40	.19	.00894	.81029
Lexical resource	Equal variances assumed	1.42	.238	2.589	50	.013	.42	.16	.09487	.75129

Grammatical range & accuracy	Equal variances assumed	.028	.868	1.851	50	.070	.30	.16	-.02611	.64149
Pronunciation	Equal variances assumed	1.44	.235	1.234	50	.223	.20	.16	-.13040	.54579

According to table 2, lexical resource has the highest value of t-observed among other speaking components in the independent sample t-tests for speaking components scores on post-test. This is compatible with findings of Ghaffari (2006), which support the positive effects of teaching vocabulary by using activities that tap the students' specific sensory preference.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics for Sensory Preferences and Teaching Styles in Iranian EFL Settings

Alongside the participants selected as matched and mismatched group to investigate the research question, a number of 171 Iranian EFL students from all age groups, all levels, and both sexes and their teachers were checked for their sensory preferences and sociological styles. Below the descriptive statistics resulting from this survey are presented.

4.2.1 Students' Sensory Preferences Vs. Teachers' Teaching Styles

The frequency statistics for students' and teachers' sensory preferences are presented in table 3. Taking a look at the table, it can be seen that the most frequent sensory preference among the student participants was kinesthetic (26.3 percent). The next most frequent style for students was visual (22.2 percent). A high percentage of students (42) were multisensory.

Table 3. Frequency statistics for teachers' and students' sensory preferences

	Frequency		Percent	
	teachers	students	teachers	students
Visual	3	38	13.6	22.2
Audio	17	34	77.3	19.9
Kinesthetic	2	45	9.1	26.3
Tactile	0	12	0.0	7.0
Multisensory	0	42	0.0	24.6
Total	22	171	100.0	100.0

Comparing these findings with the frequency statistics for teacher's preferences, the difference between teachers' and students' preferences was evident. The teachers' most frequent preference was auditory (77.3 percent). Moreover, there was not any tactile and multisensory preference among teachers. It can be concluded that there is no congruity

between the students' sensory preferences with that of their teachers.

4.2.2 Students' Vs. Teachers' Sociological Styles

As sociological styles (group and individual learning/teaching) are not classified as sensory preferences they are discussed separately below, based on the frequency statistics for the same participants above.

Table 4. Frequency statistics for teachers' and students' sociological styles

	Frequency		Percent	
	teachers	students	teachers	students
Individual	4	49	18.2	28.7
Group	18	122	81.8	71.3
Total	22	171	100.0	100.0

Looking at the sociological learning style preferences (table 4.), an overwhelming majority of students (71 percent) had a major preference for *group* learning, and only 28 percent had a major preference for *individual* learning . In a similar way the majority of teachers (81 percent) had a major preference for *group* learning, and only 18 percent had a major preference for *individual* learning.

Comparing the students' preferences for sociological styles with that of teachers a strong congruity can be seen. In a similar way the majority of teachers (81 percent) had a major preference for *group* learning, and only 18 percent had a major preference for *individual* learning. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a strong congruity between the students' sociological styles with that of their teachers.

4.2.3 Correlation between Tactile and Kinesthetic Scores

Some researchers (e.g. Oxford, 1993; O'Brien, 1990; Doyle and Rutherford, 1984) do not refer to tactile and kinaesthetic as separate preferences. Rather, they refer to 'hands-on' or 'haptic' learning styles, which are a combination of tactile and kinaesthetic styles. In order to check whether these two are the same or not, the researcher calculated the correlation coefficients for numeric values of these two styles for 172 Iranian EFL students.

Table 5. Correlation coefficient for tactile and kinesthetic numeric values

Correlations		Tactile
Kinesthetic	Pearson Correlation	.615(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	172
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2		

As can be seen in table 5, the correlation coefficient for tactile and kinesthetic scores is significant (table 5). Thus, in the present study just three styles namely visual, auditory, and kinesthetic (VAK) as measured by Reid's (1987) questionnaire were taken into account as students' sensory preferences.

5. Discussion

According to the analysis above, the difference between the mean score of the matched group in two components (pronunciation and grammatical range and accuracy) is not significant in comparison with that of the comparison group. Considering these findings, it could be concluded that although the difference between the mean score of the matched group in some components is not significant in comparison to that of the comparison group, the sum of the differences is indeed that much enough to make the average gain score of the matched group significantly higher than the that of the comparison group.

Lexical resource turned out to have the highest value of t-observed among other speaking components in the independent sample t-tests for speaking components scores on post-test. This is compatible with findings of Ghaffari (2006), which support the positive effects of teaching vocabulary by using activities that tap the students' specific sensory preference.

Regarding the comparative analysis of frequencies of students' and teachers' preferences, just in the area of sociological styles (group and individual teaching/learning) there was a strong congruity between teachers' and students' preferences. An overwhelming majority of students (71 percent) had a major preference for *group* learning, and only 28 percent had a major preference for *individual* learning. In a similar way the majority of teachers (81 percent) had a major preference for *group* learning, and only 18 percent had a major preference for *individual* learning.

This is a bit different from the findings of some researchers (Reid, 1987). This difference can be explained in two ways. It could be that learners find it more comfortable working in groups with others of the same nationality in an EFL setting, as opposed to the ESL environments observed by Reid (1987) and others, where they have to work with a diverse group of people. It may also be that the learners have adjusted to the teaching style of the teachers at the institute, which often favours group work (Fourier, 1984, reported in Reid, 1987: 100), under the influence of Communicative Language Teaching.

It should be noted that the questionnaire did not distinguish between small group work and pair work. Some researchers suggest that learners prefer to work with a single partner rather than a group (Kinsella, 1996). That is, the learners' preferred mode of interaction can be different across contexts.

As to the correlation between the raters given scores, a point is worth mentioning. The investigation of the relationship among components of speaking (fluency and coherence; lexical resource; grammatical range and accuracy; and pronunciation), scored by two raters, showed a positive correlation between different variables (table 4.1 above). However, there are some medium and low correlations as well. This can be related to the unavoidable difference between the raters' performance due to their historical background and experience.

Moreover, it is really difficult to separate those learners who are not at high levels of proficiency. Another reason for this, according to Hughes (2003) is the difference between language proficiency of the raters.

6. Conclusion

This study investigated Iranian EFL learners' and teachers' sensory preferences and the learners' speaking ability. The findings indicate that matching learners' and teachers' sensory preferences has a significant effect on the learners' speaking ability.

Although in practice it is too difficult to set a situation in which all students are matched with their teachers in terms of sensory preferences, the idea can be helpful in other ways. First of all the sheer awareness of different sensory channels and its effects on learning can help the English teachers take into account these differences in his judgment about different students' learning potentials. As teaching styles can be modified, at least to some extent, teachers should be willing to alter their teaching styles if necessary, rather than expecting the learner to adapt to the teacher. Second, the teachers can provide an array of different activities which tap different preferences in the classroom, and thus provide opportunities for different students to use their potentials to learn the language. For example, at institutes, teachers should try to vary their lessons and continue to provide as much multi-sensory input as possible.

The material developers should also be aware of the different sensory preferences of the students and the way it affects their learning. Instead of confining themselves to specific kinds of activities which may tap just one preference, they should provide variety in the modes of presenting language to be learned.

The focus of this study was sensory preferences. Other studies are needed to investigate the effects of a match between students' other learning styles and individual differences with that of their teachers on their achievement. Another line of research can focus on developing specific activities for each style and investigate their effects on students' language learning.

References

Akbari, R., Mirhassani, A., & Bahri, H. (2005). The relationship between teaching style and personality type of Iranian EFL teachers. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL),* 11, 1-28.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Longman.

Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second-language skills: Theory and practice*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms research on teaching and learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Diaz-Maggioli, G. H. (1996). The good, the bad, and the ugly: Learning preferences in EFL. *Language Forum, 34* (2), Retrieved October, 2006, from http://exchanges.state.gov/forum.

Ehrman, M. E., Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *System, 31*, 313–330. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0346-251x(03)00045-9

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Felder, R. M., & Henriques, E. R. (1995). Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals, 28*(1), 21–3. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1995.tb00767.x

Farhady, H., Ja'farpur, A., & Birjandi, P. (1994). *Testing language skills from theory to practice*. Tehran: SAMT.

Ghaffari, T. (2006). *The impact of four styles of vocabulary presentation on the vocabulary learning of Iranian EFL learners*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Tehran: Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Campus.

Hyman, R., & Rosoff, B. (1984). Matching learning and teaching styles: The jug and what's in it. *Theory into Practice, 23*(1), 35-43. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405848409543087

Ingram, J.C.L. (2007). *Neurolinguistics: An Introduction to Spoken Language Processing and its Disorders*. Cambridge University Press.

Isemonger, I., & Sheppard, C. (2003). Learning styles. *RELC Journal, 34*(2), 195-222. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/003368820303400205

Keefe, J. W. (1985). Assessment of learning style variables: The NASSP task force model. *Theory into Practice*, *24*(2), 138-144. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405848509543162

Larsen- freeman, D., & Long, H. M. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. New York: Longman.

Meredith, R. A. (1978). Improved oral test scores through delayed response. *The Modern Language Journal, 62*(7), 321-327. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1978.tb02402.x

Naserieh, F., & Anani Sarab, M. R. (2013). Perceptual learning style preferences among Iranian graduate students. *System, 41,* 122-133. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.018

Oxford, R. L. (2001). Language learning styles and strategies. In M. Celce-Murcia, (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 350-367). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Peacock, M. (2001). Match or mismatch? Learning style and teaching style in EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), 1-20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00001

Rao, Z. (2002). Bridging the gap between teaching and learning styles in East Asian contexts. *TESOL Journal, 11*(2), 5-11.

Reid, J. M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(1), 87-109. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3586356

Reid, J. M., (1995). Preface. In: Reid, J.M. (Ed.), *Learning Styles in the ESL/EFL Classroom* (pp. viii e xvii). Heinle & Heinle, Boston.

Riazi, A., Mansoorian, M. A. (2008). Learning style preferences among Iranian male and female EFL students. Iranian EFL Journal 2, 88 e 100. [Online] Available: http://www.iranian-efl-journal.com/Iranian-EFL-Journal-second-edition.pdf (March 27, 2009).

Rivers, W. (1980). *Teaching foreign language skills*. New York: The University of Chicago Press.

Bagher Shabani, M. (2012). Different Learning Style Preferences of Male and Female Iranian Non-academic EFL Learners. *ELT, 5*(9). http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n9p127

Tai, F. (1999). *Preferred teaching styles of Taiwanese teachers and preferred learning styles of traditional and nontraditional EFL students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Dakota: University of South Dakota. (UMI No. 9937394)

Tosey, P. & Mathison, J., (2006) "Introducing Neuro-Linguistic Programming Centre for Management Learning & Development, School of Management, University of Surrey. http://www.som.surrey.ac.uk/NLP/Resources/IntroducingNLP.pdf

Williams, M., & Burden, R. (2000). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wintergerst, A. C., DeCapua, A., & Ann Verna, M. (2003). Conceptualizing learning style modalities for ESL/EFL students. *System, 31*(1), 85-106. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0346-251x(02)00075-1

Zhenhui, R. (2001). Matching teaching styles with learning styles in East Asian contexts. *The Internet TESL Journal, 2*(7), n.p