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Abstract
Learning style is a defining factor in the teaching and learning practice. Understanding students’ learning style supports in designing effective courses. Cultures affect students’ learning styles; as such designing curriculum and learning activities based on students’ learning styles results in enhancing students’ academic achievement. This paper attempts to examine the effect learning styles have on learners’ academic achievement. The paper is divided into two parts. The first part explores claims affirming the existence of a correlation between students’ learning style and their academic performance. The second part discusses the claims dismissing any connection between students’ learning style and their academic performance. The research reached the following results: Language learning styles are not substantial predictors of language learning strategies. There is no significant difference between learners of Pakistan, China and Saudi Arab in terms of language learning style and students’ application of language learning strategies. Learning styles do not affect groups and low achievers results in the universities of the countries under study.

Introduction
Learners differ in the ways they understand, analyze and remember certain information. This difference in understanding and treatment of knowledge leads to a difference in academic achievement. This diversity of understanding and responding to information might be linked to students’ learning styles. However, there is a debate among educators and researchers about the effects of learning styles on learners’ academic achievement. Learning styles are considered by a number of educators to be a means of relating information in a better way to learners in the way they can understand it. As a result, various educators have examined the effects that learning styles might have on learners’ academic achievement and were faced with contradictory findings.

According to Hofstede (2001) (as cited in Manikutty, Anuradha & Hansen, 2007: 80) members of a society function based on implicit models in the minds determined by their culture. He stated that differentiating between cultures can be done by looking at five dimensions. These dimensions are power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity vs. femininity, long-term vs. short-term orientation, and individualism vs. collectivism (Manikutty et al., 2007: 80).

Students from different countries come with different learning styles affected by their cultures. Their culture determines how they perceive learning and teaching which sometimes makes it difficult for them to adapt when studying in a new learning environment. However, being aware of the different learning and teaching styles might help the students overcome this issue. Further, having an idea about learning styles in different cultures might improve the effectiveness of teachers’ practice.

This paper attempts to examine the influence that learning styles might have on learners’ academic achievement. This assignment comprises two parts investigating the research on this influence: the first part will explore claims affirming the existence of a correlation between students’ learning style and their academic performance. The second part will deal with the claims dismissing any connection between students’ learning style and their academic performance.

1. Language learning styles are not significant predictors of language learning strategies.
2. There is no any significant difference between learners of Pakistan, China and Saudi Arabia in terms of language learning style and in their application of language learning strategies.

3. There are no differences in learning styles between groups and low achievers in universities of these countries.

Literature review

What is learning Styles?

Before examining the different claims on the influence that learning styles might have on learners’ academic achievement, it might be helpful to define learning styles and academic achievement in relation to the process of learning. Tizazu and Ambaye (2017: 343) defined a learning style as the individual’s preference in receiving, arranging and preserving knowledge. Tizazu and Ambaye (2017: 343) also pointed out that the learning behaviour interaction and responses of the learners within the learning situation are significantly influenced by their learning style. Furthermore, Islam and Mahavidyalaya (2019: 369) defined learning styles as learners’ use of particular senses in receiving new knowledge. On this point, Islam and Mahavidyalaya (2019: 369) remarked on the debatable issue of learning style affecting students’ understanding of educational items. In addition, Islam and Mahavidyalaya (2019: 369) defined academic achievement generally as the marks acquired by a learner in the subjects they study. Academic achievement is more specifically related to the benefits obtained by learners from given educational instructions (Islam & Mahavidyalaya, 2019: 369). In other words, academic performance is revealed in the abilities and skills gained by the learner from the educational environment.

Claims affirming the existence of a correlation between students’ learning style and their academic performance

The connection between students’ learning style and their academic performance is an often-debated issue within educational research. In fact, a considerable number of studies claimed that the difference in learners’ styles of learning has a definite effect on their performance.

One of these studies is published in (2019) by Magulod on the relationship between academic performance and students’ learning styles and study habits. The study was done on a sample of 75 students at the Cagayan State University in The Philippines. The study followed a descriptive correlation design revolving around the sample’s learning styles, study habits and academic performance. Magulod (2019: 187) explained the use of two instruments to collect the study data: a “Reid’s Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire” and a “study habits inventory adapted from Gilbert Wrenn of Stanford University Press” (Magulod, 2019: 187). After that, Magulod (2019: 187) explained the use of descriptive data treatment and found considerable correlations between the study variables using Pearson correlation. Magulod (2019: 194) conclude that there is a relationship between study practices, learning styles and academic accomplishment.

The second study was done by Li and Alduais in (2018) in Glasgow. The purpose of the study, as stated by Li and Alduais (2018: 27), is to explore different learning styles influence on students’ academic performance. Li and Alduais (2018: 36) reported on the sampling technique and the size of the sample, which is 40 university students: 24 males and 16 females. A questionnaire was designed and utilized to collect both qualitative and quantitative data (Li & Alduais, 2018: 34). Li and Alduais (2018: 39) concluded that certain learning styles, namely kinesthetic and visual, performed higher than other styles. Moreover, Li and Alduais (2018: 40) found that certain styles of learning performed better than others at certain study subjects. Also, a study by Derakhshan and Shakki in (2018) found a link between kinesthetic and tactile learning styles and high achievement.

A study by Jayanama in (2018) explored the difference in learning styles and its relation to academic achievement among students at a university in Thailand. Jayanama (2018:22) reported the use of mixed-method research, implementing both qualitative and quantitative data collection tools. The sample consisted of 247 female and 171 male university students (Jayanama, 2018:22). The study instruments are a “PLSPQ or Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire developed by Joy Reid”, and an interview with seven randomly selected students (Jayanama, 2018:22). Jayanama (2018:27) found that visual and tactile learning styles may significantly impact academic achievement.

Claims dismissing any connection between students’ learning style and their academic performance

The connection between students’ learning style and their academic performance has been examined in many studies in order to reach an enhanced understanding of its impact on learners’ achievement. A number of studies have reached conclusions dismissing the existence of any impact
of students’ learning styles on their academic performance.

A study was done by Al-Hebaishi (2012: 510) to explore the relationships connecting learning styles, strategy and the scholastic performance of Saudi English majors. The study sample consisted of 88 undergraduate EFL majors at Taibah University (Al-Hebaishi, 2012: 514). The study utilized three instruments for data collection: a questionnaire, an inventory list and an achievement test (Kanglong, L. and Afzaal, M. (2020); Al-Hebaishi, 2012: 514). Al-Hebaishi (2012: 518) concluded that the learning style of learners had no significant effect on their academic performance.

Another study was done by Al-Zayed (2017: 176) exploring the effect of learning style preferences on the students’ academic achievements of English. The study sample comprised 166 tenth grade students from Pioneer Educational School in Amman, Jordan (Al-Zayed, 2017: 176), Afzaal, M., & Xiangyi, J. (2020). The study instruments were a “modified version of the PLSP questionnaire” and a Likert Scale (Al-Zayed, 2017: 178). Study findings showed no significant connection between students’ learning styles and their achievement academically (Al-Zayed, 2017: 178).

Furthermore, numerous studies dismissed the effects of learning styles on a learner’s performance. Swartz (2018:182) examined learning styles and found no significant effects or correlation with academic achievement. Cimermanová (2018: 229) also examined the link between learning styles and achievement and concluded a lack of any significant connection between them. Munir, Emzir and Rahmat (2017) explored the effects of learning styles using different strategies and concluded the lack of correlation between the two variables. Afzaal, M., Hu, K., Chishti, M. I., & Imran, M. (2019) discusses the cohesion plays a pivotal role in English language while analyzing English text. Wilkinson, Boohan and Stevenson (2014) also dismissed any relationship between learning styles and achievement or assessment methods.

Research studies that linked the components of learning styles with students’ success. Numerous research studies have linked the components of learning styles with students’ success in schools, and the mismatch between teaching and learning styles might result in school failure.

To begin with, Alqahtani in (2011) has conducted a study to identify the perceptions of EFL Saudi learners towards learning styles. He concluded that Saudi EFL learners prefer auditory, visual, interpersonal, kinesthetic, and intrapersonal learning styles in that order (Alqahtani, 2011). He also reported that students’ perceptions of their learning styles are affected by their personality types, cultural beliefs, and their teacher’s teaching style (Alqahtani, 2011). So, from my experience as a teacher, it might be said that teaching students, according to learning styles, might be a strong predictor of their success. To clarify, as a teacher, I was cautious in choosing my teaching strategies and technique to meet all my students’ diverse learning styles. I used to present each lesson using the interactive book and the smartboard. I also used to make sure that classroom activity would depend on both peer, group, and individual work. In addition to that, I used to always connect the lesson to nature, social life, and other subjects. As a result, all learners with different learning styles would keep motivated and would benefit the most from the lesson.

To emphasize, Kornhaber, Fierros, and Veenema in (2004) have done a study to investigate the impact of teaching based on learning styles across many educational settings using interviews and questionnaires. The data in this study were collected from 41 schools, which have been implementing teaching methods based on learning styles for at least three years (Kornhaber et al., 2004). This study has reported improvements in student discipline (54% of schools), parent participation (60% of schools), and performances of students diagnosed with learning disabilities (78% of schools) (Kornhaber et al., 2004). Moreover, Dunn, Griggs, Olson, Gorman, and Beasley in (1995), based on the results of a meta-analysis of 42 experimental studies, declared that academic success and failure in higher education is influenced by “the match between how the material is presented and how students process it.” They claimed that students who are taught according to their learning style have better academic achievements than those whose learning styles are not matched to teaching approaches. Thus, it seems to me that students’ achievement can be increased if teachers concentrate more on teaching according to learning styles. So, I strongly agree that for the sake of students, teachers should determine their students’ learning styles first then choose the teaching methods and strategies according to that.

Likewise, Peacock in (2001) has conducted a study to investigate Reid’s (1987) hypothesis that “a mismatch between teaching and learning styles causes learning failure, frustration, and demotivation.” The data in this study were collected through Reid’s questionnaire, interviews, and tests using 206 EFL students and 46 EFL teachers at a Hong Kong university (Peacock, 2001).
Peacock in (2001), Haberman, P., Afzaal, M., Ghaffar, A., & Alfadda, H. (2020) found that learners favored kinesthetic and auditory and disfavored interpersonal and interpersonal styles, while teachers favored kinesthetic, interpersonal, and auditory styles and disfavored intrapersonal styles. As a result, there was a mismatch regarding interpersonal and auditory styles (Peacock, 2001). Then, the interviews revealed, “72% of the students were frustrated by a mismatch between teaching and learning styles; 76% said it affected their learning, often seriously; and 81% of the teachers agreed with Reid’s hypothesis” (Peacock, 2001). Therefore, Peacock in (2001) concluded that EFL teachers need to be aware of their students' learning styles and design their teaching methods according to that to avoid students’ academic failure.

Students prefer to absorb and process information in different ways: through vision, listening, meditation, acting, logical and intuitive thinking, analysis and visualization. Therefore, teaching styles must vary accordingly. How much the student may learn is determined by compatibility between student learning styles and teacher teaching styles. It is vital for teachers to understand their learners’ most popular learning styles. Thus, the teacher can facilitate teaching process to arrange their lessons to suit or adapt to teaching different styles and supply the foremost applicable and significant activities or tasks to suit a specific group of students at totally different stages.

The concept of teaching style is approximately unknown in education, and the search for it has flourished only in the past two decades. Educational research has shown that all students are unique individuals who have been integrated into a common classroom coming from diverse socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds, and have different learning styles that rarely correspond to the teaching styles of their teachers. Teaching styles are undoubtedly important ongoing support for teachers-students communication. Choosing different teaching styles that are flexible and tolerant designed to create an atmosphere of simulation and reliable can ensure collaboration among school teachers and students.

Teaching Style
Definitions of Teaching Style
Teaching styles are connected to the teacher’s educational value system and stem from the teaching philosophy of education. The teacher awareness of teaching style (or styles) will facilitate lecturers to boost and improve their teaching methods and encourage more students. “Teaching style is based on a set of strategies used in the classroom that you think help your students learn the subjects more effectively” (Frunză, 2014). Teaching styles refer not only to the teaching strategies and methods used but also to the use of certain types of rhetoric. Teachers are usually unaware of their teaching style and can even be described as an “emerging property”. Grasha, (1996), claimed that “In general, a person’s values, beliefs, and philosophy can be easily verified by the way he or she teaches. The teacher’s educational strategies and techniques speak of his attitudes towards himself and his students and their roles in the learning and education process”.

Teaching styles consist of approaches and methods that teachers feel more comfortable with. “When teaching methods are used to determine the teaching style, methods can be categorized according to the amount of risk involved and the extent to which active learning is facilitated”. (Grasha, 1996). Risk involves things like the possibility of failure of certain methods, controversy, spending too much time in the classroom, not accepting students and colleagues, or not achieving the goals for which they are designed.

Teaching Style and the Importance for Teachers to Know the Learning Styles of Students
All teachers have a personal learning style that limits their perception of other possibilities in the classroom and their understanding of different types of students, and also restricts their choice and interpretation of teaching techniques. To be effective in the classroom, teachers need to know the learning needs of learners, individual learning differences, required teaching methods, learner preferences as well as educational materials needed to meet the needs of learners in the learning environment.

To sum up, numerous research studies have supported the idea that the mismatch between individuals’ learning styles and teaching methods and strategies might cause students’ failure. In other words, Teachers’ and learners’ awareness of learning styles components might help them to enrich the learning process, increase learning autonomy, and overcome the obstacles that might hinder learners’ academic achievements.

Advantages of Teaching Style
Teaching styles can vary greatly depending on every classroom setting, the subject being taught, and a variety of students. A power-based teaching
The ability to learn depends on the style or lecture, for example, is perfectly suited for large classes and topics that require heavy preservation, such as history. The teaching style for a group may be more appropriate for materials that require laboratory activity, such as chemistry, or those involving important observations, such as discussion and creative writing.

The goal of any teaching style is to focus on teaching goals, encourage students to participate as much as possible while avoiding making an attempt to be everything for all students. Not all students respond well to a specific style, that is why several teachers who are familiar with teaching styles use a combination of them based on the subject or environment. Although students are the most significant factor, it is important to use the teaching style to interact with students at all levels of learning and ability.

The student's ability to learn depends on the quality and suitability of the teaching style for the approach they prefer to learn with. Whereas engaging students in a variety of activities inside the room and making an attractive and enjoyable learning environment, they will have a deeper psychological investment within the work. "School culture can also influence student participation. In general, student participation is an important indicator of academic performance" (Shaari, 2014). Therefore, the more students engaged and participating in their studies, the more likely they are to perform better.

Furthermore, some teaching styles are more active in teaching and learning than others. Any teaching style that includes less lecture time and more student interaction lead to active learning. "To encourage an active learning environment, ensure its prosperity, find a comfortable balance between both cognitive and emotional dimensions of teaching, and work to develop a real relationship with students in some way". (Shaari, 2014).

The Importance, for Teachers, to Know the Learning Styles of Students

Since the students learn differently; according to their different personalities, cultural backgrounds and multiple intelligences, teachers must be aware of different learning styles. In other words, they must pay more attention and focus to the different learning styles of their students. In fact, matching the students learning styles with different suitable methods and techniques affects learning process significantly.

For teachers, knowing different learning styles can indicate the strategies or methods to be used. For example, students associated with (feeling and watching) prefer to work in groups and that can give a hint to the teacher to divide them into groups and apply cooperative learning strategy. Since they are interested in people more than ideas, they will work very well within groups or teams.

Moreover, knowing different learning styles can help the teacher to recognize the skill that each student is good in, and concentrate on it with him. For example, with students who are associated with (watching and thinking), teacher will focus on their reading skill. Since ideas and concepts are more important than people, for them, they will prefer reading, lectures and have time to think.

Furthermore, teachers can take advantages of the students' ideas and imagination according to their learning styles. For instance, with students who like (doing and thinking) and prefer technical tasks and less concerned with people, teachers can solve problems by asking students to think about them. Whether the problems are their own problems or even problems and issues of their schools and society, students will be able to solve them innovatively.

The linguistic learner

Felder and Henriques in (1995) declared that linguistic learner and called (Verbal) is a student who learns best by repeating structural patterns. Besides, linguistic learners depend on combining their verbal skills (inductive) with learned reading and writing skills (deductive) (Felder, & Henriques, 1995). In other words, linguistic learners like to read, write, and tell stories, which makes them bright more in memorizing. Moreover, Silver and Strong in (1997) stated that a linguistic learner might become a poet or a debater (as cited in Gardner, 1987). Thus, the best method to teach linguistic learners a new skill or information is to ask them to read about it, listen to audio, speak about it, and finally write about it extensively (Jaleel, & Thomas, 2019).

The naturalistic learner

Brualdi in (1996) stated that naturalistic learners are those who respond more to patterns in nature (sun, space, rocks ...) as well as living things (plants, animals, human...). In other words, they have a naturalistic intelligence that enables them to identify and distinguish among products of the natural world (Gardner, 1999). Thus, the best way to teach a naturalistic learner is to relate the information in a learning environment with their natural surroundings (Gardner, 1992). For instance, teachers can include classifying natural forms or ask students to paint on stones, which will give a
chance for naturalistic learners to work in harmony with nature (Gardner, 1992). Finally, Naturalistic learners are more likely to be proficient in meteorology, botany, and zoology (Felder, & Henriques, 1995).

The auditory musical learner

Gilakjani in (2012) declared that auditory or (musical) learners are the individuals who prefer to learn through listening and interpreting information utilizing pitch and rhymes. To clarify, auditory learners gain knowledge from reading out loud the material and might lose attention if they read silently (Gilakjani, 2012). In addition, Brualdi in (1996) included that auditory learners are usually capable of recognizing and composing musical pitches, tones, and rhythms. Finally, to help auditory learners, teachers might hold discussions and debates, speak clearly, and incorporate background music into the lesson (Aarhus University, 2010).

The Kinesthetic Learner

Gilakjani (2012) has described the kinesthetic learners as individuals who favor interaction with the physical world, which makes it hard for them to stay on one target, and they might lose attention quickly if they did not move. Brualdi (1996) suggested that kinesthetic learners can use their mental abilities to match their bodily movements, which challenge the popular claim that mental and physical activity are unrelated. Furthermore, kinesthetic learners prefer active participation and experiences such as role-play, drama, or playing games (Peacock, 2001). Therefore, they need to use their whole body, so they might walk around while reading or talking to other people, or take part in games where they get to activate their entire body (Aarhus University, 2010).

The visual learner

As the name suggests, Renou (2008) indicated that visual style refers to learners who prefer to learn through vision. Visual learners rely on their sights, and they turn first to the graphs, charts, and pictures in their textbook (Renou, 2008). To emphasize, visual learners can be text-visual who prefer to learn by looking at a text or image visual who learn better looking at pictures and diagram, or they can be both at the same time (Aarhus University, 2010). Visual learners learn best when they can observe photographs, films, diagrams, flashcards, cartoons, and they like written instruction (Jaleel, & Thomas, 2019). Moreover, several studies of learning styles in foreign language education suggested that visual learners like reading, which meet the needs by relying on written instructional materials in a text (Felder, & Henriques, 1995). They can also be attracted to different computer fonts, so teachers might consider the use of maps, flowcharts, or webs to help those students who also appreciate opportunities to highlight material or to use checklists (Jaleel, & Thomas, 2019).

The logical or mathematical learner

Logical or Mathematical learners can identify patterns and think logically, which is associated with scientific and mathematical thinking (Brualdi, 1996). To clarify, those learners enjoy solving problems, mainly if they are math-related, and they are very logical, straightforward type of learners (Jaleel, & Thomas, 2019). Gardner in (1987) said that mathematical learners like to learn by questioning themselves how things work, how things relate to one another, why things are here, and they like coherent arguments. Thus, the best way for mathematical learners to learn is by categorizing, classifying, and working with abstract patterns or relationships. (Jaleel, & Thomas, 2019).

The Interpersonal learner

Calik and Birgili (2013) have described interpersonal learners by individuals who learn best through communicating and working cooperatively with others in a small group. They usually have the ability to recognize and understand other people’s moods, desires, motivations, and intentions, which makes learning in a group an excellent method to enhance their knowledge (Gardner, 1992). Thus, the best ways to teach them new information is through group work, peer editing, peer teaching discussing, brainstorming (Calik, & Birgili, 2013).

The intrapersonal learner

According to Calik and Birgili (2013), intrapersonal or (solidary) learners are learners who learn best on their own by studying their personal goals, setting individual projects, independent reading, and keeping personal choice in projects. They have the ability to recognize and understand one’s moods, desires, motivations, and intentions (Gardner, 1992). Thus, the best way for them to learn is by asking them direct questions and encourage them to work on individual assignments and projects (Calik, & Birgili, 2013)

The trend of education has changes in the past few years. From teacher centered to students centered learning in the recent years. Therefore, it is important to identify different learning style of
students as to modify instructional methods and strategy as to match up with adult performances. Anderson and Adam (cited in torres, 1993) stated that one of the most significant challenges that University instruction face is to be tolerant and perceptive enough to recognize learning difference among their students. Many instructors do not realize that students vary in the way they process and understand information.

Method
Total 300 hundred students enrolled at reputed public sector universities of Pakistan, China and Saudi Arabia participated in the study. All of the students were selected from undergraduate sections of the universities. The sample comprises both national and international students studying in these universities such as Pakistan, China, and Saudi Arabia and many foreign students studying in these countries. The Saudi students sample consists of 100 undergraduate and graduate students from college of education, and English department. Pakistani students are enrolled in BS program. Chinese students are undergraduate and graduate students of school of foreign languages. The study uses a questionnaire devised by Leaver and Ehrman (2002) focusing on the learning style of the learners. The questionnaire comprises 30 items seeking the responses of learners’ motivation, learning aptitude and strategies. Minor modification was made to the questionnaire based on language.

Procedure
The data was collected from the students enrolled in Pakistani, Chinese and Saudi Arabian universities. First of all, the students were given online survey for responses. These responses are then correlated with the responses of two universities.

Sample
The sample of study includes university students from China, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia (n=123). In order to maintain the reliability of the data, we use, Alfa Cronbach to measure reliability of questionnaire we found it equal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parts of Questionnaire</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Detail of the sample is given in table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Graduate1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium of Instruction</td>
<td>Arabic1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>japanese3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish-turkish3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urdu3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>17-30</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results and Discussion
Table 3. t-test gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.7923</td>
<td>1.11664</td>
<td>-.381-</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>-.68973-</td>
<td>.46707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4.9036</td>
<td>.98200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no difference between Male and Female
Above table shows the t-test for the subscales of gender in the questionnaire designated the sample of the study was distributed normally and was not found to be different from the population. Hence, parametric statistics were legitimately applied. Mean of the gender reveal (M=4.79, SD= 1.11) for male participants, and female participants (M=4.903, SD= 0.982).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. One-way Anova Medium of Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above table shows the results of Arab students learning style with others such as Pakistani, Chinese etc. The participants' reports mean remain higher than other preferences or learning styles. The dominant style of Arab students was found to be synoptic with indicator of mean as M= 5.32, SD=1.02 and Pakistan and Chinese student remain as M=4.9, SD=0.908.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. One-way Anova Medium of Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. t-test age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-29 years</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.9106</td>
<td>1.04713</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>.33328-</td>
<td>0.47744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.8385</td>
<td>0.83108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, age difference shows also a few differences in learning style. Participants with the ages from 17-29 years show M=4.9106 with the SD=1.047. Moreover, age range starting from 30-50 show a M= 4.83 with the SD= 0.83. Statistically, there remain no difference in terms of age.
The results of t-test and anova show no difference in learning style as mean remain consistent as M=4.8 for graduates, postgraduate M=4.9 and mean square between groups 0.78 whereas within group it showed 1.001. To summarize, a significant difference was reported between the students of different countries. Additionally, whereas no significant effect was found between genders and grades of students.

Ehrman (1996) reports that leveler - sharpener show a common style enriched in learning styles to improve the pedagogy while considering it a very important position in language learning. So, with reference to the focus of the study, the results show a significant similarity in learning styles in different universities of three countries.

The overall results of the study revealed that 94% of between groups were field sensitive according to subscale of synopsis, in profound analysis of the subscales of language learning style. They like to learn new words through setting while at the same time perusing the content or address material as a component of the unique situation. On the other hand, 53% of low achievers were discovered to be field insensitive. Furthermore, they made next to zero utilization of the specific circumstance and wanted to check the significance of new words in the word reference as they were perusing the content.

Most significantly, all between groups and 78% of low achievers of both groups supported subscale of learning style and they favored an efficient, remotely gave the way of processing, for example, precise after the units in the course reading. In contrast to 65% of between groups who reported that they would set themselves up for inclining language at the earliest opportunity immediately and they rushed to make an action, 64% of low achievers said that it required some amount of money for them to set themselves up for study and they ought to have intended to concentrate.

There are other social strategies difference between two groups was also found. For instance, between groups were reported that they are more interested in developing cultural understanding by cooperating with teacher and peers and speaking to native speakers. However, fewer numbers of low achievers were interested in these strategies as half of the low achievers favored individually practicing language rather than group work.

Finally, both groups showed their language differences in learning style, by their propensities to either leveling, seeing similitudes and consolidate things to shape a summed-up picture (a concise subscale) or honing, seeing contrasts, 71% of low accomplishes inclined toward honing style while recovering subtleties in that 64% of between groups acknowledged leveling.

**Conclusion**

The study concludes that the primary null hypothesis of this study is not acceptable for brief style to be the indicator of memory, metacognitive, and social. In any case, the principal invalid speculation of the investigation was kept up for succinct style anticipating intellectual, pay, and emotional procedures. As such, succinct style discovered not to be critical indicator for these procedures.

Ehrman and Leaver (2003) described synoptic as individuals who subliminally wanted to isolate some part of involvement to organize it, and indicated responsiveness to the encompassing foundation. In this examination, synoptic inclinations for metacognitive methodologies by focusing their learning in a productive manner, diverting their energy in the destinations and objectives they set, shown that succinct students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. One-way Anova education</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>120.063</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120.219</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no difference between Education

Ehrman and Leaver (1996) described synoptic as individuals who subliminally wanted to isolate some part of involvement to organize it, and indicated responsiveness to the encompassing foundation. In this examination, synoptic inclinations for metacognitive methodologies by focusing their learning in a productive manner, diverting their energy in the destinations and objectives they set, shown that succinct students
were in an ideal position. Especially, their inclination for metacognitive systems was as per the attributes of good language students noted by O’Malley et al. (1985) and Oxford (1990). Additionally, their use of social techniques by collaboration and identifying with others showed an incredible favorable position for these understudies. They additionally utilized memory techniques, however not exactly their eccentric partners, by making mental linkages and applying pictures and sounds and utilizing activity to be more key student of the language.

Ehrman and Leaver (2003) additionally revealed synoptics as the best language students, since they were regularly both field free and field delicate; in light of the fact that they could perceive what was generally significant, and they could get language universally by being presented to it.

Subjective contrasts between successful people and low achievers in language learning techniques uncovered outperformance of successful people in all procedures when all is said in done and remuneration systems specifically. Furthermore, Rubin (1987) recognized effective language students as the ones who utilized pay and social methodologies in light of the fact that these techniques permitted the students to stay in the discussion. Furthermore, between groups appear differently in relation to low achievers in that successful people are more regular and modern clients of countless language learning methodologies. They emotionally repay their inadequacies in language learning, though low achievers are acceptable at retention. At the end of the day, low achievers are restricted in the number and nature of their techniques use, and simultaneously they are withdrawn of emotional and pay procedures. The outcomes show that instructors could likewise assist understudies with finding and get acquainted with their own learning styles so as to assist them with turning out to be mindful students. Procedure preparing dependent on learning styles would plan educators for mindful students. Procedure preparing dependent on learning styles so as to assist them with turning out to be mindful students. Procedure preparing dependent on learning styles so as to assist them with turning out to be mindful students.
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