Volume and Issues Obtainable at Center for Sustainability Research and Consultancy

Review of Economics and Development Studies
ISSN:2519-9692 ISSN (E): 2519-9706
Volume 5: No. 4, 2019
Journal homepage: www.publishing.globalcsrc.org/reads

Relating Learner Empowerment with Learner Self-Regulation Learning in Higher Education

[1] Tahira Batool, [2] Ghazala Noureen, [3] Zobia Ayuob

[1] Lahore College for Women University, Lahore Pakistan. tahirashehbaz@yahoo.com
[2] Lahore College for Women University, Lahore Pakistan. g_noureen@yahoo.com
[3] M. Phil Scholar, Lahore College for Women University, Lahore Pakistan. zobiaayuob11@yahoo.com

ARTICLE DETAILS

History
Revised format: 30 Nov 2019
Available Online: 31 Dec 2019

Keywords
Learner Empowerment, Self-Regulation Learning, Students At University Level.

JEL Classification:
M54, M59, D83, D89

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study was to analyze the relationship of Learner empowerment and Self-regulation at university level. The researcher conducted a survey by administering the questionnaire to collect a data on a sample of 300 students in which 150 male students and 150 female students in District Lahore were included. Data were analyzed by using inferential and descriptive statistics. Researcher has used two instruments first one learner empowerment and second students' self- regulation. Learner empowerment composed of three factors and students' self-regulation also has three factors. Sample was selected by random sampling technique. There were 22 statements of Learner empowerment questionnaire and 23 statements of Self-regulation questionnaire. The Study revealed that students' level of Self- regulation was high. The study also revealed that most of students were much empowered on overall learner empowerment scale and its three components. The study was also found positive and strong relationship between Learner empowerment and students' Self-regulation at university level. It can be concluded from the findings of the study that Self-regulation and Learner empowerment are correlated and strengthen to each other.

Corresponding author's email address: tahirashehbaz@yahoo.com
Recommended citation: Batool, T., Noureen, G. and Ayuob. Z. (2019). Relating Learner Empowerment with Learner Self-Regulation Learning in Higher Education. Review of Economics and Development Studies, 5 (4), 755-766
DOI: 10.26710/reads.v5i4.903

1. Introduction

Empowered learners are those who own their own learning and feel that learning happens anytime and anywhere. They take possession and responsibility for their learning. They can transfer thought and knowledge into focused action. Student empowerment means giving young pupils the chance of energetic participation in school activities and decisions that can shape their lives (Ashcroft, 1987). Hattie told the significance of making students' thinking observable, both to the teacher and the student, as a critical process in developing students' knowledge of the material being learned. Increasing metacognitive awareness and control is acknowledged as having a powerful influence on students' learning and their capability to become independent learners. Skilled reflection develops understanding and allows students to apply their knowledge in new settings. It is also at the heart of being a self-regulated, life-long learner.

Whitebread (2017) has explained that children's' self-regulatory skills are predictor of academic outcomes and emotional welfare more powerfully than any other facet of children's development. Watkins (2010) has argued that schools need to have learning somewhat than a performance orientation to improve students' self-regulatory skills, to learn by what means to learn. This includes making learning a thing of attention and reflection or to make learning an entity of learning. When this is adjusted fully, students also do well in assessments.

Hill (2007) has suggested that all learning is basically social in nature. In the meantime, individuals are social creatures, which mean learning happens through social procedure of language use. The purpose of present research work is to explore how instructors can empower learners by developing self-directed learning. By giving learners more ownership in their learning might be resulted in a profounder and more meaningful experience. There are a number of views on how to choose what to include in the curriculum and what weighting to attach to each. Traditionally, these have highlighted cultural communication (Lawton, 1989), wherever, on the part of the school, students would be empowered with the knowledge and competencies appreciated in their culture.

Watkins (2010) reports a learning orientation, not only supports students to develop the learning abilities that they will be needed for further education, life and the world of work but it also supports them to do better in other examinations. This can be an authoritative fact in influence results-orientated parents and learners about why reflective learning matters. According to Zimmerman (2002), self-regulated learning (SRL) is a self-directive method that allows students to change their mental abilities into academic skills, and it is a regular and mental knowledge procedure in which learners involve very energetically until their learning goals are grasped. The world is moving towards knowledge-based economies, and this carry out new requirements and difficulties upon the education systems to grow and enrich learners' knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development OECD, 2003). Therefore, it is needed to reason deeply about education systems; numerous learning theories provide clarifications, uses, and models to make students who are able to see the challenges of this era. SRL depends seriously on students' practical involvement in their learning outcomes; it has been one of the most commonly discussed topics in the field of academic learning (Dent & Koenka, 2015).

So, students who claim concern for their learning and results have a high likelihood of increasing their capacity to suggest learning experiences stored in their memory, develop their sense of responsibility, and gain self-governing learning skills. In this case, academic achievements and self-confidence will be higher, and learning goals will be met. In recent years, the concept of SRL has become the source of attention of applied educational studies as a significant variable in enhancing academic achievement and bringing about success (Tanriseven & Dilmac, 2013). Learning requires to be made an entity of attention, conversation, reflection and evaluation in everything the school does.

Behavioral theories in self-regulated learning (SRL) in teaching have a framework of not considering the students' internal states (e.g. thoughts, emotions, motivations, and views), instead determining heavily on learners' self-control styles (e.g. self-mentoring, self-evaluation, self- support, self-correction, and self-instruction) In the same way, cognitive theories concentrated on students' cognitive abilities and aptitudes that fully description for their learning, also offer an incomplete explanation of students' learning processes. But, cognitive SRL theories have developed to focus on learners' active roles in developing their own abilities and strategies (Zimmerman, 2008). According to Vygotsky's theory of social learning (1978), social context (e.g. contact with others, linguistic, and ethos) plays a central role in expressing students' cognitive functions, and must be clarified as the product of social connections. Vygotsky (1978) debated that every cognitive function looks steadily in the learning process at two levels: inter psychological level (controlled by others-social contact) and intra psychological level (controlled by the learner him or herself). Interaction between these two levels and the surroundings was suggested in Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory. Behaviors, personal procedures and surroundings interact in

return to effect students' functioning and regulate any changes needed to revise their cognition, strategies and perceptions.

The term "empowerment" was defined by Fymeir, Shulman & Houser (1996) as "the process of creating intrinsic task motivation by providing an environment and tasks which increase one's sense of self efficacy and energy." Hill (2007) proposed that all learning social in nature. Since humans are social creatures, which means making creates through social procedure of language use after some time. Pack (1976) concurred with social precepts of learning when he presented conversation theory. This theory recommends that discussion principal procedure of learning. As students' associate with each other and teacher in important ways, change starts for occur as far as student development and advancement. Adapting on that point turns into procedure of coming for now through shared change and transaction.

Self-regulation certifiably is not a psychological capacity or scholarly execution aptitude; rather it is a self-order process by which students change their psychological capacities into scholastic abilities (Zeidner, Boekarts, & Pintrich, 2000). When all said in done, self-control includes students who proactively guide their conduct or procedures for accomplish self-set objectives. They additionally depend on full of feeling, intellectual, motivational, and conduct criticism for change or modify their systems and practices when unfit for on first achieve their objectives (Zimmerman, 1989). Self-regulation includes processes that have evolved for extend range and flexibility of hum behavior, making it possible for hum beings for override counterproductive responses. For self-regulation for occur, one needs sense of self-awareness and, if other people are involved, ability for infer mental state of others (Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco, & Twenge, 2005). Self-regulation processes are supposed for bring about positive outcomes. When self-regulation fails, however, control over one's behavior breaks down, which likely leads for negative outcomes (Baumeister, 1997). Proposed that there are two forms of self-regulation failure: under regulation and miss regulation. First refers for self-failing for try for change its response and produce best outcome, whereas second refers for self-making effort for change its response, but change does not lead for best outcome. Latter indicates that there may be downside for use of self-regulation processes.

Self-control with regards for learning has been proposed for self-guided procedures that empower students for change their psychological capacities into execution abilities (Zimmerman, 2008). Self-regulated students are people who proactively as opposed for responsively approach their learning errands. These indicate individual activity, persistence, or versatile abilities, starting from ideal met psychological procedures and motivational convictions (e.g., Zimmerman, 2006, 2008). Met perception for contemplating one's own reasoning and incorporates procedures, for example, arranging or self-observing (e.g., Hong & O'Neil, 2001). Self-control forms proposed for not promptly deliver elevated amounts of aptitude. These procedures are thought enable individuals for get information and aptitudes successfully. One powerful instrument that students' use for enhancing their adapting, paying little mind for capacity, self-direction. A meta-analysis conducted by Dent and Koenka (2016) have explored relationship of components of self-regulated learning for secondary and elementary school students. They have shown that average relationship differ based on the type of achievement measure. The purpose of this study was to explore relationship of learning empowerment and student self-regulation at university level.

2. Research Questions

The following were research questions of the study:

1. To what extent students are empowered at university level?
2. To explore the level of self-regulation of students at university level?
3. Is there any relationship between learning empowerment and students' self-regulation?

3. Methodology

This study was conducted by using quantitative research method. This descriptive study was conducted through survey of concerned Universities. Survey method was adopted to collect the data through a

questionnaire to find out the opinion of the concerned participant about study variables. Population of the study has included all the 33 Higher Education Commission (HEC) recognized universities of Lahore including 14 Public and 19 Private universities. By random sampling technique three hundred (300) students were selected as the sample of the study. After selection of four public and four private universities in Lahore District at random, one hundred fifty (150) females and one hundred fifty (150) male students were sample of the study.

4. Instruments of the Study

Researchers have used two instruments first learner empowerment and second students' self-regulation questionnaire. Self-regulation questionnaire was a part of motivational strategies for learning questionnaire that was developed by Pintrich and De Groot (1990). It was composed of three factors. Similarly, learner empowerment questionnaire that was previously developed by Fymeir, Shulman & Houser (1996). Questionnaire for learner empowerment composed of three factors. Both instruments were Likert scales (questionnaires) with 5-point on it, to collect data from the participants. There were 22 statements of learner empowerment questionnaire and 23 statements of self-regulation questionnaire. The questionnaires were pilot tested on fifty students from two private and two public sector universities of Lahore. The reliability of self-regulation questionnaire was found .78 and the reliability of learner empowerment questionnaire was found .81, which were encouraging. Both instruments were validated before use.

5. Data Collection

The data was collected through questionnaires adapted by the researchers. Researcher personally visited sample universities to collect data.

6. Data Analysis

The collected data was analyzed by using IBM SPSS ver.22 (Statistical package for social science) to investigate the relationship of learner empowerment and student self-regulation at university level. The data collected through questionnaire was tabulated and analyzed by applying inferential and descriptive statistics.

7. Results

Results were calculated for frequencies and percentages of demographic variables shown in following tables:

Table 1

Demographic information of the Participation

Variables	Levels	Frequency	Percentage
Gender			
	Male	250	50
	Female	250	50
Age			
	20-25	180	49
	25-30	153	40
	30-35	67	11
Qualification			
	BS/BSc	158	41
	MA/MSc	159	42
	PhD	83	17
Type of University			
	Public	250	50
	Private	250	50

Demographic information from table 1 shows that two hundred and fifty male and same number of female students participated in this research. Forty nine percent participants were 20-25 years old and forty percent participants were 25-30 years old, in the same way, eleven percent participant were 30-35 years old. Qualification of forty two percent students was MA/MSc and almost same percentage was of BS/BSc participants, and seventeen percent were PhD degree holders. There was same percentage of public and private university participants.

Table 2
Students' level of learner empowerment

	Frequency	Percentage
Low (2.85 to 3.50)	115	16%
Medium (3.50 to 4.25)	116	16.7%
High (4.25 to 5.00)	269	67.3%
Total	500	100.0

Results revealed that learner empowerment level of 16% students was low. There were 16.7% students whose level of learner empowerment was medium. There were 67.3% students whose level of learner empowerment was high. It was concluded from the results that learner empowerment level of majority of students was high.

Table 3
Students' levels of self-regulation

	Frequency	Percentage
Low (2.90 to 3.50	104	12.3%
Medium (3.50 to 4.75)	134	22.3%
High (4.75 to 5.00)	262	65.3%
Total	500	100.0

Results shown from table 3 that self-regulation level of 12.3% students was low. There were 22.3% students whose level of self-regulation was medium. There were 65.3% students whose level of self-regulation was high. It was concluded from the results that self-regulation level of majority of students was high.

Table 4
Responses of students about competence

Sr	Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA
1	I feel self-assured that I can effectively do my duties.	10 (3.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	15 (5%)	275 (91.7%)
2	I feel scared by what is required from me in my class.	11 (3.7%)	1 (.3%)	0 (0%)	24 (8%)	264 (88%)
3	I am able to perform the necessary activities to succeed in my class.	10 (3.3%)	1 (.3%)	0 (0%)	23 (7.7%)	266 (88.7%)
4	My teacher makes me feel scarce.	10 (3.3%)	2 (.7%)	0 (0%)	22 (7.3%)	266 (88.7%)
5	I find my class to be exciting and energizing.	9 (3.0%)	1 (.3%)	0 (0%)	22 (7.3%)	268 (89.3%)

Table 4 shows responses of students about statements related to competence. Two hundred ninety (96.7%) respondents agreed or strongly agreed to perform their duties adequately. Overall ninety six percent (96%) participants were agreed statements related to competence.

Table 5
Responses of students about Meaningfulness

Sr	Statement	SDA	DA	N	A	SA
1	The material I read in this class is useful for me.	12 (4%)	1 (.3%)	0 (0%)	19 (6.3%)	268 (89.3%)
2	Class is consistent with my values.	10 (3.3%)	4 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	20 (6.7%)	266 (88.7%)
3	I find my class to be motivating.	4 (1.3%)	5 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	28 (9.3%)	263 (87.7%)
4	I have the ability to make a supportive learning environment in this class.	12 (4%)	1 (.3%)	0 (0%)	24 (8%)	263 (87.7%)
5	I can decide how assignment can be performed.	10 (3.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	25 (8.3%)	265 (88.3%)

Results in table 5 are showing the responses of students about statements related to meaningfulness. Two hundred eighty seven (95.6%) respondents agreed or strongly agreed that information got in this class is useful. Two hundred eighty six (95.4%) respondents were agreed that students' class is consistent with their values. Similarly, with other statements more than ninety six percent (96%) respondents were agreed with statements related to meaningfulness.

Table 6
Responses of students about Choice

Sr	Statement	SDA	DA	N	A	SA
1	The assignment required in my class is meaningful in my view.	10 (3.3%)	6 (2%)	0 (0%)	24 (8%)	260 (86.7%)
2	I approve the standards I must meet in my class.	9 (3%)	5 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	33 (11%)	253 (84.3%)
3	The assignment required by my class is valued to me.	9 (3%)	7 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	29 (9.7%)	255 (85%)
4	I usually do more work than is mandatory by the syllabus.	7 (2.3%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	23 (7.7%)	267 (89%)
5	I have a choice of performing my work in my own way.	12 (4%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	49 (16.3%)	236 (78.7%)
6	Stating my own attitudes and ideas is appreciated in my class.	9 (3%)	5 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	27 (9%)	259 (86.3)
7	I have a high level of autonomy in completing my work.	8 (2.7%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	30 (10%)	259 (86.3%)
8	My teacher allows flexibility in the way I perform my responsibilities.	8 (2.7%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	37 (12.3%)	252 (84%)

Table 6 shows responses of students about statements related to choice. Two hundred eighty four (94.7%) respondents were agreed that students task required in their class are personally meaningful. Similarly ratio of participants agreed with statements related to the choice was high (96%).

Table 7
Responses of students about self-efficacy

Sr	Statements	SDA	DA	N	A	SA
1	I believe to do well than the other students in my class.	9 (3%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	54 (18%)	234 (78%)

2	I feel that I do very well in this class.	4 (1.3%)	1 (.3%)	0 (0%)	45 (15%)	250 (83.3%)
3	I believe I am a best student than to other class fellows.	4 (1.3%)	4 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	35 (11.7%)	257 (85.7%)
4	I believe that I will get good grades in this class.	6 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	48 (16%)	246 (82%)
5	I am sure I can do an excellent job on the problems	7 (2.3%)	1 (.3%)	0 (0%)	36 (12%)	256 (85.3%)
6	My study skills are excellent than others in this class.	4 (1.3%)	4 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	41 (13.7%)	251 (83.7%)
7	I believe I know more about the subject as compare to other class fellows.	3 (1%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	32 (10.7%)	262 (87.3%)
8	I feel that I will be able to learn the material for this class.	4 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	34 (11.3%)	262 (87.3%)

Table 7 shows the responses of students about statements related to self-efficacy. Two hundred eighty eight (96%) respondents agreed that students expect to do well as compared with other students in this class. Similarly, ratio of students agree with statements related to self-efficacy was high (96%).

Table 8

Responses of students about intrinsic value

Sr	Statement	SDA	DA	N	A	SA
1	I like challenging class work that is helpful to learn new things.	5 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	47 (15.7%)	248 (82.6%)
2	Understanding of this subject is useful for me.	6 (2%)	2 (.7%)	0 (0%)	39 (13%)	253 (84.3%)
3	I take interest what I am learning in this class.	7 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	43 (14.3%)	250 (83.3%)
4	I think I will be able to use what I learn in this class in other classes.	4 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	39 (13%)	257 (85.7%)
5	I think that what I am learning in this class is interesting for me.	7 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	46 (15.3%)	247 (82.3%)
6	I always learn from my mistakes, even if I do poorly on a test.	11 (3.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	48 (16%)	241 (80.3%)
7	It is important for me to learn what is being taught in this class.	8 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	38 (12.6%)	254 (84.7%)
8	I think it is useful knowledge that we are learning in this class.	11 (3.7%)	2 (.7%)	0 (0%)	39 (13%)	248 (82.6%)

Table 8 shows the responses of students about statements related to intrinsic value. Two hundred ninety five (98.3%) respondents agreed that students prefer class work is challenging so that they can learn new things. Two hundred ninety two (97.3%) respondents agreed that important for students to learn what is being taught in this class. Similarly ratio of participants agreed with statements related to the intrinsic value was high (95%).

Table 9

Responses of students about student self-regulation

Sr	Statement	SDA	DA	N	A	SA
1	For difficult lessons I leave studies otherwise I study only the easy parts.	4 (1.3%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	39 (13%)	256 (85.3%)

2	I use self-questioning technique to make sure that I know what I have studied	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	49 (16.3%)	248 (82.7%)
3	I work hard to get a good grade even when I do not have any interest in the class.	12 (4%)	1 (.3%)	0 (0%)	36 (12%)	251 (83.7%)
4	I often find that I have been reading for class but do not know what it is all about.	1 (.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	55 (18.3%)	244 (81.3%)

Table 9 shows responses of students about statements related to students' self-regulation. Two hundred ninety five (98.3%) respondents agreed or strongly agreed that students ask their self-questions to make sure they know the material they have been studying. Similarly, ratio of participants agreed with statements related to the self-regulation was high (95%).

Table 10

Relationship between learner empowerment and student self-regulation

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Self-efficacy	4.77	0.27	-	.301**	.186**	.756**	.329**	.243**	.215**	.371**
2. Intrinsic value	4.76	0.28		-	.243**	.784**	.179**	.138*	.137*	.214**
3. Self-regulation	4.78	0.35			-	.541**	.044	.155**	.051	.104
4.Overal self- regulation	4.77	0.21				-	.288**	.253**	.205**	.348**
5.Competence	4.80	0.55					-1	.221**	.254**	.746**
6.Meaningfulness	4.78	0.42						-	.310**	.627**
7.Choice	4.73	0.36							-	.749**
8.Learner empowerment	4.77	0.31								-

Table 10 shows about Pearson coefficient of correlation that was used to find the relationship between learner empowerment and students self-regulation. Learner empowerment composed of three factors and students' self-regulation also has three factors. The correlation was calculated within and between factors of learner empowerment and students self-regulation. There was a noteworthy relationship of Self efficacy with Intrinsic value, Self- regulation, Competence respectively (r=.301, r=.186, r=.756, r=.329, p<.01). There was a noteworthy positive and small relationship of Meaningfulness, Choice, Learner empowerment with Self efficacy (r=.243, r=.215, r=.371, p<.01). There was a noteworthy relationship of Self- regulation, overall Self-regulation and Competence with Intrinsic value (r=.243, r=.784, r=.179, p<.01) respectively. There was a significant relationship of Meaningfulness, Choice and learner empowerment with Intrinsic value (r=.138, r=.137 p<.05, r=.214, p<.01). There was no significant relationship of Competence, Choice and Learner empowerment with self-regulation (r=.044, r=.051, r=.104, p>.05). There was a noteworthy relationship of Overall Self-regulation Meaningfulness with Self-regulation(r=.541, r=.155, p<.01). Overall relationship between all factors was positive and significant.

8. Discussion

The findings of this research have shown that there were majority of students whose level of learner empowerment was high. On the other hand, there were some students whose level of learner empowerment was medium and in the same line learner empowerment level of a small number of students was low. It was concluded from the results that learner empowerment level of majority of students was high. The results of this study have shown that the percentage of students' response on learner empowerment (and its components) questionnaire was highly positive. Majority of the students marked on strongly agree on overall statements of learner empowerment, competence, meaningfulness and choice. Students were confident, exciting and energizing. They feel that information given in their class is consistent with their values interesting and useful, therefore they work hard and can perform well. They were agreed that they do more effort to fulfil the requirement of the class and enjoyed higher level of autonomy in the class therefore we can be more creative in the class. Hence, empowered learner have positive attitude towards learning and have positive impact on students' achievement (Frymier, Shulman

& Houser, 1996).

The findings of this research have also shown that there were majority of students whose level of self-regulation was high. On the other hand, there were some students whose level of self-regulation was medium and in the same line self-regulation level of a small number of students was low. It was concluded from the results self-regulation level of majority of students was high. Most teachers are agreed to implement self-regulation in classroom is ideal. Planning such lesson for implementation of self-regulation is not a small achievement (Paris & Winograd, 1990). Since, components of self-regulation learning has positive relationship with each other (Dent & Koenka, 2016).

Generally, students were strongly agreed with the statements related to self-efficacy, intrinsic value and self-regulation. Students were agreed that they can perform very well in class and they were aware that they can learn given material for the class. Their overall self-efficacy level was very high. They were confident that they can learn new things and know the importance and usefulness of lessons taught in the class. They believe that they learn from their mistakes. They think that they need to question their-self they work hard even if the class is not interesting to get good grades. A variety of research literature has encouraged self-regulation in classroom for effective instructions (e.g. Andreassen & Braten, 2011; Cleary & Zimmerman, 2004; Dignath & Buettner, 2008; Tonks & Taboada, 2011; Hong, & O'Neil, 2001) and promote collective discussion (Han, & Hill, 2007)

The relationship between learner empowerment and students self-regulation was found positive. Three factors of learner empowerment were highly correlated with three factors of students' self-regulation. Self-efficacy was correlated with intrinsic value, self- regulation and competence respectively. Similarly, meaningfulness, choice and learner empowerment have positive relationship with self-efficacy. Self-regulation, overall self-regulation and competence were found to be correlated with intrinsic value. A notable relationship of meaningfulness, choice and learner empowerment with intrinsic value was also found. Competence, choice and learner empowerments were not correlated with self-regulation considerably.

9. Conclusion and Recommendations

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship of learner empowerment and student self-regulation at university level. Study reveals that Self-regulation of students was very high. Those students who are very high in self-regulation they may be very good in planning and executing their academic activities themselves. They may be good in preparation in class tests and assignment but it is needed to do further research on this issue. The study also reveals that most of students were much empowered on overall scale and its three components. Empowerment will support to take risk of new and challenging academic task and will help to achieve their goals. Self-regulation and learner empowerment both construct push to students toward successful academic life. The study also reflects strong relationship between learner empowerment and student self-regulation at university level. It can be concluded from the findings of the study that Self-regulation and learner empowerment are inter related and strengthen to each other.

The students should get awareness about to current affairs and situations. The students should communicate with other students, scholars, counselors to solve the different kinds of problems of relevance to the education and students. The self-regulated learning skills should attend the group discussion meetings, symposium, workshop and seminars etc. to develop their knowledge and understanding of self-regulated learning skills.

References

Andreassen, R., & Braten, I. (2011). Implementation and effects of explicit reading comprehension instruction in fifth-grade classrooms. *Learning and Instruction*, *21*(4), 520-537.

Ashcroft, L. (1987). Defusing" empowering": The what and the why. *Language Arts*, *64*(2), 142-156.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. *Englewood Cliffs, NJ*.

Baumeister, R. F. (1997). Esteem threat, self-regulatory breakdown, and emotional distress as factors in self-defeating behavior. *Review of General Psychology*, *1*(2), 145.

Baumeister, R. F., DeWall, C. N., Ciarocco, N. J., & Twenge, J. M. (2005). Social exclusion impairs self-regulation. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *88*(4), 589.

Cleary, T. J., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2004). Self-regulation empowerment program: A school-based program to enhance self-regulated and self-motivated cycles of student learning. Psychology in the Schools, 41, 537-550.

Dent, A. L., & Koenka, A. C. (2016). The relation between self-regulated learning and academic achievement across childhood and adolescence: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, *28*(3), 425-474.

Dignath, C. & Buttner, G. (2008). Components of fostering self-regulated learning among students. A meta-analysis on intervention studies at primary and secondary school level. Metacognition and Learning, 3, 231-264.

Frymier, A. B., Shulman, G. M., & Houser, M. (1996). The development of a learner empowerment measure. *Communication Education*, *45*(3), 181-199.

Han, S. Y., & Hill, J. R. (2007). Collaborate to learn, learn to collaborate: Examining the roles of context, community, and cognition in asynchronous discussion. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *36*(1), 89-123.

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement.* London: New York Routledge.

Hill, C. A. (2007). *Wood modification: chemical, thermal and other processes* (Vol. 5). John Wiley & Sons.

Hong, E., & O'Neil Jr, H. F. (2001). Construct validation of a trait self-regulation model. *International Journal of Psychology*, *36*(3), 186-194.

Lawton, D. (1989). Education, culture and National Curriculum. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2003). The PISA 2003 Technical Report. https://www.oecd.org/edu/school/programmeforinternationalstudentassessmentpisa/35188570.pdf. Accessed 20 March 2016

Paris, S. G., & Winograd, P. (1990). How metacognition can promote academic learning and instruction. *Dimensions of thinking and cognitive instruction*, *1*, 15-51.

Pask, G. (1976). Styles and strategies of learning. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *46*(2), 128-148.

Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of educational psychology*, *82*(1), 33.

Tanriseven, I., & Dilmac, B. (2013). Predictive relationships between secondary school students' human values, motivational beliefs, and self- regulated learning strategies. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 13, 29-36.

Tonks, S. M., & Taboada, A. (2011). Developing self-regulated readers through instruction for reading engagement. In B. J. Zimmerman, & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance (pp. 173-186). New York: Routledge.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Watkins, C. (2010). Learning Performance and Improvement. Research Matters, issue 34, Summer. [online] The London Centre for Leadership in Learning. Available at: http:// www.mantleoftheexpert.com/wp-content/ uploads/2010/ 06/ Watkins-10-LngPerf-Imp.pdf

Whitebread, D. (2017). Cambridge Primary/Secondary 1 Global Perspectives programme 5–14: Overview and Academic Rationale. Unpublished paper presented to the pilot schools

Zeidner, M., Boekaerts, M., & Pintrich, P. R. (2000). Self-regulation: Directions and challenges for future research. In *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 749-768).

Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *81*(3), 329.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into practice*, *41*(2), 64-70.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2006). Development and Adaptation of Expertise: *The Role of Self-Regulatory Processes and Beliefs*

Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). Investigating self-regulation and motivation: Historical background, methodological developments, and future prospects. *American Educational Research Journal*, *45*(1), 166-183.