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ABSTRACT
The main aim of this study was to investigate the relationships between parents' lifestyle and their high schoolchildren’s self-regulated learning and procrastination. The research statistical population included all high school boys and girls students and their parents in district 11 Education in Tehran city. The research sample comprised 200 (100 males and 100 females) and their parents who were randomly selected using cluster sampling method. Pintrich's and DeGroot's(MSLQ) (1990) and Tackman's procrastination questionnaire (2001) were administrated to assess the students’ self-regulated learning and their procrastination. The life style questionnaire (LSQ) (Lali et al., 2012) was also used to determine the parents' life styles. The collected data were analyzed in terms of descriptive and inferential statistics (Pearson's correlation, regression coefficient, and t test). The results revealed that; a) There is a meaningful relationship between parents' lifestyle and their schoolchildren’s self-regulated learning and procrastination. b) Among the components of parents' lifestyle, weight and nutrition control, diseases preventing, psychological health, social health, drugs and substance use avoiding, accidents avoiding, and environmental health had a significant relationship with schoolchildren’s self-regulated learning. c) The relationship between the components of weight and nutrition control, spiritual health, social health, drugs avoiding, and accidents avoiding with schoolchildren’s procrastination was also significant. d) There is a meaningful relationship between parents’ lifestyle and their schoolchildren's motivational beliefs and learning strategies in self-regulated learning. e) In terms of gender, self-regulated learning was high in girls in comparison to boys. Further findings will be discussed fully in this paper. Parents’ lifestyle can influence their schoolchildren’s self-regulated learning and procrastination. As such, an appropriate lifestyle in parents may encourage their schoolchildren to use self-regulated learning and avoid procrastination.
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INTRODUCTION
Lifestyle is a relatively new concept in the scientific and cultural literature. In the field of psychology, this concept was first noticed by Alfred Adler as an independent and serious discussion, so it is now used for the analysis, prediction, control, and managing many social, cultural, and psychological phenomena (Boeree and George, 1997). Adler believed that human may face with three certain problems as the attitude in three categories of community, work, and love (Allen, 1994). But being unique, it is a concerted action to move towards individual goals and ideals that created and developed during childhood. Lifestyle is certainly originated from a combination of two factors including orientation of individual target and special fantastic fatalism (Bass et al., 2002). In addition to these two factors, there are some environmental forces that are helping to move a person in a certain way, or even alter him or her (Sweeny et al., 2003; Cockerham, 2005).

Self-regulated learning includes the approaches for regulation of cognitive processes or management strategies that are used to control learning process. Self-regulated learning is in fact control the thought, and also feelings in behaviors to achieve a goal (Pintrich and De Groot, 1990; Zimmerman, 2000). Self-regulated learning can help people to control and manage their behaviors (Chen, 2002; Cobb, 2003).
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Auto-regulation determinants are usually categorized into three personal, environmental and behavioral categories (Dang et al., 2011).

Procrastination is to tend to avoid activities; assigning work in the future and using apologize to justify the delay in working. Procrastination is a pattern of life that achieved through inefficient behavior in situations of decision making, setting priorities, planning, and program implementation in one or more life situations (Thompson and Rudolph, 2000).

Investigations which have been conducted on self-regulation and procrastination shown that environment influences in the development of these two traits in individuals, particularly adolescents. According to the observations made in the centers, educational institutions, and schools, addressing education of self-regulation learning and procrastination is very important among students. The family is an effective environment, because the current lifestyles are changeable, the assessment relation to parents' lifestyles and self-regulation and procrastination is very important for educational groups and also for families. Since family is an important environment, in the present study, the lifestyle of family was first assessed and then the relationships between the lifestyle and two factors of self-regulated learning and procrastination were determined.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Method

Statistical society: the research statistical population included all high school boys and girls students and their parents in district 11 Education in Tehran city. The research sample comprised 200 (100 males and 100 females) in the academic year of 2012-13 and their parents who were randomly selected using cluster sampling method.

Instrument

In order to collect the required data, the followings questionnaires were administrated:

a) Pintrich's and DeGroot's (MSLQ) (1990): The motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ) is an 81-items, self-report instrument designed to measure students' motivational orientations and their use of different learning strategies developed firstly by Pintrich and DeGroot's (1990). The MSLQ consists of 81, self-report items divided into two broad categories: (1) a motivation section, and (2) a learning strategies section. According to the MSLQ manual, the motivation section consists of 31 items that assess students' goals and value beliefs for a course, their beliefs about their skill to succeed in a course, and their anxiety about tests in a course. The learning strategy section includes 31 items regarding students' use of different cognitive and metacognitive strategies. The learning strategies section includes 19 items concerning student management of different resources. Students rate themselves on a 7-pointsLikert scale, from 1 (not at all true of me) to 7 (very true of me). Scores for the individual scales are computed by taking the mean of the items that make up the scale. Regarding the reliability of the questionnaire, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for subscales of the questionnaire was 0.79 to 0.98.

b) Tackman's procrastination questionnaire (2001): this is a 35-item questionnaire designed and compiled by Takman to measure students' procrastination. It is accurately able to measure the degree of academic procrastination of university students. This scale measures the followings items: generalized description for willingness to delay, the strong willingness to do extreme activities while doing unpleasant things, and the tendency to blame events or individuals for the consequences of procrastination. This questionnaire is scored on 4-pointsLikert scale. Thus, the maximum score is 140 and the minimum score is 35. In a study by Ghasemi (2009) this 35-item scale was used and the reliability and validity of the scale was obtained to be 0.87 through the use of Cronbach's Alpha coefficient.

c) Life style questionnaire (LSQ) (Lali et al., 2012): This questionnaire was used to determine the parents' life styles. This questionnaire has been developed based on the social and cultural characteristics of Iranian population and consists of 70 questions rated in the Likert scaling method. The reliability of the questionnaire was assessed according to the Cronbach's alpha coefficient that was ranged 0.76 to 0.89. To determine content validity, the questionnaire was assessed by 10 specialists. After applying the comments
regarding delete, add and modify items, the content validity of the questionnaire was obtained. This was also used to determine the parents’ life styles.

The collected data were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistics indexes (e.g. Pearson’s correlation, regression coefficient, using t test, Mann-Whitney U) by SPSS 20 for windows (SPSS Inc, Chicago IL).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The mean total score of procrastination, lifestyle, and motivated strategies for learning was 59.45 ± 9.69, 142.31 ± 23.14, and 154.15 ± 19.19, respectively. Assessing the relationship between the study components showed a positive correlation between parents’ lifestyle and motivated strategies for learning \( (r = 0.298, p < 0.001) \) as well as an adverse relationship between parents’ lifestyle and students’ procrastination \( (r = -0.258, p < 0.001) \). Also, procrastination was negatively associated with motivated strategies for learning \( (r = -0.257, p < 0.001) \).

Assessing the relationship between different components of parents’ lifestyle and motivated strategies for learning (table 1) showed positive correlations of motivated strategies for learning with some components of lifestyle including weight and nutrition control \( (r = 0.223, p = 0.002) \), prevention of disease \( (r = 0.150, p = 0.034) \), psychological health \( (r = 0.203, p = 0.004) \), spiritual health \( (r = 0.341, p < 0.001) \), social health \( (r = 0.199, p = 0.005) \), prevention of drug and substance use \( (r = 0.239, p = 0.001) \), prevention of accidents \( (r = 0.251, p < 0.001) \), and environmental health \( (r = 0.162, 0.022) \) (table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R coefficient</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical health</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise and wellbeing</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of weight and nutrition</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of diseases</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological health</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual health</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social health</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of drug and substance use</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of accidents</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental health</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, the assessment of relationship between components of lifestyle and procrastination showed negative association of weight and nutrition control \( (r=-0.296, p<0.001) \), spiritual health \( (r=-0.293, p<0.001) \), social health \( (r = -0.211, p = 0.003) \), prevention of drug and substance use \( (r=-0.154, p=0.030) \), and prevention of accidents \( (r=0.229, p=0.001) \). According to mean difference analysis using \( t \) test showed that the mean score of motivated strategies for learning in female students was significantly higher than in males \( (159.34 \text{ versus } 149.11, t= 0.388, p<0.001) \). However, there was no difference in mean score of procrastination between male and female students \( (58.54 \text{ versus } 60.33, t= 1.30, p=0.192) \) (table 2).
Table 2: Relationship between parents’ lifestyle and their school children's procrastination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R coefficient</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical health</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise and wellbeing</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of weight and nutrition</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of diseases</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological health</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual health</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social health</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of drug and substance use</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of accidents</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental health</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The first finding in this study was a positive relationship between parents’ lifestyle and motivated strategies for learning in high school students that was also similarly revealed in other previous studies. The lifestyle is a cognitive plan to facilitate individuals' life activities. In fact, lifestyle is a collection of ideas allowing the people to manage and predict life facts as well as to create life motivation leading determination of person condition in the world. In this line, a motivated strategy for learning or auto-regulation is to obtain positive opinions about individuals' capacity. In this context, environment is one of the main sources of auto-regulation (Stephanie and et al., 2011). In fact, according to these results, parents' lifestyle is a pattern that can determine auto-regulation cognitive plan for their children (Anastaziakitsantas, 2008). In fact, different components of lifestyle in parents such as weight and nutrition control, prevention of diseases, psychological health, spiritual health, social health, prevention of drug and substance use, prevention of accidents, and environmental health can result in motivated strategies for learning in high school students.

It was also found that there is an adverse relationship between parents’ lifestyle and their schoolchildren's procrastination. On the other hand, increase positive aspects of parents’ lifestyle such as weight and nutrition control, spiritual health, social health, prevention of drug and substance use, and prevention of accidents can effectively reduce procrastination in students (Hess et al., 2000). This result was also consistent with previous studies. In fact, lifestyle can potentially involve in students' social adaptation and also their living and occupational activities (Milgram et al., 1998). On the other hand, environment, familial patterns and sense of demission in children can determine their lifestyle (Fuschia and Sirois, 2007).

In fact, lifestyle can generate amplitudes and effective behaviors. Since procrastination is defined as delaying the start or completion of an action, negative association between procrastination and lifestyle can be explained. Another finding was the negative association between procrastination and motivated strategies for learning in students. Procrastination is defined as absence or lack of auto-regulative action. In fact, procrastination is provocateur problem (Ferrari et al., 1995).

Based on these results, both characteristics can be different in boys and girls indicate that not only both procrastination and motivated strategies for learning can be affected by parents' lifestyle, but also can be affected by students demographics that should be more investigated in further studies.

In conclusion, parents' lifestyle can influence their children's procrastination and motivated strategies for learning. So, an appropriate lifestyle in parents can stimulate their children's motivation and inhibit their procrastination in doing schoolwork. This is however a study with its own limitation. So, further investigations are needed to be done and support these findings. Hence, any application based on these results should be accompany with needed caution.
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