

*What is my Learning Style Preference?*

Sabariah Abd Rahim, Kasma Mohd Hayas, Alice Alim

Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia

0028

The Asian Conference on Language Learning 2013

Official Conference Proceedings 2013



iafor

iafor  
The International Academic Forum  
[www.iafor.org](http://www.iafor.org)

## Introduction

It is important to understand the way students learn because it helps to improve their performance. A course that is compatible to the ways students like to learn can be developed if students' learning style preferences are identified. Students' different abilities in comprehending matters make them different from each other. Their different background, strengths and weaknesses, interests and ambitions, sense of responsibility, level of motivation, and approaches in learning further distinguish them. Some students may easily lose interest in a lesson if the teachers do all the talking (one-way interaction), and some may even prefer this kind of approach because they only need to listen to what the teachers going to teach in class. In addition, teaching methods also vary---some teachers mainly lecture, some focus more on hands-on-activities, some emphasize on memory, while others more on understanding. When there is a mismatch between students' learning style and teachers' teaching style, students will do poorly in examinations, become inattentive in class, lose interest on the course and in the worst case scenario, students can even drop out from school (Felder, 1996). Thus, it is very crucial for teachers to understand their students' learning style preferences before asking them to do any course.

Learning style preference (LSP) is defined as a set of cognitive features, affective and physiological factors that stabilize students' perceptions, interests and responses to the learning environment (Keefe, 1979). It is an instructive condition that students are most likely to learn (Stewart & Felicatti, 1992). It also refers to how students prefer to learn. Most of students are uninformed about their LSP, and if they are not given the chance to identify their LSP, they are most likely fail to start learning in new approaches (Merrill, 2000). By knowing their LSP, students will become aware of their strengths and weaknesses in learning which then can be used to overcome problems encountered in learning (Coffield, Moseley, Hall & Ecclestone, 2004). It is also very essential for instructors or lecturers to reveal their students' learning style so that they are aware of it (Pask, 1976). Thus, LSP plays an important role in the learning of a language.

There are various perspectives on LSP that can be generalized into these three general categories, namely information processing, personality patterns and social interaction (Conner, 2004). Information processing refers to how students sense, think, solve problem and remember information. Kolb's Learning Style Inventory and Gregorc's Mind Styles Model are two LSP models/perspectives that are commonly describe information processing in detailed. Kolb's Learning Style Inventory (Kolb, 1984) includes the followings:

Learning Style	Description
<i>Feeling and Watching (Diverging)</i>	Students are able to work in situations requiring ideas-generation, e.g. brainstorming because they have infinite cultural interests and love to gather information. They love people; they are imaginative and emotional, and also are good in arts. They perform better in groups, have an open mind and prefer to receive personal comments.
<i>Watching and Thinking (Assimilating)</i>	Students prefer a concise and logical approach. For them, ideas and concepts are more essential than people. In formal learning situations, these students prefer readings, lectures, investigating analytical models and having time to think.
<i>Doing and Thinking (Converging)</i>	Students prefer technical tasks and are less focused on people. They use their learning to find solutions to practical issues. They can decide and solve problems as well as experiment new ideas.
<i>Doing and Feeling (Accommodating)</i>	Students prefer to take a practical, experimental approach. They prefer to work in groups and perform better in tasks involving actions and initiatives.

Figure 1: Kolb's Learning Style Inventory

Mind Styles Model classifies four major learning types (Gregorc, 1985), i.e. (a) *Concrete Sequential*: Students with this learning style prefer order, logical sequence, following directions, certainty and getting facts. They perform best in a structured learning environment, relying on others and applying ideas in pragmatic ways. They cannot work well in groups, (b) *Abstract Random*: This group of students performs best in a personalized environment and able to work in groups, and they cannot learn in stressful environment and accept criticism even though it is a constructive criticism, (c) *Abstract Sequential*: Students with this learning style like people to listen to their points; they prefer to analyze situations before making decision and prefer logic explanations. These students can work alone because they cannot work with people of differing opinions and easily feel bored with repetitive tasks, and (d) *Concrete Random*: This group of students experiments to find answers; they take risks and use their intuition to solve problem. They learn best in competitive and autonomous learning environment.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and Keirsey Temperament Sorter are among the most popular personality patterns analyses that refer to attention, emotion and values. The analyses predict the way students react and feel about different situations. The

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator categorizes students according to their preference, namely (a) introversion- interest on concepts and ideas, (b) extroversion- interest on actions, objects and people, (c) sensing- perceive quick, real, practical facts of experience and life, (d) intuition- perceive possibilities, relationships, and meanings of experiences, (e) thinking- make decisions objectively and impersonally, (f) feeling- make decisions subjectively and personally, (g) judging- act in a planned and decisive way, and (h) perceiving- act in spontaneous and flexible way. Students with different type of preferences are likely to respond differently in different teaching styles. For example, extroverts prefer to work in groups, whereas introverts prefer working alone; sensors prefer concrete learning experiences and clearly defined objectives and they dislike theories; intuitors prefer instructions based on understanding concepts, and they dislike memorization of facts, rote substitution and repetitive calculations; thinkers prefer logical and organized presentations of course material and feedback related to their work; feelers enjoy being with people who have a good relationship with them and those who appreciate their efforts; judges, on the other hand, prefer well-structured instructions with clear goals and objectives; whereas perceivers prefer to have choice and flexibility in their tasks and dislike rigid timelines (Felder, Felder & Dietz, 2002).

Keirsey Temperament Sorter groups students' characteristics (Keirsey, 1998, as cited in Putintseva, 2006) into:

- (a) *Idealists*: Students can sometime become leaders, and often speak according to their imaginations.
- (b) *Guardians*: Students carry out tasks and actions with caution and careful preparation. They believe in rules and regulations.
- (c) *Rational*: Students are able to organize and plan, invent and configure operations. They are capable and practical.
- (d) *Artisans*: Students have natural talent for all the arts, e.g. fine arts, dramatic, athletic, military, political and financial arts. They make free, spontaneous actions for quick and effective results.

In addition, McCarthy and Gardner McCarthy (1990) categorized four learning styles, namely innovative learners (they enjoy social interaction, work as a team and want to make the world a better place), analytic learners (they develop intellectuality while learning, are tolerant and thoughtful), common sense learners (they prefer finding solutions, value useful things, are kinesthetic, practical and undemanding), and dynamic learners (they process information from different sources, and are enthusiastic and adventurous). Gardner's model identifies three types of LSP (Gardner, 1985), namely visual learners---need to see teachers' body language and facial expression to grasp fully the content of the lesson, prefer visual displays and will take detailed notes to understand information, auditory learners---prefer verbal lectures, discussion, and listen to what others have to say, and tactile/kinesthetic learners---learn best through a hands-on-approach, and have the difficulty to focus for long periods and can get easily bored.

Social interaction is another category of LSP. It deals with students' attitudes, habits, and strategies in doing their work, participation in learning environment. For this category, the Reichmann-Grasha model is one of the models used to identify students' LSP. It focuses on students' attitudes toward learning, classroom activities, teachers and peers (Reichmann & Grasha, 1974). This model identifies students as in Figure 2. :

<b>Learning Style</b>	<b>Description</b>
<i>Avoidant students</i>	This group of students is likely to perform badly in learning because they have high absenteeism, organize their work poorly and are irresponsible towards their learning.
<i>Participative students</i>	The students are accountable to self-learning and relate well to their peers.
<i>Competitive students</i>	The students love to compete for rewards and recognitions.
<i>Collaborative students</i>	This group of students loves to work harmoniously with their peers.
<i>Dependent students</i>	This group of students loves attention and will become frustrated whenever they are not directly addressed in the classroom
<i>Independent students</i>	These students enjoy working alone and require little assistance from the teachers.

Figure 2: Reichmann-Grasha Model

The list of LSP models continues because teachers or people involved in education realize the importance of learning style in learning environment. Various findings also support the evolution of these models because the studies show that matching LSP and teaching styles can profoundly enhance academic achievement, students' attitudes and behaviours at any level of education, be it in primary or secondary school level (Griggs & Dunn, 1984; Smith & Renzulli, 1984), at the tertiary level (Brown, 1978; Charkins, OToole & Wetzel, 1985), and significantly in foreign or second language classrooms (Oxford, Ehrman & Lavine, 1991; Wallace & Oxford, 1992). It is also found that students will feel stress, frustration and burnout if their LSP is inconsistent with the teaching style (Smith & Renzulli, 1984). Yet, when the mode of teaching style applied in a classroom is varied, students will learn more information (Stice, 1987). Still, to achieve effective foreign and second language learning, instructional methods used in the classroom should be balanced, and this can only be achieved by structuring the classroom according to students' LSP (Oxford, 1990). Thus, it is very vital for teachers to identify students' LSP before they design a course.

As discussed in earlier paragraphs, there are many perspectives of LSP that teachers can use to describe their students' LSP. However, for this study, Reid's Perceptual Learning-Style Preferences will be used to describe the foreign and second language learners in Universiti Malaysia Sabah. Reid (1987) has proposed six LSP that is elicited in the Perceptual Learning-Style Preferences Questionnaire, namely *Individual Major LSP*, *Kinesthetic Major LSP*, *Group Major LSP*, *Visual Major LSP*,

*Auditory Major LSP*, and *Tactile Major LSP*. This questionnaire is designed to identify the ways students learn the best. Reid (1987) described *Individual Major LSP* refers to students who will learn best when they are not in group. They can perform positively by themselves without the help of their peers, whereas students with *Group Major LSP* need to work in a group or at least with one other student because they prefer group interaction and class work with other students, and they remember information better when they work in a group because the stimulation they get from the group work helps them to learn and understand information better. *Kinesthetic Major LSP*, on the other hand, refers to students who will learn best by involving physically in classroom activities. These students will remember and learn well when they actively participate in activities, field trips, and role-playing in the classroom. Then students with *Visual Major LSP* will learn best when they see words; they prefer more to read than to listen as they understand better when they see words--whether the words in books, on the whiteboards or workbooks. They prefer note-taking. Another LSP proposed by Reid is *Auditory Major LSP*. Unlike the *Visual Major LSP*, *Auditory Major LSP* refers to students who learn best through listening. They learn from hearing words of spoken or oral explanations. They learn best through discussion and will remember best when they read-aloud the information. Next, *Tactile Major LSP* is another LSP proposed by Reid. Students with *Tactile Major LSP* will learn best when they have the opportunity to do 'hands-on' activities. Any physical involvement-related-activities in the classroom will help these students to understand better new information and writing-notes and instructions help them to remember information better. Also, Reid (1987) did a study on the learning style preferences of ESL students in the United States (U.S.) and found that these students preferred *Kinesthetic* and *Tactile* learning styles. The majority of them illustrated a negative preference for *Group* learning style. The students' different learning style preferences were related to their gender, length of time studying in the U.S., field of study, educational background, TOEFL score and age.

In addition, Mulalic, Shah and Ahmad (1985) did a study of the learning style of the ESL students in University Tenaga Nasional (UNITEN) and they established the notion of the importance of determining students' learning styles and making sure students are aware of the different methods of learning. They also suggested that a variety of teaching materials should be implemented in the classroom in order to cater the students' different learning styles. According to them students' attitude and achievement can also be influenced by their learning styles.

In conclusion, LSP is very much a significant factor in learning environment because it facilitates teachers to incorporate teaching styles suited for their students. Discovering the students learning style preference will let students know their weaknesses and strengths, and any problems encountered in learning can perhaps be managed and more successful learners can be produced with the key attention given to identifying their LSP.

### **The Background of the Study**

Internal or external factors are always highlighted as the causes for students' failure to perform in the foreign and second language classroom---mainly affect students'

motivation to learn the languages. However, between the two, external factors, such as learning environment, materials used, teachers' teaching styles play a major role as they are the determinants for the ups and downs of the internal factors (Bandura, 1993; Graham, 1994; Dornyei, 2001). In designing a course, teachers, or in this study, lecturers, rely solely on the general guidelines given to them that normally conforms to the real-working environment. A course is designed to suit the basic skills needed for the undergraduates to survive in the working world---the skills are speaking, writing, listening and reading. These skills are carefully employed in a course, and sometimes literally taught in its own specific course. For example, in Universiti Malaysia Sabah (UMS), for the English Language, the skills are focused in an individual course or level which only focuses on one or two specific skills, e.g. Level 3 of the English Language course focuses on reading and writing skills, whereas Level 2 of the language course focuses on speaking skill. The foreign language courses, on the other hand, incorporate all the four skills into a level---all the three courses or levels of a foreign language course has all these four basic skills, i.e. reading, writing, speaking and listening. For instance, the Spanish Language course features all the four basic skills in each level of their course---there are three levels of the Spanish Language course, i.e. Spanish Levels 1, 2 and 3.

About 130 students doing the Spanish Language Level 2 (70 students) and the English Language Level 3 (60 students) of Centre for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning (PPIB), Universiti Malaysia Sabah, were selected for this study. All of the students were selected based on convenience sampling as they are the only groups available at the time the study was conducted. The Spanish Language Level 2 focuses on the four basic skills, i.e. reading, writing, listening and speaking, and all these skills are applied in the assessments as well as in the teaching techniques. The lecturer of this language course uses a lot of written and oral approaches, where every lesson taught is either found in the textbook they use or written on the whiteboard, and explanations of these lessons are done orally in order to enhance students' understanding. She also applies a lot of group work activities in class, such as role-play and interview, in order to improve students' speaking skill. However, most of the teaching techniques rely on written works. As for the English Language Level 2, the focus of this level would be the reading and writing skills. Unlike the Spanish Language lecturer, the lecturer of the English Language seldom uses the textbook for she would like the students to read the lesson in the textbook first before coming to class. In the classroom, the lecturer will teach and explain the lessons in the textbook verbally and seldom refer to the textbook. The students are also encouraged to ask questions.

Reid's Perceptual Learning Style Preference questionnaire (PLSP) (1987) is used to collect the data for this study because it is designed to identify students' learning style preference (LSP) and there are six variables or LSP proposed by Reid (1984), namely the *Individual Major LSP*, *Kinesthetic Major LSP*, *Group Major LSP*, *Visual Major LSP*, *Auditory Major LSP*, and *Tactile Major LSP*. PLSP has 30 items, i.e. five items for each LSP..

As discussed earlier, the design of the language courses in Universiti Malaysia Sabah (UMS) is based on the skills needed for the undergraduates to perform well in their work, and none of these courses are tailored according to students' needs, which perhaps become to be one of the falling factors for the question why students cannot perform in the language courses. In addition, students' different background may also contribute to the difficulty of designing a course that suits everybody. Thus, it is very important for lecturers designing the language course to identify students' learning style preference (LSP). When students' LSP is identified, an effective course can be developed because relevant teaching techniques related to students' LSP can be adopted in the course. As it is, the current language courses are designed based on the requirements set by the lecturers following on the assumptions that students can master all the skills effectively. In reality, this is not what has happened. Students still fail to perform in the languages and something should be done in order to curb this problem. Therefore, this study is essential as it can be used as a platform for language lecturers to design a course that suits students' LSP.

This study attempts to answer these following questions, i.e. (1) What is the students' LSP? And (2) Which of the LSP is the most prevalence among the students? Thus, the objectives of this study are to identify the students' LSP and to determine which of the learning style preference is the most prevalent among the students.

Although this study tries to determine whether or not LSP should be taken into consideration in the designing of a language course, it only focuses on two specific groups, i.e. 70 students doing the Spanish Language Level 2 and 60 students doing the English Language Level 3. Thus, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to other groups.

## THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Reid's Perceptual Learning Style Preferences Questionnaire (PLSPQ) (see Appendix 1) was adopted in this study. The questionnaire has 30 multiple-choice items where students need to indicate their responses by choosing a point along a Likert Scale that best corresponded to their feelings. Items 1, 7, 9, 17 and 20 elicit the *Auditory* LSP; items 6, 10, 12, 24, 29 elicit the *Visual* LSP; items 11, 14, 16, 22 and 25 elicit the *Tactile* LSP; items 3, 4, 5, 21 and 23 elicit the *Group* LSP; items 2, 8, 15, 19 and 26 elicit the *Kinesthetic* LSP; and items 13, 18, 27, 28 and 30 elicit the *Individual* LSP.

Next, the questionnaire was given to 130 students, where all were then collected to be analyzed. The data were analyzed according to the frequency count of each point of the Likert Scale used in the questionnaire. Reid (1984) assigned a numerical index score for each point of the Likert Scale, i.e. 5 for *strongly agree*, 4 for *agree*, 3 for *undecided*, 2 for *disagree* and 1 for *strongly disagree*. The students' scores for each item in the questionnaire were added up and the total scores were used to determine the students' LSP. The scores were then divided into three categories which are *major learning style preference*, *minor learning style preference* and *negligible learning style preference*.



Based on the fact that there are five items of each LSP and the frequency of LSP of each item was identified by a five-point Likert Scale, the total cumulative score ranges from 5 (the minimum cumulative score, 1 X 5) to 25 (the maximum cumulative score, 5 X 5). To get the range of scores for each scale, the minimum score of each scale was subtracted from the maximum cumulative score of each scale, i.e. 25 – 5. Therefore, the score range for each scale is 20. This range of 20 (25 – 5) was then divided into three categories, namely *major learning style preference*, *minor learning style preference* and *negligible learning style preference*, i.e. the range of score for the scale (20) was divided by these three categories (20 ÷ 3). Thus, the range of score for each category is 7. Based on this range, it was determined that the students' LSP is *negligible learning style preference* if the score is 0 to 6, *minor learning style preference* if the score is 7 to 13, and *major learning style preference* if the score is 14 to 20 (see Table 1).

Table 1: Range of Scores for the Students' Learning Style Preference

Category	Score
<i>Major learning style preference</i>	14 – 20
<i>Minor learning style preference</i>	7 – 13
<i>Negligible learning style preference</i>	0 – 6

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Tables 2(a) and (b) illustrate the findings of this study.

Table 2 (a): The English Language Students' Learning Style Preference

Category	Learning Style (LS)
<i>Major learning style preference</i>	<i>Group &amp; Visual</i>
<i>Minor learning style preference</i>	<i>Kinesthetic, Auditory &amp; Tactile</i>
<i>Negligible learning style preference</i>	<i>Individual</i>

Table 2 (b): The Spanish Language Students' Learning Style Preference

Category	Learning Style Preference (LS)
<i>Major learning style preference</i>	<i>Group, Kinesthetic &amp; Tactile</i>
<i>Minor learning style preference</i>	<i>Visual &amp; Auditory</i>
<i>Negligible learning style preference</i>	<i>Individual</i>

Tables 2 (a) and (b) show the students' learning style preference where the major learning style preferences for the students doing the English Language are *Group LS* and *Visual LS*, and for students doing the Spanish Language, their major learning style preferences are *Group LS*, *Kinesthetic LS* and *Tactile LS*. Both groups of students prefer *Group LS* and this is true because from the researchers' observation, it is found that the students perform better in group work activities than individual. Perhaps this is due to the ideas that they can teach each other, share knowledge, and learn from each other without feeling any anxiety because they are comfortable with each other. Also, the idea to discuss or ask lecturers for any doubts or questions regarding the lessons makes group work activities less pressured and looked forward by the students as they can freely discuss and clear any doubts or questions relating to the lessons with their peers.

Other major learning style preferences of these two groups of students are *Visual LS*, *Kinesthetic LS* and *Tactile LS*. *Visual LS* is the most preferred learning style preference of the English Language students. This explains why many of the students have problems to understand the lesson taught in class because the English Language lecturer seldom refers to the textbook and she also seldom writes notes on the whiteboard. Most of the time, the lecturer explains the lessons verbally in class with the idea that the students had read the textbook before coming to class. Students with *Visual LS* rely on words, be it in the textbook or on the whiteboard, to comprehend the lesson taught verbally in class. They can learn and understand best if the verbal explanations are also shown in words. The Spanish Language students, on the other hand, prefer *Kinesthetic LS* and *Tactile LS*. Students with these learning style preferences learn best if they can get involved or participate actively in any activities in the classroom. They need to practise what they have learnt in order to have maximum understanding of the lessons. The active participation from the students in communicative activities in the Spanish Language class, e.g. pair works and group works, supports their learning styles, i.e. *Kinesthetic LS* and *Tactile LS*. Perhaps this explains why *Group LS* is one of their major learning style preferences.

Next, Tables (a) and (b) also show that the minor learning style preferences of the students doing the English Language are *Kinesthetic LS*, *Auditory LS* and *Tactile LS*, whereas the minor learning style preferences of the Spanish Language students are *Visual LS* and *Auditory LS*. For the researchers, *Kinesthetic LS* and *Tactile LS* are less preferred by the English Language students because of the nature of the course itself which focuses on reading and writing. Writing essays and the answers for the comprehension part of reading individually has somehow affected the students' choice of learning style preferences. This perhaps due to the fact that they have to do the writings during class time, and this results in pressured environment for them because they have to submit the writings at the end of the class whether they can or cannot write. The researchers realize that the English Language students prefer to do the writings at home (not during class time) because they can have their writings checked by peers who have a good command in the English Language before submitting them to the lecturer. Also, by doing the writings at home, they can find examples of the writings online. These are the strategies that the students do in order to reduce mistakes in their writings, and this will surely help them to get better grades. All these reasons/strategies perhaps cause <sup>46</sup>*Kinesthetic LS* and *Tactile LS* to become

less preferred by the English Language students. On the contrary, the Spanish Language students prefer more the *Kinesthetic LS* and *Tactile LS*, and it is *the Auditory LS* and *Visual LS* that are less preferred by the Spanish Language students. The researchers feel that these two learning style preferences are less preferred because unlike English, Spanish is a language that the students can only learn and practise in class with other peers; it is not a language that is widely spoken or used outside of the classroom, unlike English, where the language is extensively spoken and used in or outside the classrooms. So it is very difficult for students to find a setting where they can use the language widely. Moreover, the students show less interest in listening activities as they find it difficult to understand the pronunciation of the native speakers. The lecturer also has the difficulty to get suitable audio activities for the teaching material. Therefore, it is very important for students to practise (*Kinesthetic LS* and *Tactile LS*) the language in class; listening (*Auditory*) to the explanations of the lessons in class and seeing (*Visual*) the words in the textbooks or whiteboard do not really help the students to improve their proficiency and fluency in the language. It may help them in their foundation, i.e. vocabulary and grammar, but to actually becoming proficient and fluent in the language, the students need to apply what they have learnt in class into practise, and this can be done in activities involving ‘hands-on’ events or physical responses such as a group project or a drama (role-play).

Also, Tables 2 (a) and (b) show that the students of both languages are not interested in *Individual LS*. Perhaps this is due to the fact that learning the language by themselves without anybody’s help will only result in poor fluency and proficiency of the languages---there will never be a corrective feedback from peers; they cannot share their language problems; they cannot practise the language, to name a few. Based on the researchers’ observation while teaching these students, working in a group that involves ‘hands-on’ activities and physical responses does influence students performance in the language, and this does not only refer to the language performance but also the students’ self-esteem. They become more confident and comfortable with their ability in the language---they do not feel shy to accept their weaknesses and work more on enhancing their strengths in the languages. Maybe the peers’ support as well as the lecturers’ openness in sharing and giving positive feedback influences the students’ motivation to learn the languages more positively.

Finally, this study has given some insights on why some students perform, while others fail to perform. It can be concluded that the students’ LSP influence their performance in the language class, as well as their involvement in the class activities. The study found that the students of both languages prefer more the *Group*, *Kinesthetic*, *Visual* and *Tactile* learning styles than the *Auditory* and *Individual* learning styles. Therefore, it is very important to apply suitable language-teaching techniques for these students. However, since the most prevalent LSP of the students is the *Group* learning style (see Tables 2 (a) & (b)), the language-teaching techniques should emphasize more on group work activities such as games, role-pay and simulations, drama, projects, interview, brainstorming, information gap, jigsaw and opinion exchange (Brown, 2001).

Felder and Henriques (1995) suggested that teachers should implement these language-teaching techniques in the classroom:

- a. Motivate learning by providing more new authentic materials relevant to the students;
- b. Assign some repetitive drill exercises for basic vocabulary and grammar practices;
- c. Balance the concrete information of the lessons taught in class;
- d. Balance structured teaching approaches that focus more on conversation and cultural contexts of the target language;
- e. Make liberal use of visuals;
- f. Give instruction in the language taught to facilitate language acquisition and develop speaking skill in the course materials; provide explicit instruction in syntax and semantics to facilitate formal language learning and develop writing and interpretation skills in the course material;
- g. Avoid excessive lecturing and writing on the board; encourage questions and problem-solving activities in class; and
- h. Give students the option of cooperation on at least some homework assignments.

Felder and Henrique's suggestions may seem like a 'mission impossible' to apply in the English Language classroom in UMS because to really apply all the suggestions will require additional time for the materials used in the teaching techniques. As it is, all language courses in UMS are only assigned to a 3-hour slot per week, and there are only 14 weeks in a semester! Besides trying to cover the syllabus of the course, the lecturers need to make sure that students understand the lessons taught in class, and this is really taxing. Therefore, applying the ones that are suitable is very essential. Of course, it will involve trial and error---the lecturers will need to try the techniques on occasional basis; keep the ones that are working and disregard those that do not work with the students---but the result will hopefully help the students to perform well in the language. All these efforts will eventually pay off as students and lecturers begin to understand their weaknesses and strengths and try to work on it more for better results.

## CONCLUSION

The study illustrates that the students of the English and Spanish Languages prefer *Group Learning Style*. The finding supports the students' positive participation in any group-related-activities conducted in the classroom, and their less participation in some of the *one-man-show* activities held in the classroom. Therefore, it can be concluded that knowing students' learning style preferences will equip language instructors, which in this case, the lecturers, on better preparations and teaching techniques that will help to enhance not only students' performance but also their self-esteem and motivation in learning the language. Not only that, it also helps language instructors to design a more effective module or course for students.

## REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. 1993. Perceived self-efficacy in linguistics development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, Vol. 28, 117-48.
- Brown, H.D. 2001. *Teaching by principles: an integrative approach to language pedagogy* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). New York: Pearson Education, 182-186.

- Brown, R. 1978. The effects of congruency between learning styles and teaching styles on college student achievement. *College Students Journal*. 12, 307-309.
- Charkins, R.J., O'Toole, D.M. & Wetzel, J.N. 1985. Linking teachers and student learning styles with student achievement and attitudes. *Journal Economic Education*. Spring, 111-120.
- Coffield, F., Moseley, D., Hall, E. & Ecclestone, K. 2004. *Learning styles and pedagogy in post-16 learning: a systematic and critical review*. London: Learning and Skills Research Centre.
- Conner, M.C. 2004. Introduction to learning style. Accessed on 9 January 2012 from <http://agelesslearner.com/intros/lstyleintro.html>.
- Dornyei, Z. 2001. *Teaching and researching motivation*. Pearson Education Limited. 112.
- Felder, R.M. & Henriques, E.R. 1995. Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals*. 28, No. 1, 21-31.
- Felder, R.M. 1996. Matters of style. *ASEE Prism*, 6(4), 18-23. Accessed on 9 January 2012 from <http://www.ncsu.edu/felder-public/Papers/LS-Prism.htm>.
- Felder, R.M., Felder, G.N. & Dietz, E.J. 2002. The effects of personality type on engineering student performance and attitudes. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 91(1), 3-17.
- Gardner, H. 1985. *Frames of mind: the theory of multiple intelligence*. New York: Basic Bookstore.
- Graham, S. 1994. Classroom motivation from an attributional perspective. In O'Neil, H.F, Jr. and Drillings, M. (Eds.). *Motivation: Theory and Research*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillside, 31-48.
- Gregorc, A.F. 1985. *An adult's guide to style (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)* Columbia, CT: Gregorc Associates Inc.
- Griggs, S.A. & Dunn, R.S. 1984. Selected case studies of the learning style preferences of gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 28, 3: 115-119.
- Keefe, J.W. 1979. Developing a defensible learning style paradigm. *Educational Leadership*, 48(2), 57-61.
- Kolb, D. 1984. *Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.
- McCarthy, B. 1990. Using the 4mat system to bring learning styles to schools. *Educational Leadership*. 48(2), 31-36.

Mulalic, A., Shah, P.M. & Ahmad, F. 1985. Learning-style preference of ESL student. *AJTLHE*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 9-17.

Oxford, R.L. & Ehrman, M. & Lavine, R. 1991. Style wars: teacher-student style conflicts in the language classrooms. In S. Magnan, ed., *Challenges in the 1990's for College Foreign Language Programs*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Oxford, R.L. 1990. Missing link: evidence from research on language learning styles and strategies. In *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

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

Putintseva, T. 2006. The importance of having styles in ESL/EFL. The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. XII, No. 3. Accessed on 9 January 2012 from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Putintseva-LearningStyle.html>.

Reid, M.J. 1987. The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 87-111.

Riechmann, S.W. & Grasha. A.F. 1974. A rational approach to developing and assessing the construct validity of a student learning styles instrument. *Journal of Psychology*. 87, 213223.

Stice, J.E. 1987. Using Kolb's learning cycle to improve student learning. *Engineering Education*. 77, 291-296.

Wallace, B. & Oxford, R.L. 1992. Disparity in learning styles and teaching in the ESL classroom: does this mean war? *AMTESOL Journal*, 45-68.

**APPENDIX 1**

**LEARNING STYLE PREFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE BY JOY REID**

**Kindly respond to the statements below. Your answers are confidential and will only be used for the purpose of this study. Thank you for your co-operation.**

**For statement 1-30, kindly tick (/) an answer from the scale below. There is no right or wrong answer for this section.**

**SA-strongly agree    A-agree                      U-undecided                      D-disagree**  
**SD-strongly disagree**

Statement	SA	A	U	D	SD
1. When the teacher tells me the instructions I understand better.					

2. I prefer to learn by doing something in class.					
3. I get more work done when I work with others.					
4. I learn more when I study with a group.					
5. In class, I learn best when I work with others.					
6. I learn better by reading what the teacher writes on the chalkboard.					
7. When someone tells me how to do something in class, I learn it better.					
8. When I do things in class, I learn better.					
9. I remember things I have heard in class better than things I have read.					
10. When I read instructions, I remember them better.					
11. I learn more when I can make a model of something.					
12. I understand better when I read instructions.					
13. When I study alone, I remember things better.					
14. I learn more when I make something for a class project.					
15. I enjoy learning in class by doing experiments.					
16. I learn better when I make drawings as I study.					
17. I learn better in class when the teacher gives a lecture.					

18. When I work alone, I learn better.					
19. I understand things better in class when I participate in role-playing.					
20. I learn better in class when I listen to someone.					
21. I enjoy working on an assignment with two or three classmates.					
22. When I build something, I remember what I have learned better.					
23. I prefer to study with others.					
24. I learn better by reading than by listening to someone.					
25. I enjoy making something for a class project.					
26. I learn best in class when I can participate in related activities.					
27. In class, I work better when I work alone.					
28. I prefer working on projects by myself.					
29. I learn more by reading textbooks than by listening to lectures.					
30. I prefer to work by myself					



