



Malaysian Journal Of ELT Research

ISSN: 1511-8002

Vol. 7 (2), 2011

Language Learning Style Preferences of Low English Proficiency (LEP) Students in a Tertiary Institution

ADI AFZAL AHMAD

Akademi Pengajian Bahasa, Universiti Teknologi MARA Perlis

Malaysia

Abstract

Learning styles are a person's natural, habitual and preferred ways of absorbing, processing and retaining new information and skills. It has been hypothesized that, in a language classroom, a match between the students' preferred learning styles and their teacher's teaching style will lead to success in language learning whereas a mismatch will lead to adverse effects such as failure and demotivation on the students' part. This study examined the learning style preferences of 252 Low English Proficiency (LEP) students at a local tertiary institution. It also examined the role of gender in determining the preferred learning styles of this particular group of students. Reid's (1987) Perceptual Learning Style Preferences Questionnaires (PLSPQ), a widely-used, reliable 30-item self report inventory with a Likert-style response format, was used in this study to identify the

students' preferred learning styles (Visual, Auditory, Kinaesthetic, Tactile, Group and/or Individual). Descriptive statistics and an independent *t*-test were used to analyse the data. Results indicated that all six styles were negative learning styles and that gender did not seem to influence students' learning style preferences. Implications of the findings for teaching and learning are then discussed. The study concludes with the recommendation that, when dealing with LEP students, every effort must be made to improve the students' confidence and motivation in learning the language.

KEYWORDS: Learning style, Low English Proficiency, English language, teaching, learning

Introduction

It has been observed that many students are not able to become proficient in the English language regardless of the number of hours of instruction that they have received. Even worse, not only are they not able to become proficient in the language, they also become demotivated to learn the language, and exhibit negative behaviours such as not paying attention in class or skipping English classes. Many studies have been conducted to discover the factors which contribute to second language (L2) learners' success and also failure in learning English. Of particular interest is the concept of individual learner differences which includes, among many possible variables, the language learning styles of the students.

Learning theorists generally agree that curriculum and instructional strategies should be adapted to accommodate students' individual differences (Burrows-Horton & Oakland, 1997). If serious mismatches occur between the learning styles of the students and the teaching styles of the instructors, unfortunate consequences, such as students getting bored and becoming inattentive in the classroom, performing rather poorly on tests, and becoming discouraged, will result (Felder & Silverman, 1988; Godleski, 1984; Oxford, Ehrman & Lavine, 1991).

In terms of learning English, a number of researchers propose that a mismatch between students' preferred learning styles and instructors' preferred teaching styles have bad effects on students' learning and attitudes in the class and to English in general (Cortazzi, 1990; Felder & Henriques, 1995; Jones, 1997; Oxford, Hollaway & Horton-Murillo, 1992; Stebbins, 1995; Reid, 1987). A match between students' preferred learning styles and the instructors' preferred teaching styles, on the other hand, would lead to an increase in motivation and learning as shown in studies by Griggs and Dunn (1984), Smith and Renzulli (1984) and Wallace and Oxford (1992).

The term "learning style" has been defined in various ways. This is because, different researchers have their own understanding of what constitutes learning styles (Zou, 2006). Oxford, Hollaway and Horton-Murillo (1992), for example, define learning styles as the general approaches (as opposed to specific strategies) that students resort to in learning a new subject. Honigsfeld and Dunn (2006) define it as a biological and developmental set of personal characteristics that make the same instruction effective for some learners and ineffective for others. Peacock (2001) defines it as students' preferred mode of learning.

Ahmad, A. (2011). Malaysian Journal of ELT Research, Vol. 7(2), p. 33-62. www.melta.org.my

Reid (1995), meanwhile, defines language learning style as the natural, habitual and preferred way or ways of absorbing, processing and retaining new information and skills. For the purpose of this study, Reid's definition of learning style and her classification of learning styles into six types, Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic, Tactile, Group, and Individual, will be used as they are the most widely used and accepted definition and categorization of learning styles (Peacock, 2001). In fact, Peacock acknowledges that Reid's work has aroused a great deal of interest in the concept of learning style since it was published in 1987.

Knowing students' learning styles is important and beneficial to teachers as it will allow them to tailor their way of teaching so as to accommodate the learning style preferences of their students (Hinton, 1992). Oxford (2003) regards learning styles and strategies as being among the main factors that help determine how and how well the students learn a second or foreign language, and indeed different students will tend to favour different learning styles. For example, in her 1987 study, Reid reports that Chinese university students studying in the United States of America (USA) favoured Kinesthetic and Tactile learning styles while disavouring the Group style. In a similar vein, Melton (1990) found that Chinese university students in the Peoples' Republic of China preferred Kinesthetic, Tactile and Individual styles, and disfavoured Group style. Jones (1997) finds that Chinese university students in Taiwan also preferred Kinesthetic and Tactile styles but disfavoured Individual styles. Chinese university students in Singapore, meanwhile, similarly favoured Kinesthetic and Tactile styles but did not disfavour any style.

In relation to Malay students, Reid (1987) reports that the Malay students studying in universities in the USA indicated Kinesthetic and Tactile learning styles as their major (most preferred) learning style preferences. The Malay students in her study also indicated that the remaining four learning styles were minor (the second most preferred) learning styles to them. In terms of Malay students in a Malaysian tertiary institution, Sharifah Azizah and Wan Zalina (1995) discovered that the Malay students favoured an Individual learning style and had five negative learning (the least preferred) style preferences. A later study by Syaharom (1999) reveals different findings in which Malay students apparently favour the Group learning style and have three negative learning style preferences.

As for secondary school students in Malaysia, Hariharan and Ismail (2003) found that form four students in Kedah did not have any major learning style, but favoured two minor learning styles (Kinesthetic and Group), and had four negative learning styles. Their study also found evidence that gender differences seem to influence the learning style preferences of the students. No published studies regarding Malaysian primary school students' learning style preferences have been found thus far.

Peacock (2001) proposes that more research concerning learning style preferences should be conducted as the findings can be used to improve teaching methodology, the development of course syllabi and materials, learner training, and teachers' professional development. He also proposes that investigations concerning the links between styles and proficiency be carried out. Peacock (2001)'s recommendation is also echoed by Thomas, Cox and Kojima (2000) who suggest that further research be carried out to

Ahmad, A. (2011). Malaysian Journal of ELT Research, Vol. 7(2), p. 33-62. www.melta.org.my

investigate the relationship between learning style and performance so that the link between the two is made clearer. Apart from that, studies should also be carried out to examine whether gender has any influence on students' preferred learning styles.

Based on the recommendations made by the researchers, the current study attempts to fill in the research gap by investigating the learning style preferences of Low English Proficiency (LEP) students, and whether gender has any influence on students' learning style preferences.

Specifically, the study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What are the learning style preferences of the LEP students?
2. Do learning style preferences differ according to gender?

Methodology

Two hundred and fifty two students who achieved the two lowest bands in the Malaysian University English Test (MUET) examination took part in the study. The MUET Handbook by the Malaysian Examinations Council (1999) describes Band 1 students as extremely limited users, and Band 2 students as limited users of the language. The handbook describes the students as having a poor command and a poor understanding of the language and as being hardly able to function in the language. Out of the maximum 300 possible aggregate scores, these students tend to score within the range of zero to 139. The students came from various degree programmes. The majority of the students were Malays with 44 males(17.5%) and the rest females(82.5%).

The instrument used in this study was Reid's (1987) Perceptual Learning Style Preferences Questionnaire (PLSPQ), a 30-item self-reporting questionnaire which seeks to identify students' preferred learning styles as to whether they are Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic, Tactile, Group and/or Individual learners. PLSPQ also seeks to identify students' major (the most preferred way of learning), minor (the second most preferred way of learning) and negative (the least preferred way of learning) learning styles. The validation of the questionnaire was done by the split half method. Correlation analysis of an original set of 60 statements which has 10 statements for each learning style determined which five statements should remain to identify the respondents' learning style.

PLSPQ was chosen because the findings generated through the use of this particular instrument make sense to language teachers as they are very practical in nature (Zou, 2006) and because it has been used in many learning styles' studies (Peacock, 2001). In terms of the reliability of the instrument, a study by Tabanlıoğlu (2003) reported a Cronbach Alpha of .82 for the questionnaire.

In order to ensure that the respondents would not face any difficulty understanding the items in the questionnaire, a Malay translation for each of the statement was incorporated into the questionnaire. The translation was taken from Hariharan and Ismail's (2003) study in which they used PLSPQ to investigate the learning style preferences of secondary school students in Kedah, Malaysia

A pilot test was conducted with 30 MUET Band 1 and 2 students prior to the actual administration of the instrument to the respondents. Students were asked to rate each of the statements as it applies to their study of the English language using a 5-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), undecided (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5). The pilot test was carried out to ensure the comprehensibility of the questionnaire; to examine the reliability of the questionnaire, and to check the amount of time required by the respondents to complete the questionnaire. The purpose of the study and the pilot test was made known to the students. It was noted that it took approximately 20 minutes for the students to complete the questionnaire. The students also reported that they did not face any problem in understanding the items in the questionnaire. The Cronbach Alpha of the PLSPQ for the pilot study was 0.774.

For the actual study, the 252 respondents were gathered in one of the lecture halls during lunch hour with the permission of the course coordinator. A brief explanation was given to the participants regarding the procedures and they were assured that their responses were strictly confidential and that their anonymity would be maintained. The students were encouraged to ask for clarification if they faced any difficulty in understanding the instructions, items and statements in the questionnaire. They were also informed that they did not have to participate in the study if they did not wish to do so. Once the participants indicated that they understood what they were required to do, the questionnaire was distributed and the students were given time to read and respond to the items in the questionnaire. Once they had completed the questionnaire, the questionnaires were

returned to the researcher. Only the researcher was present with the respondents in the lecture hall.

Results and discussion

The data collected were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 12.0. In the actual study in which 252 students were involved, the Cronbach Alpha for the PLSPQ was 0.774. Even though the value was lower compared to the value reported for the pilot study ($r = 0.852$), it is still acceptable. According to Nunally (cited in Cavana, Delahaye & Sekaran, 2001), an alpha coefficient of 0.6 and above is still acceptable. In other words, the PLSPQ is still a reliable instrument.

To identify the students' learning style preferences, the mean score was computed and each learning style was assigned as major, minor or negative learning style as suggested and used by Reid (1987) and Peacock (2001). A mean score of 13.5 and above indicates that the learning style is a major learning style for the students. A mean score of 11.5 to 13.49 indicates that the learning style is a minor learning style for the students. And a mean of 11.49 or less indicates that the learning style is a negative learning style for the students. The results are shown in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1: Learning style preference mean scores and standard deviations (SD)

Learning Style

Scores	Visual	Auditory	Kinesthetic	Tactile	Group	Individual
Mean scores	3.5460	3.9563	4.0817	3.9357	3.9643	2.9603
SD	.57152	.43967	.46467	.49330	.50479	.78126

Note: Means 13.5 and above = major learning style preference

Means 11.5 – 13.49 = minor learning style preference

Means 11.49 or less = negative learning style preference

Table 2: Learning style mean and type

Style	Mean	Type
Visual	3.5460	Negative
Auditory	3.9563	Negative
Kinesthetic	4.0817	Negative
Tactile	3.9357	Negative
Group	3.9643	Negative
Individual	2.9603	Negative

As a whole, the mean scores show that the students do not have any major or even minor learning style preference. All of the learning styles are negative learning style preferences with the individual learning style considered the least preferred style (among all the negative learning style preferences). The findings of this study differ from the findings concerning Malay respondents reported in Reid's (1987) study ($n = 113$). Her findings show that the Malay respondents indicated Kinesthetic and Tactile as their major learning style and the remaining four as their minor learning styles. None of the learning styles was indicated as a negative learning style. Reid's findings concerning Malay students' learning style preferences seem to suggest that the respondents will not have much difficulty in learning the English language because, since all the learning styles are favourable to them, they will be able to accommodate the teacher's teaching style without much difficulty unlike the respondents in the present study who indicated that all learning styles are negative learning styles to them.

The difference in terms of the result could be attributed to the fact that the Malay students in Reid's (1987) study are ESL students who were studying in universities in the United States. Her respondents were in an environment where English was being used extensively and that their understanding and mastery of the language was crucial for their studies as well as for their day-to-day use. Since achieving a certain level of English as indicated by a TOEFL score is a requirement for entering universities in the United States, it can be deduced that the Malay respondents in Reid's study were students who are already very proficient in the language. Such students tend to have a favourable attitude towards the English language and the native speaker culture (Brown, 2000). Conversely,

students who are not proficient in the language tend to have an unfavourable attitude towards English language and the native speaker culture.

In terms of the respondents not rating any of the learning style as their major learning style, the findings of this study concur with Hariharan and Ismail's (2003) findings in which there are no major learning style preferences among the form four Malay students in secondary schools in Kedah. Their respondents, however, selected Kinesthetic and Group learning styles as their minor learning style preferences unlike the respondents of the current study who do not indicate any of the learning style as their minor learning style. The Malay respondents in their study also regarded the four remaining learning styles as negative learning styles, which is similar to the outcome of this study.

A rather worrying hypothetical deduction can be made from the findings of Hariharan and Ismail's (2003) study and the present study. Assuming that no positive or successful intervention is carried out, the students in a secondary school who have already indicated that they have four negative learning styles may graduate to having six negative learning styles by the time they enter a tertiary institution. Since learning style preference is considered one of the main factors that help determine how and how well a student learns a second or foreign language (Oxford, 2003), and a match between the students' preferred learning style and their teacher's teaching style would lead to understanding and learning on the students' part (Reid, 1987), it is somewhat disconcerting to discover that among LEP students, all learning styles are considered negative learning styles. This is because this suggests that no matter what the teacher does in the classroom, or no matter what teaching style the teacher employs in teaching the LEP students, the students

would not be able to learn as effectively as they should. This is because, since all the learning styles are rated as negative learning styles, it could be postulated that no ideal match can ever occur between the teacher's teaching style and the students' learning style.

According to Fauziah and Nita (2002), some of the factors which contribute to low English proficiency among Malaysian students are a negative attitude towards the English language and a lack of confidence and motivation to learn the language. Brown (2000) points out that attitudes are cognitive and affective, and that attitudes are related to thoughts as well as to feelings and emotions. Attitudes govern how one approaches learning. Because attitude can be modified by experience (Elyidrim & Ashton, 2006), perhaps, teachers of LEP students should focus on motivating the students to enjoy learning the language and to focus on creating a positive experience in learning the language to the students. After the students have become more positive, confident and motivated to learn the language, only then can effective interventions related to learning styles, such as the ones suggested by Thomas, Cox and Kojima (2000), Rochford (2003) and Honigsfeld and Dunn (2006) in their respective studies, be implemented to ensure continuous success in terms of learning the language on the part of the students.

Next, to determine whether there is any significant difference between the learning style preferences of male and female students, a *t*-test for independent samples was used. The samples are referred to as independent samples because members of one sample (male) are not related to members of the other sample (female) in any systematic way other than they were selected from the same population (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh & Sorensen, 2006).

Table 3 shows the result of the *t*-test.

Table 3: *t*-test result on gender

LS	N		Std	df	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Visual	M=44	3.445	.487	250	-1.287	.199
	F=208	3.567	.586			
Auditory	M=44	3.927	.537	250	-.482	.630
	F=208	3.962	.417			
Kinesthetic	M=44	4.181	.456	250	1.577	.116
	F=208	4.060	.464			
Tactile	M=44	4.004	.559	250	1.019	.309
	F=208	3.921	.478			

Group	M=44	4.013	.523	250	.713	.476
	F=208	3.953	.501			
<hr/>						
Individual	M=44	3.000	.766	250	.370	.712
	F=208	2.951	.785			

$p < 0.5$

As can be seen from the table, the female students obtained a higher mean for Visual and Auditory learning styles compared to the male students. Hence, the female students appear to be more Visual and Auditory than the male students. The male students, on the other hand, obtained a higher mean for Kinesthetic, Tactile, Group and Individual learning styles compared to the female students. This shows that the male students are more Kinesthetic, Tactile, Group and Individual than the female students. The t -test further shows that the difference between the means is not significant; for example, $t(250) = -1.287$, $p > 0.5$ for the Visual learning style. This can be interpreted to mean that students' gender does not seem to influence the students' choice of learning styles.

The findings concur with the findings of the study carried out by Thomas, Cox and Kojima (2000). In their study, they found that there is no significant difference between

learning style preference and gender among Japanese college students. The findings of this particular study, however, differ from the ones found in Reid (1987) and Hariharan and Ismail (2003) in which there is a significant difference in terms of gender and learning style preference. Oxford (cited in Thomas, Cox & Kojima, 2000) also suggests that women are more likely to be less tactile, less kinesthetic and more auditory than men.

There are several plausible explanations as to why there is no significant difference between male and female respondents in this study. Firstly, the number of male respondents for this study is very small ($n = 44$). Secondly, perhaps, due to the students belonging in the same category of students (LEP), regardless of gender, they all share the same negative preference for all the learning styles. A significant finding from Hariharan and Ismail's (2003) study is that the lower the achievement of a student, the more number of negative learning style preference the students tend to have. Since the respondents of this study are all LEP students, perhaps it should not come as a surprise that all of the respondents, regardless of gender, indicated that all learning styles are negative learning styles to them. An almost similar observation was made by Honigsfeld and Dunn (2006) in which they state that high achieving college students tend to have significantly different learning styles from low-achieving college students.

Another possible reason as to why there is no significant difference between the learning style and gender of the respondents for this study is perhaps due to the students' similar background. Among them are: almost all of them are Malay students who have undergone 11 years of instruction in Malaysian schools; they learn English as a Second Language; and they are in an environment in which almost all day-to-day activities can

be accomplished in their first language which is Malay. They are also living in a country where the education system is very examination-oriented (Lewey, 1977, as cited in Fauziah & Nita, 2002). In other words, the students are living in an exam-oriented culture in which studying and learning something is done for the sake of obtaining high scores in examinations. Fauziah and Nita (2002), in fact, note that Malaysian classroom teachers tend to conduct examination-oriented lessons. Due to all these similarities in experience, perhaps, it can be deduced that all the LEP students regardless of whether they are male or female have been subjected to the same kind of instruction at school and may even have experienced the same trials and tribulations in learning the language, which have shaped their present feelings about learning the language; and which is then translated into a negative learning style preference for all six types of learning styles.

Finally, the reason as to why there is no significant difference in terms of learning style preferences and the respondents' gender might be attributed to culture. According to Oxford, Holloway and Horton-Murillo (1992), culture plays a significant part in influencing learning styles which are unconsciously adopted by the participants of that culture. In other words, students from a Chinese culture might have different learning style preferences from students from a Malay or Indian background. However, due to the uniqueness of the findings of this study in which all learning styles are indicated as negative learning styles, it is felt that the definition of "culture" can be expanded from its traditional use of signaling ethnicity to also incorporating subcultures such as the students' own classroom culture, the teaching and learning culture which the students are subjected to, and even the students as LEP students' culture. In short, due to the fact that

both the male and female students belong to the same “LEP students” culture, they both share similar traits and preferences, and that is the reason as to why there is no significant difference between learning style preference and gender.

Implications for teaching and learning

Some of the findings of this study such as the ones related to the first research question were not anticipated by the researcher. It seems that the LEP students did consider any of the learning style to be their major or even their minor learning style. All six styles were indicated as negative learning styles. Learning style preferences of the LEP students also do not differ according to gender. As was discussed in the previous section, it is felt that the students’ negative attitude and lack of motivation toward learning the language were the factors which contributed to the unexpected findings of this study. This, in turn, has certain implications for the teaching and learning of English in the language classroom.

Firstly, when dealing with LEP students, the instructor needs to be aware of the students’ background and motivational needs. This is because, due to their own unique experience in learning the language, some of the students may have grown to believe that they will never succeed in learning the language, and therefore, no longer feel the need or the inclination to put in any effort in learning the language. The instructor must be able to motivate the students to believe in themselves again and must be encouraging on an on-going basis in order to cater to the learners’ affective needs.

Secondly, the instructor needs to be able to come up with interesting or engaging lessons which are successful in capturing the LEP students' interest in learning the language. Perhaps, it would be wise for the instructor to present the lessons in "bite-size" pieces so as not to overwhelm the LEP students. By doing so, the students would have a better chance at understanding the lesson and mastering the concept that is being taught by the instructor. The feeling of accomplishment and success that the students feel will make them more confident in their ability to learn the language. In the process, they might also develop an interest in learning the language.

Once the students have sufficiently developed prolonged interest and motivation in learning the language, the instructor should expose the students to the concept of learning styles. They should be taught how to assess their learning styles so that they know their major, minor and negative learning styles as the knowledge will help them to cope with their language learning better. At the very least, by knowing their learning style preference, the students will become aware that they can take responsibility for their own second language learning. Students should be taught to tolerate teaching styles which they may have not looked on favourably as the instructor also needs to cater to the needs of their peers who might have different preferred learning styles.

In order to develop the students' repertoire of learning styles, the students should also be guided to explore learning styles which they themselves have rated as a minor or negative learning style. Doing so will help the students to experience the various learning styles, understand their friends' learning styles and, hopefully, develop their ability to

accommodate as many learning styles possible so that they will be able to handle the various teaching styles of the instructor.

Finally, perhaps, it is time for language instructors (and the policy-makers) to look at the pedagogical approaches being used in the teaching of the English language in regular classrooms to see whether the approaches are still relevant and effective to the present generation of students. According to Tapscott (2009) and Pletka (2007), the present generation of students is known as the Net Generation. Tapscott (2009) describes the Net Generation as a generation of students who grows up surrounded by digital media and this has shaped the way the students perceive and interact with technology in every aspect of their lives. Eight characteristics typical of these students are:

They prize freedom and freedom of choice. They want to customize things, make them their own. They're natural collaborators, who enjoy a conversation, not a lecture. They'll scrutinize you and your organization. They insist on integrity. They want to have fun, even at work and at school. Speed is normal. Innovation is part of life. (Tapscott, 2009, p. 6)

Pletka (2007) explains that Net Generation students dislike the traditional classroom teaching and learning method because they have grown up in an environment which is "information and communication rich, team-based, achievement-oriented, visually based, and instantly responsive" (p. 13). Because of this, students belonging to this generation have different expectations when it comes to how lessons are conducted in the classroom. Therefore, to ensure that the students would be able to follow the English lesson

successfully, and to prevent them from becoming bored and unmotivated to learn English, instructors should take the time to learn about the characteristics of this Net Generation and design their lessons to address the specific needs of their learners. By doing so, students may become more interested and engaged in following the language lessons.

Conclusion

Research on learning styles has demonstrated the importance of becoming aware of students' learning styles so that the instructors can make a more informed decision on the kind of teaching approach to be used in delivering lessons to the students. A match between the instructors' teaching style and the students' learning style has been shown to improve students' learning and motivation whereas a mismatch tends to have a dire outcome.

The findings of this study, unfortunately, show that none of the six learning styles are favoured by the LEP students. In fact, all six learning styles are indicated as negative learning styles by the students. This also does not seem to be influenced by gender. Since the students do not indicate any of the learning styles as their major or minor learning style, instructors do not have the necessary information to choose the best teaching style, and this could create problems as learning style theory postulates that a match between the instructor's teaching style and the learners' learning styles is important and desirable for effective learning to take place. The unexpected findings appear to be due to the students' lack of interest and motivation in learning English. Thus, instructors must take

appropriate steps to address the students' motivational needs. The instructor also must design his or her lessons to cater to the interests of the students. Once these two conditions have been fulfilled, only then would the instructor be able to assess the students' preferred learning styles.

Indeed, language learning is a complex process and other factors such as the students' own language learning aptitude, parental involvement, pedagogical approaches and classroom dynamics may also influence the success of the students in learning a second language. As such, Gregorcs (1979, as cited in Reid, 1987) cautions that learning style preferences of the learners cannot become the sole factor for designing instruction. In spite of these constraints, however, learning styles have their own merits and benefits if they are introduced in the classroom as they can, at least, make the students aware that they can take part in managing their language learning process.

Future research projects to assess the learning style preferences of LEP students in other tertiary institutions should be carried out to see whether a generalization on LEP students' learning style preferences can be made. In addition, research projects involving primary school students should also be carried out due to the dearth of information regarding learning style preferences of primary school students in Malaysia. The translation of PLSPQ from English to Malay for all 30 statements could also be refined to elicit a more accurate response from the respondent. Apart from that, the relationship between learning style and learning strategies could also be an area of investigation as

both are important in helping students take control of their own language learning. Finally, taking into consideration that the present generation of students, are different from the previous generations, perhaps, there is a need to redefine learning styles and to come up with a new and relevant instrument to identify the learning styles of the students in this new technologically-driven era.

References

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2006). *Introduction to research in education, 7th edition*. California: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Burrows-Horton, C., & Oakland, T. (1997). Temperament-based learning styles as moderators of academic achievement. *Adolescence, 32* (125), 131-142.
- Cavana, R. Y., Delahaye, B. L., & Sekaran, U. (2001). *Applied business research: Qualitative and quantitative methods*. Australia: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cortazzi, M. (1990). Cultural and educational expectations in the language classroom. In B. Harrison, *Culture and the language classroom* (pp. 54-65). London: Modern English Publication.
- Elyidrim, S., & Ashton, S. (2006). Creating positive attitudes towards English as a Foreign Language. *English Teaching Forum, 4*, 2-21.
- Fauziah Hassan & Nita Fauzee Selamat (2002). Why aren't students proficient in ESL: The teachers' perspective. *The English Teacher, 18*. Retrieved on December 1, 2007 from <http://www.melta.org.my/ET/2002/wp10.htm>
- Felder, R. M, & Henriques, E. R. (1995). Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals, 28* (1), 21-31.
- Felder, R. M., & Silverman, L. K. (1988). Learning and teaching styles in engineering
- Ahmad, A. (2011). Malaysian Journal of ELT Research, Vol. 7(2), p. 33-62. www.melta.org.my*

- education. *Engineering Education*, 78, 674-681.
- Godleski, E. S. (1984). Learning style compatibility of engineering students and faculty. *Proceedings, Annual Frontiers in Education Conference*. ASEE/IEEE, Philadelphia, 362.
- 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.
- Hariharan N. Krishnasamy & Ismail Ibrahim (2003). Learning style preferences of Kedah secondary school students. UUM. Unpublished research report.
- Hinton, S. (1992). *The learning style preference of students in graduate school*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Knoxville, November 1992.
- Honigsfeld, A., & Dunn, R. (2006). Learning-style characteristics of adult learners. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, Winter 2006*. Retrieved November, 10, 2007, from Academic Search Premiere database.
- Jones, N. B. (1997). *Applying learning styles research to improve writing instruction*. Paper presented at RELC Seminar on Learners and Language Learning, Singapore, April 1997.
- Melton, C. D. (1990). Bridging the cultural gap: A study of Chinese students' learning style preferences. *RELC Journal*, 21 (1), 29-54.
- Malaysian Examinations Council (1999). Malaysian University English Test. Batu Caves: Percetakan Warni
- Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning styles and strategies: An overview. Learning Styles & Strategies/Oxford, GALA 2003. Retrieved on October 1, 2007 from <http://web.ntpu.edu.tw/~language/workshop/read2.pdf>
- Oxford, R. L., Hollaway, M. E., & Horton-Murillo, D. (1992). Language learning styles: Research and practical considerations for teaching in the multicultural tertiary ESL/EFL classroom. *System*, 20 (4), 439-445.
- Oxford, R., Ehrman, M., & Lavine, R. (1991). Style wars: Teacher-student style

- conflicts in the language classroom. In S. Magnan (Ed.), *Challenges in the 1990's for College Foreign Language Programs*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Peacock, M. (2001). Match or mismatch? Learning styles and teaching styles in EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1 (2), 1-20.
- Pletka, B. (2007). *Educating the Net Generation: How to engage students in the 21st century*. Santa Monica: Santa Monica Press.
- Reid, J. M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (1), 87-111.
- Reid, J. M. (1995). Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom (Ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Rochford, R. A. (2003). Assessing learning styles to improve the quality of performance of community college students in developmental writing programs: A pilot study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 27, 665-677.
- Sharifah Azizah Syed Sahil & Wan Zalina Wan Din (1995). Students' preferential learning styles. UUM. Unpublished research report.
- Smith, L. H., & Renzulli, J. S. (1984). Learning style preferences: A practical approach for classroom teachers. *Theory into practice*, 23, 44-50.
- Stebbins, C. (1995). Cultural-specific perceptual preferences of post-secondary students of English as a second language. In J. M. Reid, *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom* (pp. 109-117). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Syaharom Abdullah (1999). The effect of learning style preferences on performance in learning which utilizes print-based open learning materials. UUM. Unpublished research report.
- Tabanlıoğlu, S. (2003). The relationship between learning styles and language learning strategies of pre-intermediate EAP students. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University.
- Tapscott, D. (2009). *Grown up digital: How the Net Generation is changing your world*. New

York: McGraw Hill.

Thomas, H., Cox, R., &Kojima, T. (2000). Relating preferred learning style to student achievement.Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to speakers of Other Languages, Vancouver, March 2000.

Wallace, B., & Oxford, R. L. (1992). Disparity in learning styles and teaching styles in the ESL classroom: Does this mean war?. *AMTESOL Journal*, 1, 45-68.

Zou, L. (2006). Teaching in the light of learning styles. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 3 (7), 52-57.

APPENDIX A

PLSPQ

Arahan: Baca setiap pernyataan di bawah dengan teliti. Bulatkan angka yang dirasai paling tepat menerangkan perasaan anda berhubung dengan pernyataan tersebut.

Instruction: Read each statement carefully and circle the number which best agrees with how you feel about the statement.

Pernyataan <i>(Statement)</i>	Sangat setuju <i>(Strongly agree)</i>	Setuju <i>(Agree)</i>	Tidak Pasti <i>(Not Sure)</i>	Tidak Setuju <i>(Disagree)</i>	Sangat Tidak Setuju <i>(Strongly disagree)</i>
1. Apabila guru memberitahu saya arahan, saya lebih memahaminya. (When the teacher gives me instructions, I understand better).	5	4	3	2	1
2. Saya lebih suka belajar dengan membuat sesuatu di dalam kelas. (I prefer to learn by doing something in class).	5	4	3	2	1
3. Pencapaian kerja saya lebih apabila					

saya bekerja dengan orang lain. (I get more work done when I work with others).	5	4	3	2	1
4. Saya belajar lebih banyak apabila saya belajar di dalam kumpulan. (I learn more when I study in a group).	5	4	3	2	1
5. Di dalam kelas, pembelajaran saya terbaik apabila saya bekerja dengan pelajar lain. (In class, I learn best when I work with others).	5	4	3	2	1
6. Saya belajar lebih baik dengan membaca apa yang guru tulis di atas papan hitam. (I learn better by reading what the teacher writes on the chalk board).	5	4	3	2	1
7. Apabila seseorang memberitahu saya bagaimana membuat sesuatu di dalam kelas, saya mempelajarinya dengan lebih baik. (When someone tells me how to do something in class, I learn better).	5	4	3	2	1
8. Apabila saya membuat sesuatu di dalam kelas, saya belajar dengan lebih baik. (When I do things in class, I learn better).	5	4	3	2	1
9. Saya lebih mengingati perkara-perkara yang saya telah dengar di dalam kelas berbanding dengan apa yang saya telah baca. (I remember things I have heard in class better than things I have read).	5	4	3	2	1
10. Apabila saya membaca arahan, saya lebih mengingatinya. (When I read instructions, I remember them better).	5	4	3	2	1
11. Saya belajar lebih apabila dapat membuat sesuatu model. (I learn	5	4	3	2	1

more when I make a model of something).					
12. Saya lebih memahami apabila membaca arahan yang diberikan. (I understand better when I read instructions).	5	4	3	2	1
13. Saya lebih mengingati sesuatu apabila saya belajar bersendirian. (When I study alone, I remember things better).	5	4	3	2	1
14. Saya belajar lebih apabila saya membuat sesuatu untuk projek kelas. (I learn more when I make something for a class project).	5	4	3	2	1
15. Saya suka belajar di dalam kelas dengan melakukan eksperimen. (I enjoy learning in class by doing experiment).	5	4	3	2	1
16. Saya belajar dengan lebih baik apabila saya membuat lakaran semasa belajar. (I learn better when I make drawings as I study).	5	4	3	2	1
17. Saya belajar dengan lebih baik di dalam kelas apabila guru memberi kuliah. (I learn better in class when the teacher gives a lecture).	5	4	3	2	1
18. Apabila saya membuat sesuatu tugas bersendirian, saya belajar dengan lebih baik. (When I work alone, I learn better).	5	4	3	2	1
19. Saya lebih memahami sesuatu di dalam kelas apabila saya menyertai "main peranan". (I understand things better in class when I participate in role-playing).	5	4	3	2	1
20. Saya belajar dengan lebih baik di dalam kelas apabila saya mendengar seseorang. (I learn better in class, when I listen to	5	4	3	2	1

someone).					
21. Saya suka membuat tugas bersama dua atau tiga rakan sekelas. (I enjoy working on an assignment with two or three classmates).	5	4	3	2	1
22. Apabila saya membina sesuatu, saya mengingati apa yang telah saya pelajari dengan lebih baik. (When I build something, I remember what I have learned better).	5	4	3	2	1
23. Saya lebih suka belajar dengan pelajar lain. (I prefer to study with others).	5	4	3	2	1
24. Saya belajar lebih baik dengan membaca daripada mendengari seseorang. (I learn better by reading than by listening to someone).	5	4	3	2	1
25. Saya suka membuat sesuatu untuk projek kelas. (I enjoy making something for a class project).	5	4	3	2	1
26. Saya belajar dengan paling baik di dalam kelas apabila menyertai aktiviti berkaitan. (I learn best in class when I participated in related activities).	5	4	3	2	1
27. Di dalam kelas, saya bekerja dengan lebih baik apabila bekerja sendirian. (In class, I work better when I work alone).	5	4	3	2	1
28. Saya lebih suka menyiapkan projek secara bersendirian. (I prefer working on projects by myself).	5	4	3	2	1
29. Saya belajar lebih banyak dengan membaca buku teks daripada mendengar kuliah. (I learn more by reading textbooks than by listening to lecturers).	5	4	3	2	1

30. Saya lebih suka bekerja bersendirian. (I prefer to work by myself).	5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---	---