Global Scientific JOURNALS

GSJ: Volume 9, Issue 5, May 2021, Online: ISSN 2320-9186
www.globalscientificjournal.com

Identify Learning style Related to Learning Outcomes Gumuz Language speakers students in Metekel Zone Grade 10th secondary schools (Benishangul Gumuz National Regional state In Ethiopia)

By Yilkal Tesfaw Assefa Language Instructor at Gilgel Beles College, Ethiopia.

Abstract

The main objective of the study was to identify learning style related to learning outcomes Gumuz language speakers students in Metekel Zone Grade 10th secondary schools. Participants selected for this study were 184 students who were enrolled in 9th grade in five high schools in the Benishangul Gumuz Regain Metekel Zone Mandura Werda, which were selected based on the objective sample selection method. Students were selected on the basis of a objective sample method, which was obtained through written questionnaires and archived Amharic Language subject academic results. The data collected were analyzed by descriptive statistics. According to the data, there was a significant difference (P <0.01) between Auditory learning style Visual learning style Kinesthetic learning style Tactile learning style Individual learning style and Group learning styles, which led to differences in group learning and visual learning styles. This shows that most students' learning style is biased towards group and visual learning. However, the data show that student learning style is not related to student academic achievement. It also examined whether there is a difference in learning style in relation to the environment. However, the data obtained did not show significant differences (P <0.01). In general, the student's learning style, environment, and learning style and Learning achievement should be taken into account by those involved in teachers and any *bodies related to education*

Key Words

Learning style
Auditory learning style
Visual learning style
Kinesthetic learning style

Tactile learning style
Individual learning style
Group learning style

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1. Background of the study

Students do not have the same behavior by nature. They vary in appearance, character, height, thinking, culture, and so on. Students who come to school have the same difference. Various publications indicate that there are differences among students' attitudes, social backgrounds, cultural backgrounds, learning choices, etc. (Berhane 1999, Marew 1998, Block 1997, Borich and Tombri 1995, Feleder 2000, Hart 1996).

Although each student experiences different information in his or her daily life, only a few are remembered in a meaningful way (Feldman 2000, Good and Brophy 1995). According to these researchers, events are marked by significant differences in student life experience, ability, cultural background, knowledge, and interests. This allows each student to have his or her own unique way of remembering events, actions, and so on.

One of the studies in the field of education deals with learning style. Researchers close to the field have made great efforts to understand how human beings perceive, filter, store, and remember information (Brown 1994, Ellis 1985, Reid1987).

Language education has many implications, especially for second language education. According to Brown (1994) one of the main reasons for the influence of interventions in secondary language education is related to the psychological problems and incompatibility with the language and culture of the second language students who were born, raised and accustomed to it.

According to Brown (1994), the way people learn things, cope with problems, and overcome them depends on their personality and mental state. This is called cognition style. Mindfulness is related to the Educational context and together with Affective and Physiological factors develop the concept of learning style (Brown, 1994).

The diversity of each student's behavior also makes the learning style different. It is well-known that each student has different learning styles that he or she seeks and uses in a variety of ways (Feldman, 2000). Of course, there may be more than one learning method; However, although it tends to be one of the main learning style, it can use different learning style, such as events. For example, some students learn by auditory learning style others visual learning style or kinesthetic learning style or tactile learning style or individual learning style or group learning styles. The rest can use two or three together (Fieldman 2000, Cruickshank et al. 1995; Hart 1996; Richards and Lockhart 1994).

Teachers, in particular, need to protect their students' learning choices. To understand their students' learning style, they must be sensitive and responsive (Tomlis 1998, Dunn 1990, Zhenhui 2001). While students in a classroom can learn from a variety of teaching methods and teaching aids, some students may benefit from one or more teaching methods and learning tools (Jenny 1999, Lainboun and Spoda 1995, Thomison 1998, Reid 1987).

Cruickshank and his colleagues (1995) state that the teaching methods used by teachers in the classroom are the result of their own cultural, social and educational background. It has also been shown by most studies that most teachers teach in the style of learning or previous learning style (Brown 1994, Feldman 2000, Capel, Lisk and Turner 2002, Cruickshank and colleagues 1995).

In general, researchers suggest that classroom instruction should be viewed in the context of the actual classroom. Crash and Trill (1983), for example, state that the purpose of classroom learning is based on the needs of the students and, more importantly, that if the students are to succeed in their goals, the starting point must be outside the classroom context. (Jenny 1999, Lainboun and Spoda 1995, Thomison, 1998, Reid1987).

Student learning style need to be considered if language learning is to be successful. One of the barriers to learning success (Jenny 1999, Lainbuun and Spoda 1995, Thomison 1998, Reid 1987.) This has been studied by various researchers in Ethiopia. (1998) Most Ethiopian students do not achieve the required level of language proficiency at all levels. Lack of language skills is a common issue during teacher and student training, as well as various reasons for students' lack of language proficiency. Haregwoin (1993) They also point out that another way to teach Ethiopian high school language is based on traditional teaching methods.

In general, the method of learning style in the Ethiopian situation especially in the context of the second language, has not yet been thoroughly researched or not fully explored. It has become a starting point of this research and researcher.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Second language and foreign language learners have their own goals for learning the language. The main ones are social networking with second or foreign speakers or some form of service in the language, such as employment, business, education, communication with speakers of the language and some social activities, etc. They are the ones who learn the language (Arnold 1982; Brown 1994, Ellis 1994, 1995 and 1997, Firman and Long 1991, Gardener 1985, Stern 1994).

The reasons why students learn a second language in the classroom vary, and there are many theories in terms of learning style and results. Among the many theories, there is a consensus among most researchers about the differences in student learning styles. However, while they agree on the differences in student learning styles, there are many differences in performance and usefulness.

While there are those who argue that teaching different students' style to make learning more effective in support of the above proposition, there are those who argue that better learning and achievement can be achieved by combining the learning process with the learning process, not by combining it with the student learning style (Dembo 1994, Dembo (1994) states that he supports the original idea of the Renaduna (1972 and 1989) study; The second idea is reinforced by the study of Cohen and his colleagues (1989), Crombach and Snow (1977), and Camuverworth and Banz (1950). In addition Stern Josévarna Zemer (1990) and Gudna Kephafi (1995) cite Dunn, Beuderna Clubs (1989), McCarthy (1989), and O'Neill (1990), citing the lack of learning style that take into account the learning process. Kerr (1990) also states that the choice of learning style has no real impact on student achievement.

Research on questionnaires based on learning style theories; It has been shown that learning styles differ in age and experience. In this study, learning style for students between the ages of 16 and 18 play an important role. All the students presented in the study were interested in identifying and developing their learning style and were comfortable with the theory. Older students, however, tend to use all style (Cotton 1995).

Marew (1998) study of the relationship between learning style and achievement shows that there are significant differences between collaborative, competitive, and individual learning choices. The reason for the differences in the study was the cooperative learning choice, and the number of students' choice of learning was higher than the cooperative learning choice; However, according to their research, none of the learning choices were significantly different from those of academic achievement. The researcher suggested that this may be due to disagreement between the teaching-learning process and the students' learning choices.

Berhane (1999) found significant differences in learning, listening, practice, and contextual and analytical learning style in their study of learning style, teaching style and learning outcomes, leading to differences in learning style and analyzes. The study found that most students' learning styles tend to focus on analysis and analysis. However, the results of the study show that most teachers are listening and analyzing when they are assigned to a teaching style. In addition, students' academic achievement differed in terms of the second language (culture) in the five learning style, but they did not show significant differences.

According to Blue (1982), cited by Pine (2003), the academic achievement of African American students has been improved through a collaborative approach to the implementation of group rewards based on team performance. A study of African American and white students also found that learning style were positively correlated with reading comprehension.

There are also researchers who argue that learning style should be viewed in terms of gender. According to Dann and Girges (1993), there is a significant difference between women's and men's educational choices. The average score on the learning and listening skills for male students was 12.53 and 13.60 respectively, indicating that the male had a higher score than the female. As a result, male students have a greater choice in learning and listening. This difference is seen between Mexican and British-American immigrants. On the other hand, studies in English as a second language have found differences in students in Malaysia, China, and India. The source of the difference is that they have different racial backgrounds.

While there are those who argue that there is a difference in student learning styles but argue that it does not relate to student achievement, there are studies that suggest that learning style is not related to student achievement. Therefore, it has become a matter of concern for researchers as the learning process has been controversial and unresolved in relation to results (Good and Brophy 1995). Moreover, in a country where there are different languages, cultures, attitudes,

experiences, backgrounds, etc., the potential educational value of such a subject is great, and an in-depth examination of the relevance of the learning style will be of great benefit to the overall academic achievement.

As we have tried to explore the various research findings above, it is not possible to come up with a definitive idea as to which research results should be applied, as there is no consensus among the various research results. Thus, the differences between the various scholars indicate that there are many unresolved gaps and that they need further research. In addition, since most of the research has been conducted in Europe and the United States, in some parts of the Far East and the Middle East, it seems inspiring to study the language-learning style and outcomes of students in developing countries with different socio-cultural lifestyles. It is also safe to say that research on Gumuz students is related to native and second language education. Therefore, this study is new to the area where it is being conducted, so the main focus is on examining Gumuz students' Amharic learning style and results.

In general, one of the reasons for this research is the lack of a common denominator in the field of learning and the fact that the subject has not yet been thoroughly researched in the second language. In addition, in informal discussions with language teachers in the teaching profession, they should think about and apply the teaching method to the second language in relation to the achievement of the second language.

1.3 Objectives of the study

The main purpose of this study is to examine and examine the relationship between Gumuz-speaking students' learning style and Amharic language learning outcomes. Students have a diverse cultural and social background, language, knowledge, experience and skills. Although both teachers and educators are aware of this, the information given by teachers who teach these students is not overly critical. You could say that this is probably due to a mismatch between the teacher's teaching style and the student's learning style. Therefore, identifying students' learning styles related to academic achievement, especially in the context of a second language, and implementing the same teaching and learning process can make learning more effective.

In general, the purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between Gumuz speaking students and Amharic language learning. Therefore, the study has a list of objectives that need to be answered.

- What are the Gumuz language students' major learning style preferences?
- Is there significant relationship between Gumuz language students' academic achievement and their learning style?
- Is there a significant learning style playing slots in the environmental or local background?

1.4 .Significance of the Study

The study is considered the following benefits. The study is believed to be the importance of language or any subject teachers, students, educational professionals (program, textbooks, curriculum and policies and policy editors and research for research.

The fact that language teachers wears this documentary will identify information that can change the progress of students learning the style. In the same language, the learning style of language teachers in learning and applying the learning style in the learning process. There are supporting research results regarding this idea. For example, the students who have learned in the teachers of the students who have learned in the study of the students who taught teachers and studies in the study of teachers who taught teachers in the study Therefore, the academic achievement of students may be interested in teachers and educational experts who can be decided from students learning style. Therefore, the study has a vital role in this regard.

In addition, students' learning strategic communication is particularly negative, especially with students who learn Amharic second-language, relateing a hint of the party that is negative or an adult. It also applies to the study of the study with research professionals on research professionals and the results of the study.

1.5 Scope of the study

The participants in the study were ninth graders at Mandura, Gilgel Beles, Dabati, Manbuk and Mankush High Schools in the Benishangul Gumuz Regional State. The study included a total of 184 tenth graders enrolled in the five high schools. The study also looked at the relationship between Amharic language subject learning and learning style for students who speak the Gumuz language.

Different authors and researchers point out that there are many types of learning style in terms of distribution. Although the distribution is complex, in this study, learning style are classified into six according to Reid (1987 and 1995). The main focus of the study was Visual learning style, Auditory learning style, Kinesthetic learning style, Tactile learning style, Individual learning style and Group learning style.

Overall, these six student learning style are the main reason why they were selected in the study; This is mainly due to their recent findings, which made it easier for researchers to record and interpret responses, to avoid further interference with the results, and to contribute to the reliability and accuracy of the study (Reid, 1995 and 1995).

In addition, after learning the language of students who have spoken the language, the results of the first semester of the year 2020 were identified by Asmrom Kidane, Lakaw Wolde, Mekonnen Yimer and Youssef Omar (1988). You are ranked in four categories, up to the highest (<50, 50 - 68.5, 69 - 74.5, 75 -100).

Although it is known that there are differences between the school and the student due to the location, age, gender, previous experience, question preparation, grading, etc. While these differences apply to all students, their first grade results are taken.

1.6 Limitations of the study

One of the data used for the study was a roster. The results of the first semester of the year 2002 were taken directly from the archives and compared with their results. Instead, if the students were taught by one teacher, the test was prepared by the same teacher, and they were tested at the same time and place, corrected and corrected, the results would increase.

The study was conducted on students in five different schools, and the study found that the students' performance was limited due to differences in interventions in teaching, test preparation, testing, administration, etc.

In addition, due to lack of time and money, this study did not cover the Gumuz language area in general and the small number of students may have been relatively limited.

Chapter Three: Research Design and Methodology

This chapter presents the research design, research methodology, sources of data, study population, sample size and sampling techniques, procedures of data collection, data gathering tools, methods of data analysis, checking for validity and reliability of instruments. The study is mainly based on a survey method. The data collected in the study describe the relationship between quantitative analysis and variables. Finally, a summary of the information is presented

3.1 Variable

The study participants were Manbuk, Mandura, Gilgel Beles, Dabati and Mankush High Schools located in Metekele Zone of Benishangul Gumuz Regional State. 2020 Grade 10th Gumuz Language Students. All five schools were selected on purpose-oriented samples. This is because all schools have Gumuz-speaking students. In addition, schools are relatively closer to the study environment than other schools, providing the necessary support and cooperation from the school community. Only 9th graders were included in the study for fear of interfering with the students' experience, knowledge and skills.

Another is that students at the high school level and above are more likely to receive information than elementary school students Grade 10th students are randomly selected. At the same time, it is reasonable to exclude older and upper secondary students (Brown 1994, Cole and Chan 1994), as older students' attitudes toward mother tongue and second language are more pronounced than children. Because their numbers were required to select a sample, students in all five schools (who spoke Gumuz) participated in the study using a general sampling method.

As a result, 41 students from Mandura, 31 Manbuk, 22 Gilgel Beles, 57 Mankush and 33 Debate High School students were among the students. They are all fluent in Gumuz. The study included all Gumuz-speaking students from the five high schools selected in terms of purpose-oriented selection. However, at the time of the study, about 18 students did not complete the questionnaire and did not follow the instructions.

3.2 Data Collection Tools

The main purpose of the study was to identify the relationship between Gumuz-speaking students' learning style and Amharic subject language achievement. Therefore, the data collection tools selected for the study are the results of the Amharic subject language academic result.

3.2.1 Written questionnaire

A written questionnaire served as the main data collection tool for the study. The questionnaire is used to get information about the types of student learning style. The questions were 30 and were designed to identify the type of learning style that was studied. The questionnaire was developed based on Visual learning style, Auditory learning style, Kinesthetic learning style, Tactile learning style, Individual learning style and Group learning style

The questionnaire contained a total of 30 questions, which were taken from Reid (1987 and 1995), Feldman (2000), Gracierichman, Richard and Lockhart (1995), and Iliot and colleagues (2000). Accordingly, by asking questions 1, 7, 9, 17 and 20, Visual learning style at 6, 10, 12, 24 and 29 Auditory learning style, 2, 8, 15, 19 and 26 Kinesthetic learning style, 11, 14, 16, 22 and 25 Tactile learning style, 13 , 18, 27, 28 and 30 are designed to measure Group learning style and 3, 4, 5, 21 and 23 are Individual learning styles. All queries are based on an indicator Rating Scales.

Four-point Rating Scales are provided in each questionnaire. They range from high to low in order I strongly agree (4), I agree (3), I disagree (2), I strongly disagree (1). These 4-1 metrics are used in the order in which they are set.

Students' test scores are known to vary from school to student due to location, age, gender, previous experience, questionnaire, grading, etc., but these interventions are applicable to all students, but their primary scores are taken into account. Another focus of this study is on formal classroom instruction.

The questions in the questionnaire were selected by the researcher, translated into Amharic, and revised and reviewed by an expert, research counselor, and colleagues, and the experimental study was conducted on five students. The developed questionnaire was calculated by Cornbach's alpha formula. Due to the reliability of the questionnaire ($\alpha = 0.643$), it was used in the main study to change, modify, and adjust the wording, phrases, and grammatical conventions of their peers based on the answers provided and the comments made by the study consultants.

The questionnaire was first filled with the permission of the principals of the schools and the students. This method was chosen to maintain the reliability of the information. In addition to the researcher, the researcher who spoke Gumuz also provided additional information and explanations regarding the completion of the questionnaire and the purpose of the study, as well as the options for the participants to choose their own feelings, attitudes and behaviors. They are also given the opportunity to ask if there is anything they do not understand in the questionnaire.

3.2.2 Students academics result

For this study, the results of the first semester of 2020 were used as a source of information for Amharic language learners. The information was important because the learning style of the students studied was similar to the results. The results of the first semester of Amharic studies were based on the interval used by Asmrom Kidane, Lakaw Wolde, Mekonnen Yimer and Youssef Omar (1988) and Marew (1998) from the lowest to the highest (<50, 50 - 68.5, 69 - 74.5, 75 -100) were classified into four categories, respectively, and the students' learning style was compared according to the results.

Therefore, the rest of the teachers who teach the results of the first semester are collected from the memorial class and the results of each survey are coded according to the questionnaire and the student's score is ranked from highest to lowest.

3.3. Data Analysis

The data from the study were verified before the analysis was completed, and the answers were verified, coded for analysis, and placed on the scoreboard. Finally, before entering the analysis, the questionnaire was retrieved.

The data are analyzed by the methods used by Reid (1987, 1995), Fieldman (2000), Gracierichman, Richard and Lockhart (1995), and Iliot and his colleagues (2000). The calculations were analyzed by the six learning style for whether or not they differentiated from the second language and the relationship of learning style to academic achievement in a variety of mean, standard, single-segment, Kai-Score, single-sample, Pearson-related determinations, and Tucson Tests.

The six learning style were calculated based on the results obtained through the written questionnaire to determine whether there were differences in the learning style of the first students studied. The data collected from the study were then calculated in a One Sample Test. The data is then analyzed as a group and individual study options. It was then analyzed by the analysis Z and the Tukai test regarding the relationship between the learning style of each other. Pearson Correlation Coefficient and chi-square test were then compared to see if learning style was related to academic achievement.

Based on the above calculation, the participants were found to be motivated to learn; Next, look at the correlation between learning style among the nine students. Based on the interval used by Marew (1998), cited by Kedani, Lakaw Wolde, Mekonnen Yimer and Youssef Omar (1988) in the first semester to determine the correlation between learning outcomes from low to high. (<50, 50 - 68.5, 69 - 74.5, 75 -100) The correlation of the ranking by four categories was analyzed by chi-square test.

Finally, after learning the students' backgrounds, they identified their group differences in six learning style and their correlation was calculated by chi-square test.

Chapter Four: Outcome Analysis and Explanation

The purpose of the study was to look at the relationship between academic achievement and learning styles in Gumuz-speaking students. For this study, the differences between the students Visual learning style, Auditory learning style, Kinesthetic learning style, Tactile learning style, Individual learning style and Group learning style and the results of the students' first semester Amharic language learning were collected. Based on the information gathered, the analysis and analysis of the study results are presented in the following order.

4.1 Outcome Analysis

Accordingly, the data collected for the study were organized accordingly and analyzed as follows. Based on the data collected by the first responders to see how different their learning styles are, the average grades and standard deviation of the students studied are presented in Table 3 as follows.

Table 3: Average and standard division for participant students.

Learning style	Students (N = 184)	
	$\overline{X}$	Sd
Visual learning style	17.07	2.96
Auditory learning style	16.15	3.06
Kinesthetic learning style	16.03	2.75
Tactile learning style	15.41	3.06
Individual learning style	15.08	3.26
Group learning style	18.02	2.18

As shown in Table 3, the data obtained with the average score and standard deviations between the students are clear. As a result, the comparison between the six learning style. compared to the six learning style for Gumuz-speaking students seems to be more in favor of group learning and visual learning.

In general, students' learning style can be categorized into first Group learning style, second Visual learning style, third Auditory learning style, fourth Kinesthetic learning style, fifth Tactile learning style, sixth- and last individual learning style.

It also shows that the results of individual, listening, and doing learning style that are studied in terms of formal distinction are significantly more than their average grades. While this may seem to indicate that students' attitudes toward these three learning styles are different, the standard study shows that the remaining learning styles have similar learning styles. Another difference is the learning style of the participants In addition to the reliability test, the results obtained using the One sample test are presented in Table 4 as follows.

Table 4 Student learning style One sample test

The variable	Number of students	Average	Special	T price	Level of intensity	Level of freedom
Learning style	184	97.76	7.13	78.46	Below 0.05	183

The One sample test shown in Table 4 shows that the average learning value of the study method (97.76) was lower than the sample value (183) by 0.05. The calculated T-price (78,46) was found to be higher than the T-table price (1.96) in the double-check, 0.05 significance level and 183 freedom level (1.96). This indicates that group learning styles have different.

The following is also shown in Table 5 The number of students participating in the study were assigned to the type of learning style in which they were most discriminated.

Table 5 Percentage of learning style choice of Participant students

Measurement	Learning Style						Total
	Visual	Auditory	Kinesthetic	Tactile	Individual	Group	
No.	57	30	8	5	7	77	184
%	30.98	16.30	4.35	2.72	3.80	41.85	100%

As the result of the election of each of the nails provided by table 5, the student's learning style style with the technical learning style with the technical learning style is about 41.85%.Second, it is a style of Visual, and in number 57 is 30.98%. When you hold the third step of Auditory, it is about 16.30% and the fourth level of education, and about 4.35% of the learning style. Fifth level is a indiv learning style, and in number 7 percent is 3.80%. The learning method of Tactile is by sixth levels and is 2.72% in numbers 5.

There is also annova procedure to ensure that there is a difference in the absence of student learning style. This was required next to table 6.

Table 6: ANOVA

sources of variation	(SS)	(df)	(MS)	F
	2377.645	5	475.529	12.363*
	6846.395	178	38.4629	
Total	9224.040	183		

* P< 0.01

The difference in student learning style shows a table that is highly reliable. In 1% (P <0.01) Emotionally obtained a calculation of an errorIf the F (12.363) enrolled on the tableThe F (3.11) confirms that there is a significant difference between learning style on the table.This indicates that the average results of learning style between students varies as differently in the style of learning. In addition, the evidence between learning style are different, and the regular film between many learning is not a significant appearance between many learning style.

The condition of the objective of the students who gave me the text style, which is consistent,In addition to learning style, it is a supervised insectuals with the differences.This size 5% (p <0.05) in the above table:F (12.363) It is also strengthening the fact that students have a difference between the students who are reported on the table (2.26) of their learning technique and the findings of learning.It is important that the difference between learning style is important to examine which of the learning style that is a cause for specialty.Because in a special method of specialty above Found in Table 6(F) Value of Mutual Learning style, so it is important to compare the average products registered by the average products registered by specialty. This can be seen at the following table.

Table **7** ``Tukey test or HSD test``

	$\overline{X}_1$=17.07	$\overline{X}_2$ = 16.15	$\overline{X}_3$ = 16.03	$\overline{X}_4$ = 15.41	$\overline{X}_5$=15.08	$\overline{X}_6$=18.02
$\overline{X}_1$ = 17.07	0.00					
$\overline{X}_2$ = 16.15	0.92	0.00				
$\overline{X}_3$ = 16.03	1.04	0.12	0.00			
$\overline{X}_4$ = 15.41	1.66	0.74	0.62	0.00		

$\overline{X}_5$ = 15.08	1.99	1.07	0.95	0.33	0.00	
$\overline{X}_6$ = 18.02	0.95	1.87	1.99	*2.61	*2.94	0.00

HSD = 2.18 * p< 0.05

The differences found in the comparison between six learning style Each average score looked at the table 7 that compared with at least one of the other (P <0.05) varying to the other one.Group learning style and visual style shows the significance of any learning style between them. The significance of elementary variations in accordance with the score is the comparison between group and private learning style. Second, the differences between groups and learning learning.

In addition, a small matter the contrast between groups and trying, showing, and listening and listening and listening and listening and listening and listening and listening and group learning.

So the general learning style may be a general learning strategic and comparison between their means of learning that they are not detected into a group. abilities therefore other learning style is more likely to be indicative of a significant differences in the comparison of learning learning style.

The second study of the study What does the learning style relate to the learning style with learning language instruction? That is.To answer that question, the students' learning and academic achievement Pearson correlation coefficient is bruised. The result as follows:

Table 8 : Related Student Learning Style and Outcomes by Pearson correlation coefficient

Transitions	Average	Special	Relationship Conflict						Result
			Visual	Auditoria	Kanastatic	Tactile	Indiv	Group	
Visual	17.07	2.96	1.00						
Auditory	16.15	3.06	.240 *	1.00					

Kinesthetic	16.03	2.75	.136 *	.143	1.00				
Tactile	15.41	3.06	.081	.265 *	.142	1.00			
Individual	15.08	3.26	-.165 *	-.180 *	-.051	-.024	1.00		
Group	18.02	2.18	-.164 *	.290 *	-.235 **	-.092	.063	1.00	
Result	48.99	12.63	1.00 *	.240 *	.136	.081	-.165 *	-.164 *	1.00

(N=184) *P< 0.05 **P< 0.01

In Table 8, significant references between personal and listening learning style is seen (r = 0.180, p <0.05). The relationship between these two other swims or the feature of these two luxuries (3.24%). This percent of the specified digit indicates the amount of relationship to share. The feature or installation of variables are also announcement of the variables of the variables. As a result, the two-scale of Treasures, which has been found in 0.48, is significantly significant than the Table of Table (1.96).

Several and visual learning style (r = -. 165, P <0.05). The relationship between these two other swims or features of the feature of these two lies is found (2.68%). This percent of the specified digit indicates the amount of relationship to share. The feature or installation of variables are also announcement of the variables of the variables. Thus, the two-scale of Treasures found in 0.26 indicates that the amount of the target is significantly significant than the Table of the Table (1.96).

A significant impact of third group and sight learning (r = -. 164, P <0.01). The relationship between these two other swims or features of the feature of these two lies is found (2.68%). This percent of the specified digit indicates the amount of relationship to share. The feature or installation of variables are also announcement of the variables of the variables. As a result, the two scanning value of Taste (2.24) indicates that the amount of the target is significantly significant than the Table of the Table of Treasury (1.96).

It is also significant in the mutual symptoms of 1% in 1% of the error that you have left 1% of the error. The relationship between these two luces or the feature of these two louds is found in percentages 8.41%. This percent of the specified digit indicates the amount of relationship to

share. The feature or installation of variables are also announcement of the variables of the variables. As a result, the two scanner of Taste (4.08) indicates that the amount of the target is significantly.

Significant in the middle of the classic learning method (r = .265, p <0.01). The relationship between these two other swims or features of the feature of these two lies is found (7.02%). The feature or installations of variables are also announcement of the variables of the variables. As a result, the two scanning value of Taste (1.64) refers to the value of the relaxation in 0.61

Significant in the middle of the learning and watching learning style (r = .240, P <0.01). The relationship between these two luches or features of the feature of these two louds (5.76%) has been calculated. This percent of the specified digit indicates the amount of relationship to share. This percent of the specified digit indicates the amount of relationship to share. The feature or installation of variables are also announcement of the variables of the variables. As a result, the two scanning price of Task (3.34) indicates that the amount of the target is significantly significant than the Table of the Table (1.64).

Fourth step on a group and testing learning style has been shown in groups and testing methods (r = .235, p <0.01). The relationship between these two luches or features of the feature of these two luxuries (5.52%). This percent of the specified digit indicates the amount of relationship to share. The feature or installation of variables are also announcement of the variables of the variables. As a result, the two scanning value of Treasurer, then, is significantly significant than the Table of Table (1.64) in the Table of the Table of 0.01.

On the other hand, as many other swims seen in Table 8, energy-based revolution has also been seen as not significant. The situation of the most common in the education of education and private learning learning can be an unbalanced. The size of the race (r =.010, p> 0.05) displayed among these swords. The two varieties of the two variables are small in behalf of the common feature of the differences in the variables of the variant behavior. On the two-tip of the Turtle (0.13) of the Title (0.13), the scanning price of 0.13 This indicates that there is no significant reference to the two variables.

In a personal and testing learning style, significant revolution has not been displayed in Table 8 of Table 8: 0.05. The character or the size of these features is a less (0.057%) of the character or the size of the translated. This statistic information denies that the relationship between the variables is small. The lecture obtained by a calculator of Treasurer (0.22) is proven that the amount of the most significant in the Table of the Table (1.96) of the Luthern Table (1.96).

The significance of the learning style (r = 0.040, p> 0.05) in Table 8. The size of the exchange rate between the variables has been found below (0.16%). From this, the relationship between the two variables are very low. The calculator of Title (0.54) of the lecture of Title (1.96) is the lowest rate of Title (1.96) of the variables. In this way, there is no idea of learning style or not without education. It means that they are very low.

A significant and experimental learning method (r = -0.051, p> 0.05) has been viewed on Table 8. The size of the exchange rate between the variables has been found below (0.26%). From this, the relationship between the two variables are very low. The calculation rate of Title (0.68) indicates that the Title (1.96) of the variables of the variables of the variation of the variation (1.96) of the variation of the variation of the variation of the variation of Title (1.96).

The significant reference to the learning and learning of learning (r = 0.081, p> 0.05) has been seen in Table 8. The size of the exchange rate between the variables has been found below (0.65%). From this, the relationship between the two variables are very low. The calculated, Lee also lememeleše in the following table 9 is being tested to see.

Table 9 learning style and academic achievement

learning style	Academic achievement				
	<50	**50 - 68.5**	**69 - 74.5**	**75 - 100**	□□□
Visual learning style	38(66.67%) 35.93	14 (24.56%) 15.49	3 (5.26%) 4.03	2 (3.51%) 1.55	57
Auditory learning style	20(66.67%) 18.92	8 (26.67%) 8.15	1 (3.33) 2.12	1 (3.33) 0.81	30

Kinesthetic learning style	4 (80%) 3.15	1 (20%) 1.36	0 (0%) 0.35	0 (0%) 0.13	5
Tactile learning style	5 (62.50%) 5.04	3 (37.50%) 2.17	0 (0%) 0.57	0 (0%) 0.22	8
Individual learning style	5 (71.43%) 4.42	1 (14.28%) 1.90	1 (14.28%) 0.49	0 (0%) 0.19	7
Group learning style	44(57.15%) 48.54	23 (29.87%) 20.92	5 (6.49%) 5.44	5 (6.49%) 2.09	77
Total	116	50	13	5	184

*P > 0.05

X^2_{ob} = 9.2116* X^2_{cr} = 24.9958 df = 15

Each learning style often shows the table of students in the student language Amharic educational products in the same way. As the case, the student's English language results are like a low-language product of low-language, 50%, 50%, 50%, 75-100, 75-100, 75-100). In learning between ments, the chart indicates the table that contains the highest digitarian learning style, and the last major number is the type of learning style.

However, 5% of the mistake of error (P> 0.05) If the Cych of the Kay Square, found in the table (X2CR) Price is highlighted with learning grade (24.9958). Additionally, agreed in kindergarten style shows the following, as comparison between the Amanite language education. The sixth of the sixth techniques, which contains 77 of all learning style, and the students of all learning style are considered by the above-scholarship of all learning style, but learning style did not have a dragon with their education.

Finally, learning style in relation to the local background of the victims has been attempted to see the following table.

Table 10 Relationships in to the background and learning style chi-square test

Background	Learning Style						Total
	Visual	Auditoria	Kanastatic	Tactile	Indiv	Group	

Gilgel Beles	10(45.45%) 6.8152	3(13.64%) 3.5869	0 (0%) 0.9565	0 (0%) 0.5978	0(0%) 0.8370	9(40.91%) 9.2065	22
Mandura	16(39.02%) 12.7011	5(12.16%) 6.6847	0 (0%) 1.7826	3(7.32%) 1.1141	6(14.63%) 1.5598	11(26.83%) 17.1526	41
Manbuk	7(22.58%) 9.6033	1(3.22%) 5.0543	3(9.68%) 1.3478	1(3.03%) 0.8967	0 (0%) 1.1793	19(61.29%) 12.9728	31
Dibate	15(45.45%) 10.2228	8(24.24%) 5.3804	0 (0%) 1.4347	1(3.03%) 0.8967	1(3.03%) 1.2554	8(24.24%) 13.8098	33
Mankush	9(15.79%) 17.6576	13(22.81) 9.2935	5(8.77%) 2.4783	0 (0%) 1.5489	0 (0%) 2.1684	30(52.63%) 23.8533	57
Total	57	30	8	5	7	77	184

*P < 0.05

X^2_{ob} = 67.3039* X^2_{cr} = 31.4104 df = 20

Table 10 shows how many learning styles are selected based on the learning background of each learning style. The number of students assigned to each of the five areas shows that the number of students with group and visual learning in all areas is much higher than the total number of students selected in the study. However, the probability of missing 5% (P <0.05) above the X2ob price (67.3039) is higher than the X2cr price (31.4104) in the table, indicating that the local background was significantly related to the choice of learning method.

As shown in Table 10 above, students from different areas, such as Dibati, Gilgel Beles, Mandura, Manbuk and Mankush, are generally associated with different types of learning styles.

Given the local background of learning style, Dibate dominates most of the group learning and visual learning style, while on the other hand, students in the Mandura area tend to choose to learn and listen to individual learning style.

4.2 Outcome Description

The main focus of this study is to determine whether the learning style of Gumuz-speaking students is related to academic achievement. Therefore, based on the information gathered in the questionnaire, there is a discrepancy between the students' learning style for learning style; In the descriptive statistics above, it has been analyzed to find out if there is a learning style that plays a significant role in predicting learning outcomes and also in terms of learning environment.

The first answer to the questionnaire was to determine if the students' learning style was different. There is also a comparison between visual, listening, doing, experimenting, individual and group learning style. Accordingly, the results of Table 2 show significant (less than 0.05) differences in the language of Gumuz students. The fact that the average student's learning style from the questionnaire was significantly higher than the expected average indicates that the students differed in their group Amharic language learning style. As a result, there are significant differences in student learning and group learning style. According to the analysis, the first group learning method, the second visual learning method, the third listening listening learning method, the fourth practice learning method, the fifth learning method, the sixth personal learning method. This information is evidenced by theories that Krushnk and colleagues 1995, Fieldman 2000, Hart 1996, Richard and Luharthar 1995, Reid 1987 and Marew 1998, have shown.

The difference between learning style and the fact that students are learning when they are assigned a learning style is another point to be explored. Thus, there is a significant difference in the way learning is related to results. Based on the data collected from the survey and the results of the student data, the correlation coefficients were 161 or 87.5 % of the students' group learning style, but this significant figure was not significant in relation to the grades . In fact, 3 or 1.6% of the 184 students had very good grades, and 9 or 4.8% had high scores, but the correlations were not significant. These findings (in Dembo 1994, Good and Brofi 1995) have been found to support researchers who argue that learning styles have nothing to do with academic achievement. This is because despite the fact that there are differences in learning styles among students, there is no significant correlation between student achievement, high, high, medium and low grades.

Finally, the focus is on the students' background and learning style. According to class essays, many researchers have argued that differentiation, especially with regard to language learning, has a role to play in learning the environment. Accordingly, the data show that the 5% error rate has no role to play in learning the environment. Accordingly, 5% of errors may be inconsistent with the results of research on environmental learning style (Dembo 1994, Borich and Tombury 1995). On the other hand, this study (Nunan 1991, Willing 1998) is supported by a theory.

Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to assess the current practice and to identify examine the relationship between Gumuz speaking students' learning style and Amharic subject related learning outcomes in Secondary Schools of Metekel Zone. The background of the study, the research findings and essays related to the study, the method of analysis and the analysis of the results of the study are presented in detail in the previous chapters, respectively. In this chapter, the results of the study are summarized, conclusions, and the researcher's suggestions and solutions that are relevant and should be considered in the future.

5.1 Summary

The main focus of the study was to examine the relationship between Gumuz-speaking students' learning style and Amharic subject related learning outcomes. Accordingly, the following are some of the key questions that the study will answer.

- What are the Gumuz language students' major learning style preferences?
- Is there significant relationship between Gumuz language students' academic achievement and their learning style?
- Is there a significant learning style playing slots in the environmental or local background?

Accordingly, first aid kits were identified and developed in a manner suitable for the study. The nominees were selected from five high schools: Gilgel Beles High School, Manbuk High School, Dibate General High School, Mandura High School and Manbuk High School. Only 184 students who are fluent in Gumuz are studying. The main data collection tool is a written questionnaire, and students' grades are taken from the roster. The questionnaire was developed by various researchers in the field and prepared to measure six types of learning style by translating them into Amharic in a way that is suitable for the study.

The questionnaire was modified by a pilot study with the addition of consultants and staff, and data was collected. The data collected were analyzed using various statistical methods.

Based on the data collected, it was calculated on average, differentiated, single differentiated, and Tokia test scores as shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5 to determine if the first responders had a group learning style. The students also showed that they have a learning style by displaying a group-based statistic ($p<0.05$). She assumed that their grades were low because they did not fit in with the curriculum.

The second leading question is what is the relationship between Gumuz language and Amharic language learning. In this regard, it has been established that there is no learning that is significantly associated with academic achievement ($p <0.05$).

The data analyzed to answer the question of the method of learning that is significantly related to Amharic language learning in Gumuz language did not show that Gumuz-speaking students had a significant role in Amharic language learning or predicted academic achievement. The question of whether there is a significant correlation in the learning environment in the Gumuz language is also related to the learning environment.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the results, analysis and explanation of the study, the following conclusions were drawn.

• Students are found to have varied learning styles in safe groups. Their average grades, however, were low.

• The multidisciplinary learning style is based on group learning and visual learning.

• Significant differences between group and individual learning style were significantly different from large to small, respectively, in the Tukai test ($p <0.05$). Second, there was a discrepancy between the group and the learning style. There was also a small but significant difference between group and experimental, individual and visual and group learning style.

• Pearson correlation coefficient ($p <0.01$) is a significant difference between group and listening learning, respectively, with respect to the correlation coefficient ($p <0.01$). Second, there is a difference between learning and listening. Third, there is a difference between listening and seeing. Fourth, there was a difference between group and experimental learning style. In addition, differences ($p <0.05$) were observed, but similar differences were observed between individual listening, individual and visual, and group and visual learning style.

• No significant correlation between student learning and academic achievement. Even the choice of most students does not have a special bearing on academic achievement.
• The environmental background of the students has been shown to be relevant in terms of learning style.

5.3. Recommendations

The study focused on the relationship between Gumuz-speaking students' learning style and academic achievement. Based on the data collected from the survey and archives to result. the study analyzed the results to provide answers to the questions raised by the objective. Based on this, the following solutions are suggested.

• It should be noted that curriculum professionals, teachers, supervisors and other stakeholders should pay more attention to the overall diversity of students in the classroom when designing curricula, developing instructional materials, and presenting in the classroom;

• Examine the different learning style of the students in the classroom and apply the learning style that are in agreement with the students themselves;
• If learning style that encourage students are implemented and activities in the classroom as a whole will focus on students' learning style, it is a better option to achieve better teaching and learning goals.

It also provides support and follow-up by providing students with a learning curve that identifies what learning style will be most effective if they are implemented in the target language. Enabling students to improve their proficiency in the language they learn, especially in the second language, will help students to become proficient in the language they are learning.In addition, small but large-scale problems in the teaching-learning process can greatly reduce the inconsistencies in the teaching-learning process, both for teachers and other stakeholders.

References

□□□ □□□□□ (1999)□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□

Ethiopia Journal of Education, XVIII. (1), 56-68

□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□ (1998) □□ *□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□*□□

□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□ □□□ □□□□□□□

Bailey, K.M., (1990). *The use of Diary Studies in Teacher Education Programs.* In Richards, J.C., Nunan, D. (Eds.), *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge,Cambridge University Press, 215-226.

Block, C. C. (1997). *Teaching the Language Arts; Expanding Thinking Through Students Centered Instruction*. Boston; Allyn And Baccn.

Borich,G.D. and Tombri,M.L. (1995). *Educational Psychology: Contemporarily Approach.* New York: HarperCollins College.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning And Teaching*. 3rd Ed.. Sanfrancisco: Sanfrancisco University Press.

Cassidy, S. (2004). Learning Styles: An Overview Of The Theories, Models And Measures. *Educational Psychology*, 24(4), 419-444.

Cruickshank,D.R.,Bainer,D.and Metcalf,K. (1995).*The Act of Teaching*. New York and London: Longman Publishing Group.

Dembo,H.M. (1994). *Applying Education Psychology*.(5th ed.). New York and London: Longman Publishing Group.

Dunn, R., Dunn, K., & Price, G.E. (1975). *The Learning Style Inventory*. Lawrence, KS: Price Systems.

Ellis, R. (1995). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elliot,S.N.,Kratochwill,T.R.,Cook,J.L.,and Travers,J.F.(2000). *Educational Psychology*. 3rd ed.. USA: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Felder, R. (1995). Learning And Teaching Styles In Foreign And Second Language Education. *Foreign Language Annals*. 28 (1), 21-31.

Feleder,R.M. (n.d). Reaching the Second TIER. Retrieved March 19,2010,From North

California State University. http://WWW.necsu.edu/felder-puplic/papers/secondtier.html.

Good,T.L. and Brophy,J.(1995). *Contemporary Educational Psychology*. 5th ed.. USA: Longman.

Hall, E. And D. Moseley. (2005). Is There A Role For Learning Styles In Personalized Education And Training." *International Journal Of Lifelong Education* 24. 3: pp243-255.

Haregewain, Abate .(1993). The Feasibility And Value Of Using Role Play To Improve Communicative Skills In Ethiopian Senior Secondary, Schools. Unpublished MA. Thesis

Keefe, J. W. (1979). Developing A Defensible Learning Style Paradigm. Educational Leadership. 48(2): 57-61.

Kinsella, K. (1995). Understanding And Empowering Diverse Learners in ESL Classrooms. In J.M. Reid (Ed.), Learning Style In The ESUEFL Class room.

Kolb, D.A. (1984). Experiential Learning: Experience As The Source Of Learning And Development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Melton, C.D. (1990). Bridging The Cultural Gap: A Study Of Chinese Students' Learning Style Preferences. RELC Journal 27(1): pp70-88.

Matthews, D. B. (1995). An Investigation Of The Learning Styles Of Students At Selected Postsecondary Institutions In South Carolina. Orangeburg: South Carolina State University.

Nunan, D. (1995). Language Teaching Methodology A Text For Teachers. London; Keyboard Service, Luton. Boston: Heinle And Heinle. 170-94.

O'Brien, L. (1989). "Learning Styles: Make The Student Aware." National Association Of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 73: pp85-89.

Parry, T.S. (1984). "The Relationship Of Selected Dimensions Of Learner Cognitive Style, Aptitude, And General Intelligence Factors To Selected Foreign Language Proficiency Tasks Of Second-Year Students Of Spanish At The Secondary Level."

Peacock, M. (2001). Match Or Mismatch? Learning Styles And Teaching Styles In EFL. *International Journal Of Applied Linguistics*. 11(1): pp38-58.

Reid, J.M. (1987). The Learning Style Preferences Of ESL Students. "TESOL Quarterly," 21, Pp87-111. (Ed.), "Learning Style," pp164-205. New

York: Academic Press.

Reid, J.M. (Ed.) (1995*) Learning Style In The Esuefl Classroom*. Boston: Heinle And Heinle.

Richards, J. And C. Lockhart. (1994). *Reflective Teaching In Second Language Classrooms.* Cambridge University Press.

Shipman, S. & Shipman, V. (1985). Cognitive Styles: Some Conceptual, Methodological, And Applied Issues. In E. Gordon (Ed.), "Review Of Research In Education," V12, pp229-91. Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.

Wallace, B., and Oxford, R. L. (1992). Disparity in learning styles and teaching styles in the ESL Classroom: Does this mean war?" AMTESOL Journal, 1, pp45-68.

Woods, D. R. (1989) .Developing Students' Problem-Solving Skills. *Journal Of College Science Teaching*, 10 (1), 108-110.

Arnold,E.(1982). *Attitudes towards language variations social Psychology of language series*. London Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd).

Ellis,R.(1994).*The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. England: Oxford University Press.

Ellis,R.(1995).*Understanding Second Language Acquisition*(10$^{t\ h\ ed.}$) :Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Stern, H.H (1994). *Fundamental concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford university press.

Gardner,R.C.(1985). *Social psychology and second language*; *The role of attitude and motivation*: London: Arnold.

Freeman, D.L & Long, M.H. (1992). *An Introduction to second language Acquisition research* (3$^{rd\ ed.}$). New York: Longman Group UK Lit.

Dunn, R. (1993).*Learning of the multicultural divers*. Retrieved on March 29, 2010 from Emergency Librarian.20 (4):25-32

Mulalic et.al. (2009). *Perceptual learning styles of ESL students.* Retrieved on Jan.10, 2010 from European Journal of Social Science-volume 7, number 3.

Nunan, D. (2003).*Practical English Language Teaching* (ed). U. S. A.: The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.

Reid, J. M. (1987). *The learning style preferences of ESL students.* Retrieved on Jan.10, 2010 from TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 21, No.1.

Zhenhui, R. (2001). *Matching Teaching Styles With Learning Styles For ESL/EFL Instruction.* Retrieved on March 29, 2010 from The internet TESL Journal, Vol.VII, No.7

Hart, S. (1996).*Differentiation and the Secondary Curriculum*. New York: Routedge.

Felder, R.M. (1996). *Matters of styles.* American Society for Engineering Education Prism, 6(4), 18–23. Retrieved on Dec.1, 2010 from http://www2.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/LS- Prism.htm.

Capel, S. et .al (2001).*Learning to teach in the Secondary School:* A Composition to School experience. Great Britain: Bell and Bain Ltd.