Global Scientific JOURNALS

GSJ: Volume 8, Issue 7, July 2020, Online: ISSN 2320-9186
www.globalscientificjournal.com

LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIESANDLEARNING STYLES AMONG FIRST STUDENTS OF CAGAYAN STATE UNIVERSITY

JOMEL B. MANUEL

JOMEL B. MANUEL is currently the Chair of the Arts and Humanities Department, College of Arts and Sciences of Cagaya State University-Carig Campus, Cagayan Valley, Philippines. He is a holder of Doctor of Philosophy in Education major in Language Education. E-mail: jomelmanuel@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to identify the learning styles and learning strategies among first students under the Department of Arts and Humanities, College of Arts and Sciences, Cagayan State University-Carig Campus. Descriptive research design was used in the study. Data from the 94particpants were gathered through the use of PerceptaulLearning Styles Preference Questionnaire(PLSPQ) by Reid (1984) and the Strategy Inventory Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1990). Frequency, percentages, mean score, standard deviation, and Chi square were used in analyzing the data. Findings of the study showed that most of the participants are BSICC students, speak Ilocano and females. They studied in a public secondary school and had an average CAT percentile. It also showed that most of the participants used indirect strategies which include metacognition, being the most used strategy, followed by social and affective strategies. Further,the most frequently preferred learning style is auditory, followed by kinesthetic and visual learning styles. Analysis also reveals that the profile variables of the respondents do not show significant relationship with their language learning strategies and learning styles. Thus, the study concludes that the participants support language learning through focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities, controlling anxiety, increasing cooperation, and empathy and other means rather than requiring the mental processing of language learning. The particpants' profile variables do not contribute to the students' language learning strategies and learning styles.

Keywords:*Cagayan State University,language learning strategies,perceptual learning styles*

I. INTRODUCTION

Second Language learners have their own way of absorbing things. Others learn faster, while others are not. This shows that learners use varied strategies in which they would consider them useful and meaningful. It is also manifested that learners do not learn in precisely the same ways. They have particular approach to learning with which they feel most comfortable.

Becoming aware of the language learning strategies will help the learner perform the language tasks effectively. This has supported the theory shown by Cohen(2003), Oxford(1990) that strategy used favors effectiveness in language learning. That is, the more aware learners are on the strategies they employ, the more effective and skillful learners they will be.On the other hand, learning style helps individuals to improve their interaction within education environment. It is evident that learning styles have turned to have a real effect on the achievement of students(Cassidy, 2004).

Learning style and learning strategy are confusable concept. To make learning style clear in meaning, we may distinguish it from learning strategy. According to Ellis (2005), individual learner differences including learning style "together with situational factors determine learners' choice of learning strategies."(p.52).

According to Oxford (2001), "language learning styles and strategies are among the main factors that help determine how and how well our students learn a second language." She further mentioned that learning style is the general approach, while learning strategy is the specific action, behavior, step, or technique. She even emphasized that when a learner consciously chooses strategies that fit his or her learning style, these strategies become a useful toolkit for active, conscious, and purposeful self-regulation of learning.

Further, Tupas (2004) defined language learning strategies as specific actions, behaviors and mental processes which learners deploy to facilitate efficient language learning. Much research has shown that use of language learning strategies correlates with successful second language learning. Moreover, it has also been found that 'better' language learners are able to reflect more on their own learning strategies than those who perform relatively poorly in language learning. These general findings point to the need for teachers and learners to know more about these strategies to maximize learning opportunities in the second language classroom.

Learners themselves should be more aware as to what learning styles and learning strategies would be more beneficial for them. This will definitely help them execute the learning tasks and use them to their advantage to improve their academic performance. On the other hand, Chiya (2003) stressed that teachers must be attentive to students' learning styles and introduce, and expose them to suitable learning strategies for successful learning takes place in the classroom.

Teachers should assess the learning styles of their learners and adapt their classroom methods to best fit each learner's learning needs. It is evident that learners will learn best if taught in a method deemed appropriate for their learning style (Pashler, et at, 2008). Chiya (2003) and Al-Hebaishi (2012) state that knowing the positive impact of learning style and strategies towards learners, many educators have started to develop good lesson plan and teaching methods that suit the learners' preferences.

Oxford (1990: 14-16) implicitly states that there are two big categories of learning strategies. They are direct strategies and indirect strategies. *Direct strategies* include memory strategies, cognitive strategies, and compensation strategies. *Indirect strategies*, on the other hand, include: metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies.

According to Oxford(2001), six subscales were established from SILL to facilitate more thorough understanding of the learning strategies of the ESL/ FL. These subscales included:memory strategies, such as grouping, imagery, rhyming, and structured reviewing; cognitive strategies, such as reasoning, analyzing, summarizing (all reflective of deep processing), as well as general practicing; compensation strategies (to compensate for limted knowledge), such as guessing meanings from the context in reading and listening and using synonyms and gestures to convey meaning when the precise expression is not known; metacognitive strategies, such as paying attention, consciously searching for practice opportunities, planning for language tasks, self-evaluating one's progress, and monitoring errors; affective (emotional, motivation-related) strategies, such as anxiety reduction, self-encouragement , and self-reward; and social strategies, such as asking questions, cooperating with native speakers of the language , and becoming culturally aware.

Reid (1995), on the other hand, divided learning styles into three major categories: cognitive learning styles, personality learning styles, and sensory learning styles. Her classification subsumed some of the key dimensions in the models presented in the previous section. Cognitive learning styles, for example, include field independent-field dependent, analytic-global, and reflective-impulsive.

Sensory learning styles in Reid's (1995) taxonomy are subdivided into two categories:perceptual learning styles and environmental learning styles. The former includes auditory, visual, tactile, and kinesthetic learning. In the category of environmental learning styles, there is a distinction between physical and sociological aspects. The first dimension refers to those who learn more effectively when variables such as temperature, sound, light, food, time, and classroom arrangement are considered. Sociological learners, in contrast, learn more effectively when variables such as group, individual, pair, and teamwork, and level of teacher authority are taken into account.

As the main focus of the the study, the Perceptual Learning Styles included the following:

a)Visual. visual learners learn well from seeing words in books, on the chalkboard, and in workbooks. These learners grasp information most effectively if provided through the visual channel. They remember and understand information and instructions better if they read them. They prefer reading tasks and often use colorful highlighting schemes to make certain information visually more salient. Visual learners favor visual media such as films and videos. In lectures, their understanding is considerably increased by a handout, aids such as overhead transparencies, or by taking extensive notes (Dörnyei, 2005).

b)Auditory. Auditory learners predominantly learn from hearing words spoken and from oral explanation and other sources of auditory input such as lectures or audiotapes. They may remember information by reading aloud or by moving their lips as they read. Their learning is enhanced if they engage in discussions and group work (Dörnyei, 2005). They could also gain benefit from making tapes to listen to, by teaching other students, and by conversing with their teacher (Reid, 1987).

c. Kinesthetic. Kinesthetic learners learn best by being physically involved in classroom experiences. They remember information well when they actively participate in activities and role-playing in the classroom. A combination of stimuli (e.g., an audiotape combined with an activity) will help them understand new material better. However, they need frequent breaks; sitting motionless for hours is usually difficult for them. They often tend to walk around while, for example, trying to memorize something (Dörnyei, 2005).

d. Tactile. As a learning style, tactile differs from kinesthetic in that it involves touching and manipulation of objects while the latter concerns whole-body movement and involvement (Dörnyei, 2005). Tactile learners prefer a hands-on and touching learning approach. Writing notes or instructions can help them remember information better. They enjoy making posters, collages, and the like. Working with flashcards, handling and building models, conducting a laboratory experiment, and touching and working with new materials are among their favorites.

e. Individual. Those students with a strong individual learning style preference learn best when they work alone. They think better when they study alone. They also understand material best when they learn it alone and make better progress in learning when they work by themselves.

f. Group. In sharp contrast to individual learners, those preferring group learning style learn more easily when they study with at least one other student. They tend to be more successful when they work cooperatively with others. They value group interaction and class work with other students. The stimulation they receive from group work helps them learn and understand new information better.

In this premise, the researcher is motivated to determine the language learning strategies and learning styles of the students of the Department of Arts and Humanties of College of Arts and Sciences, Cagayan State University-Carig Campus. The result would be of great help in enhancing the teaching methodologies, curriculum, and assessments not only for the programs under the department but the whole college in general.

II. Objectives

Generally, **t**his study aimed to identify the learning styles ad language learning strategies of the first year communication and language students under the Department of Arts and Humanities, College of Arts and Sciences, Cagayan State University-Carig Campus for the school year 2018-2019.

Specifically, it attempted to:

1. Describe the profile variables of the participants which include sex, high school graduate from, parents' highest educational attainment, language used at home, and CAT result;

2. Determine the most frequently used language learning strategies by the particcipants;

3. Determine the the most preferred learning styles of the participants; and

4. Correlate the language learning strategies and the learning styles of the respondents with respect to their profile variables.

II. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Descriptive-correlational design was employed in this study. It described the profile of the participants as well as the learning styles and language learning strategies. Further, it correlated the profile variables of the

particpants and their learning styles and language learning strategies.

Participants

The participantsof the study were the officially enrolled students from three programs of the Department of Arts and Humanities, namely; Bachelor of Arts in Communication, Bachelor of Arts in Engliah Language Studies, and Bachelor of Sciences in Indusatrial and Commercial Communication for the school year 2017-2018. Total enumeration technique was employed in choosing the 94 participants.

Instrumentation

The study utilized two main instruments. The first instrument was The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) developed by Oxford(1990) which presents the 50 items that suggest different language learning strategies, including memory strategies reflected in statements 1-9, cognitive strategies in statements 10-23, compensation strategies in statements 24-29, metacognitive strategies in statements 30-38, affective strategies in statements 39-44, and social strategies in statements 45-50.

The second instrument was The Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire (PLSPQ) developed by Joy Reid(1987). This instrument consists of 30 randaomly ordered statements and participants respond on the basis of a five point Likert Scale ranging from *Strongly Agree*(5 points), *Agree* (4 points), *Undecided* (3 points), *Disagree* (2 points) to *Strongly Agree* (1 point).

The six components of perceptual learning styles are measrued through questions 6, 10, 12, 24, and 29 (Visual); questions 1,7,9,17, and 20 (Auditory); questions 2, 8, 15, 19 and 26 (Kinesthetic); questions 11, 14, 16, 22, and 25 (Tactile); questions 3, 4, 5, 21, and 23 (Group Learning; and questions 13, 18, 27, 28, and 30 (Individual learning).
Legend:

Analysis of Data

In analyzing the profile variables of the participants, frequency counts and percentages were used. The language learning strategies and learning styles of the participants were computed in terms of mean and standard deviation.Oxford (1990) suggestsa mean of lower than 2.5 for “low”, a mean range of 2.5 to 3.4 for “medium,” and a mean range of 3.5 for “higjh” levels of strategy use.

To identify the language learning strategy most or least commonly used by the respondents, the 50-item questionnaire was categorized according to the six subscales of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning by Oxford(1990). The responsens of the participants were tallied and analyzed using the scheme above to determine the interpretation according to the 5-point Likert Scale. The mean of each statement and the mean of each subscale were also computed to identify the rank of the language learning strategy used. Chi square was used in determining the correlation of the language learning strategies, the learning styles, and the profile variables.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the participants according to Sex

The table presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to sex. As gleaned from the table, female respondents outnumbered its male counterpart with a frequency of 74 or 78.7 out of 94 respondents, while the male respondents have the frequency of 20 or 21.3. This shows that communication and language courses are female-dominated. This further displays that programs under the Department of Arts and Humanities are attracted to females because of the possible job opportunities after graduation.

Table 1. Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to sex.

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	20	21.3
Female	74	78.7
Total	**94**	**100.0**

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Participants according to Course

The table presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to course. As gleaned from the table, across three programs offered in the department, Bachelor of Sciences in Industrial and Commercial Communication (BSICC) has the highest enrolees with a frequency of 34 or 36.2 percent, followed by Bachelor of Arts in English Language Studies which has a frequency of 32 or 34.0 percent, while the least is the Bachelor of Arts in Communication which has a frequency of 28 or 29.8 percent.

The data reveal that BSICC has the highest number of enrolees because of its nature. The program is designed as a ladderized course. A Certificate of Completion will be given to a BSICC student once satisfying all the requirements in every year level. The said certifacates are as follows: Certificate of Completion in Advertsingand Promotion, Associate in Translation Services, Diploma in Contact Center Services, and Medical Transcription.

Table 2. Frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to course.

Course	Frequency	Percent
AB English Language Studies	32	34.0
AB Communication	28	29.8
BSICC	34	36.2
Total	**94**	**100.0**

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Participants according to High School Graduated from

Table 3 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to high school graduated from. As gleaned from the table, majority of the enrolees in the department had finished their high school education in a public school. This shows that students pursuing their tertiary education at Cagayan State University have an everagefamily income. Cagayan State University offers free tuition fee which attracts more students most especially those who come from poor family yet interested to finish their studies.

Table 3. Frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to high school graduated from.

	Frequency	Percent
Private	23	24.5
Public	71	75.5
Total	**94**	**100.0**

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Participants according to Fathers' Highest Educational Attainament

Table 4 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the particpants according to fathers' highest educational attainment. As gleaned from the table, out of 94 respondents 25(26.6%) of them have fathers who had finished their high school and had only one difference from those who pursued their college level with a frequency of 24(25.5%), followed by high school level and elementary graduate with 14(14.9) and 11(11.7) respectively. Both College graduate and elementary level have the same frequency of 9(.96) being the least. The data simply display that the participants' fathersare equipped with the knowledge needed in guiding their children. Fathers have possessed technical skills that could be of great help academically.

Table 4. Frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to fathers' highest educational attainament.

Father	Frequency	Percent
College Graduate	9	9.6
College Level	24	25.5
High School Graduate	25	26.6
High School Level	14	14.9
Elementary Graduate	11	11.7
Elementary Level	9	9.6
No Response	2	2.1
Total	**94**	**100.0**

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Participants according to Fathers' Highest Educational Attainament

Table 5 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the particpants according to mothers' highest educational attainment. As gleaned from the table, majority of the mothers had completed their secondary education with a frequency of 34(36.2%), followed high school level with 17(18.1%), college level with 14 (14.9%), College graduate with 10 (10.6%), Elementary graduate with 9(9.6%), and elementary with 7(7.4%). With MA/MS Units was the least with a frequency of 1(1.1%).The data display that the respondents' mothers are able to guide their children as they pursue their academic endeavor.

Table 5. Frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to mothers' highest educational attainament

Mother	Frequency	Percent
With MA/MS Units	1	1.1
College Graduate	10	10.6
College Level	14	14.9

High School Graduate	34	36.2
High School Level	17	18.1
Elementary Graduate	9	9.6
Elementary Level	7	7.4
No Response	2	2.1
Total	**94**	**100.0**

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Participants According to Language Used at Home

Table 6 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to language used at home. As shown in the table, half of the participants speak Ilocano with a frequency of 47 or 50%, followed by Itawes with a frequency of 24 or 25.5 % and Tagalog with a frequency of 16 or 17 %. English and Ibanag have the same frequency of 2 or 2.1%. This confirms the findings of Suyu( ) that migration made Ilocano the dominat language spoken in the province, composing 67.3% of the total population.

Table 6. Frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to language used at home.

Language	Frequency	Percent
Ilocano	47	50.0
Itawes	24	25.5
English	2	2.1
Tagalog	16	17.0
Ibanag	2	2.1
Others	1	1.1
No Answer	2	2.1
Total	94	100.0

Frequency and percentage distribution according College Admission Test Result

Table 7 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to College Admission Test(CAT) result. As shown in the table, almost half of the particpants got a percentile between 50.01-75.00 with a frequencyof 38 (40.4%), followed by 75.01+ with a frequency of 24(25.5%), 25.01-50.00 with a frequency of 218 (19.1%), and 0.01-25.00 with a frequency 14 (14.9) % respectively. The mean average is 61.60 with a standard deviation of 21.33. This means that the particpants have an average performance in the CAT Examination, basis to be accepted in a certain program.

Table 7. Frequency and percentage distribution according College Admission Test Result

Percentile	**Frequency**	**Percent**
0.01 - 25.00	14	14.9
25.01 - 50.00	18	19.1
50.01 - 75.00	38	40.4

75.01+	24	25.5
Total	94	100.0

Mean 61.60 Std. Deviation 21.33

Descriptive Statistics of the Leanguage Learning Strategies

Table 8 presents the descriptive statistics of six learning strategies. As shown in the table. The overall weighted mean is 3.58*(High).* This means that the participants utilize varied language learning strategies in order to learn.

As regards strategies most frequently employed by the participants in this study, metacognition was ranked 1 with a mean of 3.88 *(High).*This suggests that students tend to be more instrinsically motivated to plan, direct, manage, maximize their own learning. They focus on centering learning so that the attention could be directed toward certain language activities or skills. They do arranging and planning learning inorder to get maximum benefit from their energy and effort. Finally, they consider evaluating learning. This helps them monitor errors and evaluate progress.

Second most used strategies are social strategies with a mean of 3.69*(High).* This shows that they practice asking questions, cooperating with others, and emphathizing with others. Asking questions is the most helpful and comes closest to understanding the meaning. It helps in conversation by generating response from the partners and shows interest and involvement. Further, cooperation with other eliminates competition and in its place brings group spirit. Studies show that the cooperative learning results in higher self-esteem, increased confidence, and rapid achievement. Third was the affective strategies with a mean of 3.62 *(High).* This displays that the participants are able to control their attitudes and emotions about learning. They are aware that negative feelings retard learning.

With these three having high frequencies, it implies that the students favor the use of indirect strategies rather than direct strategies.This suggests that they support language learning through "focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities, controlling anxiety, increasing cooperation, and empathy and other means "rather than "requiring the mental processing of language learning" (Oxford, 1990, p. 151).

In the study conducted by Ella (2018), she had made similar findings that of the six language learning strategies, metacognitive strategies are the most frequently used while the memory strategies are the least used. This metacognitive preference can be explained by the motivation a learner expresses in learninjg a language. According to Oxford and Nyikos (1989), motivation, among the manyu internal and external factors, has the most powerful influence on strategy choice. It also suggests that there exists an association between the degree of motivation a learner has, and the number of strategies used. Coversely, the more motivated the learners are, the more strategies they tend to use. Nikoopour and Farsani (2010) explained that between intrinsic and extrinsic potivation, intrinsic motivation has shown to have an effect in strategy use. They proved that intrinsic motivation contributes higly in the increased use of metacognitive and congtivitve strategies of irianian EFL learners.

The findings of the presents study corroborate the study conducted by Muniandy and Shuib (2016) in Malaysia. Their study entitled 'Learning Styles, Language Learning Strategies and Fields of Study among ESL learners found that metacognition was the most frequently employed learning strategies of the respondents.

In the study of Alcazaren(2016) entiled " Language Learning Stragies: The Case of Foreign Multilinguals in a Philippine Secondary Schools', he confirmed the result of the study that metacognitive was the most frequently used strategic category, followed by cognitive, social, compensation, memory, and affective.

However, the results of the present study contradict the findings of Al-Hebaishi (2012) in his study on

Taibak University's female EFL majors using the Language learning Style Questionnaire and SILL on eighty-eight (88) participants. He states that the major preference of the participants for learning strategies were memory and affective strategies in which in the present study, memory strategy was the least preferred one, while affective strategy was ranked 3.

Table 8. Descriptive statistics of language learning strategies.

Memory Strategies	**Weighted Mean**	**Interpretation**	**Rank**
1. I think of relationship between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	3.72	High	
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	3.56	High	
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help remember the word.	3.41	Moderate	
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	3.49	Moderate	
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.	3.18	Moderate	
6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.	2.63	Moderate	
7. I physically act out new English words.	3.07	Moderate	
8. I review English lessons often.	3.46	Moderate	
9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page. On the board, or on a street sign.	3.40	Moderate	
Sub-Weighted Mean	**3.32**	**Moderate**	**6**
Cognitive Strategies			
10. I say or write new English words several times.	3.45	Moderate	
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	3.43	Moderate	
12. I practice the sounds of English.	3.79	High	
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	3.48	Moderate	
14. I start conversations in English.	3.31	Moderate	
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	3.91	High	
16. I read for pleasure in English.	3.46	Moderate	
17. I write notes, messages, letter, and reports in English.	3.69	High	
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3.74	High	
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	3.37	Moderate	
20. I try to find patterns in English.	3.23	Moderate	
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	3.26	Moderate	
22. I try not to translate word-for –word.	3.55	High	
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read	3.60	High	

in English.			
Sub-Weighted Mean	**3.52**	**High**	**4**
Compensation strategies			
24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	3.48	Moderate	
25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	3.66	High	
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	3.52	High	
27. I read English without looking up every new words.	2.89	Moderate	
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	3.44	Moderate	
29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	3.82	High	
Sub-Weighted Mean	**3.47**	**Moderate**	**5**
Metacongition strategies			
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English	3.96	High	
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	4.18	High	
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	4.30	High	
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	4.19	High	
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	3.30	Moderate	
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	3.13	Moderate	
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	3.77	High	
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	4.10	High	
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	4.00	High	
Sub-Weighted Mean	**3.88**	**High**	**1**
Affectiver strategies			
39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English	3.73	High	
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	4.04	High	
41. I give myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	3.96	High	
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	3.64	High	
43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	3.21	Moderate	
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	3.12	Moderate	
Sub-Weighted Mean	**3.62**	**High**	**3**
Social strategies			
45. If do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	4.01	High	
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	3.76	High	
47. I practice English with other students.	3.61	High	
48. I ask for help from English speakers.	3.59	High	

49. I ask questions in English.	3.57	High	
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	3.61	High	
Sub-Weighted Mean	**3.69**	**High**	**2**
Over-All Weighted Mean	**3.58**	**High**	

Descriptive Statistics of the Learning Styles

Table 9 presents the overall mean score values of the 94 participants and their learning styles. As gleaned from the table, the mean score is 3. 96*(Agree).*The table shows that studentshave different approaches to how theyprocess information. This simply implies that teachers may vary their teaching strategies, assignments, and learning activities.

As shown from the table, the highest mean score of 4.13 *(Agree)* was recorded for Auditory learning style, followed by Kinesthetic with a mean score of 4.05 *(Agree)*and Visual with a mean score of 4.03 *(Agree*). This means that auditory learners obtain information via listening and they prefer classroom activities like role-play and discussion. They retain information best when it is presented through sound and speech.

Further, auditory learners will be some of the most engaged and responsive members of any classroom. They are good at explaining ideas out loud, knack for understanding changes in tone voice, skilled at oral reports and class presentations, unafraid to speak it up in class, follows verbal directions well, effective member o study groups, gifted storyteller, and able to work through complex problems by talking out loud.(https://www.thuoghtco.com/auditory-learning-style-p3-32120380).

Kinesthetic learners, on the other hand, process information best when they are physically engaged during the learning process. They have a hard time learning through traditional lecture-based schooling because the body does not make the connection that they are doing something when they're listening without movement. Their brains are engaged, but their bodies are not, whicvh makes it more difficulty for them to process the information. In short, these learners have great hand-eye coordination, quick reactions, excellent motor memory, excellent experimenters, good at sports, perform well in art and drama, and high levels of energy.(https://www/thoughtco.com/the-kinesthetic-learning-style-3212046)

Muniandy&Shuib (2016) supported the findings of the present study.They found thatr auditory style is the most preffered LS of the respondets from the School of Communication. This indicates clearly that the respondents in this study learn best by involving themselves in activities like role-play and discussion.Communication students enjoy doing projects and interacting with peers for effective learning to take place.

The findings of the study almost present a close scenary with the study of Karthigeyan&Nirmala (2013) in India entitled "Learning Style Preference of English Language Learners. They found that visual learning style is predominatly style of students' second language learning followed by auditory learning style. In this study, visual learning style was ranked 3 while auditory was the most preferred learning style. It is important to note that while kinesthetic learning style was second most preferred learning style in this study, it was also the least preferred learning style of the students in their study.

Peacock (2001)affirmed the findings of study when he conducted a research on learning and teaching styles based on Reid's two major hypotheses. In his study, 206 EFL learners and 46 EFL educators at a Hong Kong University were interviewed and given Reid's Perceptual Learning Style Questionnaire. Based on the study, he found most learners preferred kinesthetic, auditory, and group.

The findings for the Kinesthetic learning styles matched the findings obtained by Mulalic, Shah, and Ahmad (2009), Nasserieh (2009), Mohamad and Rajuddin (2010), as well as Gee-Whai (2018) whereby the students favoured the kinesthetic learning style, in comparison to other learning styles. Kinesthetic students learn best when they are given the opportunity to do 'hands-on' activitiesd, such as working on experiments in laboratory, handling and building models, as well as touching and working with materials. Such activities provide them a successful situation (Obralic&Akbarov, 2012).

Generally, most studies on PLS show that most ESL students are kinaesthetic (Reid, 1987; Peacock, 2011; Ong, Ragendram and Mond, Suffian, 2006; Mimi Mohaffyza& Muhammad, 2010).Related studies (Lee, 1976: Reid 1987) have supported the results of the present investigation that English as Second language (ESL) students varied significantly in their sensory preferences. Students from Asian cultures were often highly visual, and Koreans being the most visual and Spanish speakers preferred visual and auditory styles.

Table 9. Descriptive statistics of learning styles.

Item	Visual Learning	Mean	DV	Rank
6	I learn better by reading what the teacher writes on the chalkboard.	4.31	Strongly Agree	
10	When I read instructions, I remember them better.	4.10	Agree	
12	I understand better when I read instructions.	4.44	Strongly Agree	
24	I learn better by reading than by listening to someone.	3.82	Agree	
29	I learn more by reading textbooks than by listening to lectures.	3.48	Agree	
Sub-Weighted Mean		**4.03**	**Agree**	**3**
	Auditory Learning style			
1	When the teacher tells me the instructions I understand better.	4.17	Agree	
7	I learn better by reading what the teacher writes on the chalkboard.	4.31	Strongly Agree	
9	When I do things in class, I learn better.	4.06	Agree	
17	I learn better in class when the teacher gives a lecture.	4.24	Strongly Agree	
20	I learn better in class when I listen to someone.	3.88	Agree	
Sub-Weighted Mean		**4.13**	**Agree**	**1**
	Kinesthetic Learning Style			
2	I prefer to learn by doing something in class.	4.00	Agree	
8	When I do things in class, I learn better.	4.06	Agree	
15	I enjoy learning in class by doing experiments.	3.98	Agree	
19	I understand things better in class when I participate in role-playing.	4.02	Agree	
26	I learn best in class when I can participate in related activities.	4.23	Strongly Agree	
Sub-Weighted Mean		**4.05**	**Agree**	**2**
	Tactile Learning Style			
11	I learn more when I can make a model of something.	3.80	Agree	
14	I learn more when I make something for a class project.	4.12	Agree	
16	I learn better when I make drawings as I study.	3.51	Agree	
22	When I build something, I remember what I have learned better.	3.99	Agree	
25	I learn better by reading than by listening to someone.	3.82	Agree	
Sub-Weighted Mean		**3.85**	**Agree**	**5**
	Group Learning Style			
3	I get more work done when I work with others.	3.72	Agree	

4	I learn more when I study with a group.	3.72	Agree	
5	In class, I learn best when I work with others.	3.91	Agree	
21	I enjoy working on an assignment with two or three class-mates.	3.67	Agree	
23	I prefer to study with others.	3.65	Agree	
	Sub-Weighted Mean	**3.73**	**Agree**	**6**
	Individual Learning Style			
13	When I study alone, I remember things better.	4.24	Strongly Agree	
18	When I work alone, I learn better.	4.14	Agree	
27	In class, I work better when I work alone.	3.83	Agree	
28	I prefer working on projects by myself.	3.74	Agree	
30	I prefer to work by myself.	3.82	Agree	
Sub-Weighted Mean		**3.95**	**Agree**	**4**
Over All Weighted Mean		**3.96**	**Agree**	

Legend: 4.21-5.0 Strongly Agree (SA) 3.41-4.20 Agree (A) 2.61-3.40 Undecided (U)
1.81-2.60 Disagree (D) 1.0-1.80 Strongly Disagree (SD)

Correlation between Language Learning Strategies and the Participants' Profile Variables

Table 11 presents the test of difference between language learning strategies and the participants' profile variables. As seen in the table, the p=value of all the variables which are greater than the alpha (0.05) shows that there is no significant difference of the participants' language learning strategies when grouped according to their profile variables. This means that the participants' language learning strategies do not differ.

Table 10. Correlation between language learning strategies and the participants' profile varialbes.

Demographic Variables vs Learning Strategies	Chi-Square Test Value	P Value (Sig. 2–Tailed)	Inference
Course	5.749	0.452	Not Significant
Sex	1.133	0.769	Not Significant
High School Graduated from	1.217	0.749	Not Significant
Father's Highest Educ'l Attainment	15.914	0.388	Not Significant
Mother's HiighestEduc'l Attainment	13.394	0.768	Not Significant
Language Used at Home	8.826	0.886	Not Significant
CAT Result	7.612	0.232	Not Significant

*significant at .05

Correlation between Learning Styles and the Participants' Profile Variables

Table 11 presents the test of difference between learning styles and the participants' profile variables. As seen in the table, the p=value of all the variables which are greater than the alpha (0.05) shows that there is no significant difference of the participants' learning styles when grouped according to their profile variables. This means that the participants' learning styles do not differ.

Table 11. Correlation between language styles and the participants' profile variables.

Variables vs Learning Style	Chi-Square Test Value	P Value (Sig. 2–Tailed)	Inference
Course	5.629	0.229	Not Significant
Sex	2.442	0.295	Not Significant
High School Graduated from	2.092	0.351	Not Significant
Fathers'Highest Educ'l Attainment	8.644	0.566	Not Significant
Mothers' Highest Educ'l Attainment	5.816	0.925	Not Significant
Language Used at Home	2.646	0.989	Not Significant
CAT Result	5.724	0.275	Not Significant

*significant at .05

IV. Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the results of the study, it is concluded that the participants most frequently used language learning stragies are indirect strategies in which metacognition was the most applied strategies, followed by social as well as affective strategies. Further, the most preferred learning style isauditory, followed by kinesthetic and visual learning styles. In like manner, the profile variables of the participants would never affect their language learning strategies and learning styles.

With this, the study recommends that educators should design innovative teaching methologies what capture the frequently used language learning strategies as well as learning styles of the students. It is important for educators to understand the differences in their students' language learning strategies and learning styles, so that they can implement best practice strategies into their daily activities, curriculum, and assessments.

The following is a list of recommended activities based on the learning strategy categories as well as learning styles mentioned in this study. For metacognitive strategy, preveiwing, skimming, identifying the gist, organizational planning, listening or readinh selectively, scanning, finding specific information, monitoring comprehension, monitoring production; for Social strategy, quesitoning for clarification, cooperatinh or working with classmates, thinking aloud, developing turn-taking skills, assigning buddies; and for affective strategy, speaking in front of an audience, short speeches are to be used.

As regards learning styles of the partiicpants, the following activities are suggested. For Auditory Learning, Call on auditory learners to answer questions; Lead class discussion and reward class participation.; During lectures, ask auditory learners to repeat ideas in their own words; Record your lectures so that auditory learners can listen to them more than once; Allow any struggling auditory learner to take an oral insteas of a written one; Create lesson plans that include a social element, such as paired readings, group work, experiments, projects, and performances; and Modulate your vocal tone, inflection, and bosy language during lectures.

On therther hand, for Kinesthetic Learning, Allow kinesthetic learners to stand, bounce their legs, or

doodle during lectures; You will get more out of them in class if they can move around a little bit; Offer various methods of instruction-lectures, paired readins, group work, experiments, projects, plays etc.; Ask you kinesthetic learners to complete relevant tasks during the lecture, like filling out a worksheet or taking notes; Allow kinesthetic learners to perform movement tasks before and after lectures, like handling out quizzes, writing on the chalkboard, or even reaaranging desks; If you feel the kinesthetic learners slipping away from you in class, pause the lecture and have the whole class do something energetic: marching, stretching, or switching desks; and Keep your lectures short and sweet! Plan several different activities throughout each class perio in order to be mindful of all your students' learning style.

Acknowledgment

The researcher deeply acknowledges the College of Arts Sciences, Cagayan State University-CarigCampus for the encouragement of venturing to research endeavor. He also wishes to extend his gratitude to his colleagues and the students from the Department of Arts and Humanities for the incomparable support and coorperation during the conduct of the study.

References

[1] Alcazaren, Holden Kenneth. (2016). Language learning Strategies: The Case of Foreign Multilinguals in a Philippine Secondary Schools. The International Academic Forum.www.iafor.org

[2]Al-Hebaishi, SafaaMohmmed. (2012). Investigating the Relationships between Learning Styles. Strategies and the Academic Performance of Saudi English Majors. International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education 1(8).510-519.

[3] Cassidy, S. (2004). Learning Styles: An Overview of theories, models, and measures, Educational Psychol ogy, 24(4) 219-244.

[4] Chiya, S. (2003). The importance of learning styles and learning strategies in EFL teaching in Japan.

[5] Cohen, A. (2003). Strategy training for second language learners. Retrieved My 10, 2005 from the World Wide web: http:/www.cal.org./resources/digest/0302cohen.html

[6] Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language ac quisition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[7] Ella, Jennibelle R. (2018). Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency of Grade 12 Students. DLSU Research Congress: Manila, Philippines. June 20 to 22, 2018. Retrieved from http:www.dlsu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/pdf/conferences/research-congress-proceedings/2018/11-11.pdf on Feb. 02, 2019.

[8] Ellis, R. (2005). The study of second language acquisition. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Education Press.

[9] Gee-Whai, Marcus.(2018). Analysing Students' Perceptual Learning Styles at a Polytechnic in Malaysia. Retrieved June 18, 2020 from https://seminar.utmspace.edu.my/lspgabc2018/Doc/7.pdf

[10] Karthigeyan, K. &Nirmala, K.(2013). Learning Style Preference of English Language Learners. Vol. 2, No.1, ISSN: 2320-009X, 134-140. Retrieved from http://www.confabjournals.com/confabjournals/images/622013824214.pdf

[11] Lee, M. (1976). Some common grammatical errors made in written English by Chinese students. CATESOL occasional Papers, 3, 115-120.

[12] Mimi Mohaffya Mohammad & Muhammad Rashid Rajuddin. (2010). Perceptual Learning Styles of Pre-service Teachers in Engineering Education. The 3rd Reginal Conference in Engineering education 2010(RCEE 2010) and Research in Higher Education, Kiching Sarawak.

[13] Muniandy, J. &MunirShuib. (2016). Learning Style, Language Learning Strategies and fields of Study among ESL Learners. Malaysian Journal of ELT Research. Vol. 12(1).pp. 1-19.

[14] Mohmad, M.M., &Rajuddin, M.R. (2010). Perceptual Learning Styles of Pre-Service Teachers in Engineer ing Education. In The 3rd Regional Conference in Engineering Education 2010.

[15] Mulalic, A.,Shah, P. M., & Ahmad, F.(2009). Learning-style preference of ESL students. Asean Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher education (AJTLHE), 1(2),9-17.

[16] Nokoopour, J. &Farsani, M. (2010). On the relationship between language learning strategies and person alitytypes among Iranian EFL learners. Journal of Englis Studies, 1(1). 81-101.

[17] Obralic, N., &Akbarov, A. (2012). Students' preference on perceptual learning style. Actadidacticanapocen sia, 5(3), 31.

[18] Ong, A., Rajenddram, S.C., and Mohd. Sffian Md. Yusof. (2006). Learning Style Preferences and English Proficiency among Cohort 3 Students in IPBA. Retrieved January 7, 2007 from http://apps.emoe.gov.my/ipba/Research/stdntseminar/pg23to36pdf.

[19] Oxford, R.L. (1990). Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know. New York: Newbury House.

[20] Oxford, R. and Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. Modern Language Journal 72(3):291-300.

[21] Oxford, Rebecca L. (2001). Language learning styles and strategies. In Celce-Murcia, Marianne (ed).Teach ing English as a Second or Foreign Language. 3rd ed., pp. 359-366. USA: Heinle&Heinle Thomson Learn ing.

[22] Oxford, R. L., (1996a). Language learning strategies around the world: cross-cultural perspec tives. Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.

[23] Oxford, R. L., (1996b). Personality type in the foreign or second language classroom: theoretical and em pirical perspectives. In A. Horning & R. Sudol (Eds.), Understanding literacy: personality preferences in rhetorical and psycholinguistic contexts (pp. 149-175). Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

[24] Pashler, H., McDaniel, M., Rohrer, D. & Bjork, R. (2008). Learning Styles: concepts and evidence. Psycho logical Science in the Public Interest, 9, 105-119.

[25] Peacock, M. (2011). Match or mismatch? Learning styles and teaching styles in EFL. International Jour-nal
ofAPllied Linguistics, 11, 1-20.

[26] Reid, J. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students, TESOL Quarterly, 21, 87-111.

[27] Reid, J. (1987). The Learning Style Preferences of ESL Students, TESOL Learning Journal. 39,43-55.

[28] Suyu, Estrella. (_____). Cagayan Valley: The Ibanag. Retrieved June 22, 2020 from https://ncca.gov.ph/about-ncca-3/subcommissions/subcommission-on-cultural-cmmunities-and-tradi tional-arts-northern.

[29]Tupas, T. Ruanni F.(2004). Second Language Teaching. UP Open University.p.180-182

[30] Troike, Muriel Saville.(2006). Introducing Second Language Acquisition. New York: Cambridge University
Press. p. 93.

Retrieved June 23, 2020 from https://www.thoughtco.com/auditory-learning-style-p3-3212038

Retrieved June 23, 2020 from https://www/thoughtco.com/the-kinesthetic-learning-style-3212046