

# CHAPTER - ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 General Background

Language, so far, is known as one of the prominent features of the human beings. It distinguishes human beings from other animals. It is a powerful means of communication. We express our thoughts, feelings, emotions, desires, and exchange factual information through it.

Language is quintessentially human. We use spoken languages, everyday, face-to-face, as a means of communication and written language allows us to record and hold on to our history across generations. Language itself is very complex. It allows us to express innumerable ideas, describe events, tell stories, recite poems, buy; sell...the list is unending. Language calls for an intricate web of skill we usually take for granted. It is an integrated part of everyday life that we rely on to convey wants and needs, thoughts, concerns and plans. Using language seems as natural as breathing or walking. (Clark 2003, p.1)

Acquiring first language does not need any conscious efforts or the great deal of efforts. Every human being learns it naturally. However, learning a second language is a variable phenomenon. There are several factors that affect this learning system of the second or third or any other language. So, English also as a second language can be learnt in the variable situations and in variable ways using variable learning strategies and learning styles.

Language learning style and strategies are among the main factors that help determine how and how well our students learn a second language

or foreign language. A second language is a language studied in a setting where that language is the main vehicle of everyday communication and where abundant input exists in that language. A foreign language is a language studied in an environment where it is not the primary vehicle for daily interaction and where input in that language is restricted (Oxford, 2003, p. 47).

Second language learning refers to the conscious process by which a language other than the mother tongue is learnt in a natural or tutored setting. It covers the development of phonology, lexis, grammar, the pragmatic knowledge, but has been largely confined to morpho-syntax. The process manifests both the variable and invariable features. “The study of SLA is directed at accounting for the learners' competence, but in order to do so has set out to investigate empirically how a learner performs when he/she uses a second language.” (Ellis 1992). And we are on the point in this study that how different learners learn language differently and what may be their learning styles.

Second language learning heavily depends upon the efforts that the learners make in their learning. All the learners do not learn language in the similar way. Obviously, it is a gradual process that it is learnt in a sequence. The degree to which one achieves proficiency is different from the learners to learners. This is because there are several aspects that bring variation in the learning. Some of such factors might be linguistic, socio-linguistic, cultural and also the individual factors. Individual learners adopt different techniques in their learning. Every learner, instead of the techniques taught in the formal classes, uses their own ways to learn the language. These ways can be taken as the part of their learning which is used by different learners in different situations. Among learning styles also there are various types that the learners use for their learning. Most of the part of learning depends upon what learners do for themselves and what they do in collaboration. This study is concerned

with three of such aspects of the learners. Mainly the concern is the learning style, specifically perceptive, deductive-inductive and field dependency.

### **1.1.1 First Language Acquisition**

First language acquisition deals with the normal children's first language acquisition, when children are born they are exposed to their first language, that may be subconsciously. Learning a first language is an amazing accomplishment. It is a learning task perhaps like no other. At the onset of the language-learning odyssey, a child has much to determine about the language that he/she hears. At the end of the journey, every child who is not cognitively impaired has an intact linguistic system that allows him/ her to interact with others and to express his or her needs. Language acquisition is the study of the processes through which learners acquire language. By itself, language acquisition refers to the first language acquisition, which studies infants' acquisition of their native language, whereas second language deals with acquisition of the additional languages in both children and adults.

According to Krashan (1985) "learning carries less importance than acquisition." Moreover Krashan says that second language performer relies far more on routines and patterns than does the first language acquirer. The term second language acquisition suggests the learners can achieve communicative competence rather faster than the learners of English as a foreign language as they try to achieve their competence without having the opinions of being exposed to it outside the classroom.

Second language acquisition is the process by which people learn a second language in addition to their native language(s). But a distinction is often made between second language and foreign language the latter being learned for use in an area where that language is not generally spoken. (Krashan, 1985)

Krashan's (2002) research findings show that first language influence in second language learning appears to be strongest in complex word order and in word for word translations and phrases. Then he says that first language influence is weaker in bound morphology and seems to be strongest in "acquisition poor" environments.

Every child who is not cognitively impaired acquires the first language amazingly. A normal human child is exposed to language as soon as possible after his/her birth and learns the language naturally, automatically and effortlessly. All the children go through approximately the similar stages while acquiring the first language, for example; crying, cooing, and babbling to saturation. The empirical research base tells us that, for children who grow up monolinguals, the bulk of language is acquired between 18 months and three to four years of age and child language acquisition happens in a predictable pattern (Ortega, 2009, p. 3). The field has been important to learn since much second language acquisition research parallels development in child language acquisition.

### **1.1.2 Second Language Acquisition**

In general, SLA refers to the process of learning another language after the native language has been learned. Sometimes the term refers to the learning of a third or fourth language. The important aspect is that SLA refers to the learning of a non-native language after the learning of the native language. At first sight, the meaning of the term "second language acquisition" seems transparent but in fact, it requires careful explanation. It has been defined variously.

Gass and Salinker (2009, p.7) define SLA as the term that "refers to the learning of a language after the learning of the native language. As with the phrase "second language" L2 can refer to any language learned after learning the L1, regardless of whether it is the second, third, fourth or fifth language". The learning or the acquisition of such languages is called second language

acquisition the process of picking up the knowledge of a second language is concerned to learning of such language.

Ellis (1985, p.5) states “SLA is the study of how learners learn an additional language after they have acquired their mother tongue.” Similarly, according to Mitchell and Myles (2004, p.5) “SLA refers to the learning of any language to any level, provided only that the learning of the second language takes place sometimes later the acquisition of the first language”. Both of these two definitions seem to express that second language is any additional language to first language and which is always acquired after first language.

When we try to minutely analyze the definitions of SLA as stated by several theorists, they seem to agree to a common point i.e. SLA is the acquisition of any additional languages to mother tongue provided that they are learned after the acquisition of first language. Whatever way it is defined, all the definitions have a common point that second language is learning of any language subsequent to mother tongue which is a variable process. This discipline of SLA has become so broad that it has an endless explanation. But the remarkable things have is that this field is related to several other fields. This is the reason why it is called a complex one because the learning of such system is heavily dependent upon many others. The term foreign language is contrasted with the second language. The term foreign language refers to the learning of a non-native language in the environment of one’s native language, for example learning English in the Nepalese context. On the other hand, SLA refers to the learning of a non-native language in the environment where that language is spoken by the native speakers; for example, learning English in the context of the United States by any foreign learners. The contexts in which a language is learnt are greatly variable. On the other hand, the learners are also different. Being based upon such variability, the complexity of SLA is predicted. There are many notions related to SLA, not all can be described here. So, focusing upon the study upon objectives, the concern is on learning styles.

### **1.1.3 Factors Affecting Second Language Learning**

Second language (L2) learners are different. They learn with different speed and different results. There are many explanations for that issue. The general factors that influence second language learning are: age, aptitude and intelligence, cognitive style, attitudes, motivation and personality (Ellis 1985).

The aim of this topic is to present these factors and their contribution to success or failure in language learning.

#### **1.1.3.1 Age**

Age is one of the factors that influence second language learning. It is generally believed that children are better at languages than adults. However, only the studies conducted in naturalistic learning settings provide the evidence that support this assumption. Researchers have proved that learners who start learning a foreign language as children achieve a more native-like accent than those who start as adolescents or adults and they are also better in the acquisition of grammar. On the other hand, the research carried out in formal learning environments give the opposite results. In the case of classroom learning, adults appear to be better both in syntax and morphology, while adolescents are the best in the context of native like accent and they also progress faster.

The studies concerning the age factor were summarized by Ellis (1985) who states that the route of SLA is not influenced by the starting age, but there is a relationship between the rate of learning and the age of the learners.

Adolescents learn faster than adults and children as far as grammar and vocabulary are concerned. Although young learners do not learn as fast as older ones, they are prompt to gain a higher overall success because of a longer exposure to the language. He also provides some explanations of the research results. The studies do not support the critical period hypothesis, which states

that children can acquire a language naturally and with no effort to some age. The starting age is important only as far as pronunciation is concerned.

Selinger (1978) claims that there is a possibility of multiple critical periods. Cognitive explanations draw attention to the differences between children and adults in the relation to their abilities to learn a language. Older learners are able to apply linguistic rules when they use the language. For children language is a tool for expressing meaning and they cannot respond to it as a form. The explanation can also lie in affective states of the learners.

### **1.1.3.2 Intelligence and Aptitude**

Intelligence is defined and measured in terms of linguistic and logical-mathematical abilities. Success in life and learning should correlate with high IQ (intelligence quotient) tests scores. The studies on intelligence show a strong relationship between intelligence and acquisition of a foreign language but only as far as academic skills are concerned. Learners with high IQ achieve better results on language tests. It is proved that intelligence can predict the rate and success of SLA in the formal language classroom .

“The ability to perform well in standard intelligence tests correlates highly with school related second language learning, but is unrelated to the learning of a second language for informal and social functions” (Spolsky 1989, p.103). It is assumed that some people are gifted and they learn foreign languages with ease. It was observed that learners acquire a language with different results despite the fact that they are at the same age and are equally motivated. It is not just intelligence that can explain these differences.

Students need aptitude - some specific abilities, which are responsible for learning languages.

The first tests that measured aptitude are Carroll and Sapon’s Modern Language Aptitude Test (1959) and Pimsleur’s Language Aptitude Battery (1966). Carroll describes aptitude as a stable factor, which cannot be trained; it

is separate from motivation, achievement and intelligence. It is an ability that allows to learn L2 faster and with less effort. He identified four factors in language aptitude: phonemic coding ability, grammatical sensitivity, inductive language learning ability and rote learning ability. Later studies conducted by Skehan (1986) concentrated on the underlying complexity of language aptitude and its relation to first language acquisition and second language learning. He has shown two predictors of the language aptitude: ‘a general language processing capability’ and an ‘ability to use language in a decontextualized way.’ Skehan’s findings show that aptitude consists of abilities identified by earlier researchers and the ability to deal with context-free language, which is connected with learning academic skills and intelligence (Ellis, 1994, p. 113).

It is still not known whether intelligence is a part of attitude or they are separate notions. Cummins (1983) distinguished language abilities into two: cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) and basic impersonal communication skills (BICS). He suggested that CALP might be related to general intelligence while BICS to aptitude. The studies, which were concerned with formal classroom learning and measured academic language proficiency, found aptitude as a predictor of second language achievement. The researchers agree that it is necessary to improve and develop new aptitude tests, which will measure not only cognitive abilities but also communicative competence. Some researchers do not believe that something like general intelligence can influence learning a foreign language (Ellis, 1994, p.111).

All children acquire their first language successfully. Gardner (1983) introduced a theory of Multiple Intelligences. He described eight types of intelligence:

1. *Linguistic* (sensitivity to spoken and written language, the capacity to use the language to accomplish certain goals);

2. *Logical-mathematical* (ability to detect patterns, reason deductively and think logically);
3. *Spatial* (ability to recognize and use the patterns of wide space and more confined areas);
4. *Musical* (capacity to recognize and create musical pitches and rhythmic patterns);
5. *Bodily-kinesthetic* (ability to use mental abilities to coordinate bodily movements);
6. *Interpersonal* (capacity to understand intentions, motivations and desires of other people);
7. *Intrapersonal* (ability to understand oneself, to develop a sense of self-identity)
8. *Naturalistic* (ability to understand the natural world).

He states that every person possesses the eight types of intelligence, which evolve independently at different times and to different degrees. Learners should be encouraged to develop all types of intelligences because they are closely bound and the growth of one area increases the capacity of the whole. Teachers should use a variety of techniques and materials in order to enable students to learn using their strengths and achieve better results. He claims that people are intelligent in different ways and they also learn in different ways. The next part of this chapter describes different learning styles which cannot be mistaken with multiple intelligences because a learning style is the way we approach a learning task while intelligence is a capacity to deal with this task.

### **1.1.3.3 Learning Styles**

Keefe (1979, as cited in Ellis 1994, p. 499) described learning styles as “the characteristic cognitive, affective, and physiological behaviors that serve relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with, and

respond to the learning environment.” Students’ learning styles can be influenced by many factors among which are their genetic background, their culture and previous learning experience. It is said that if teachers match their teaching methods to the students’ learning styles, the students will be more successful and more interested in the language. Researchers have developed many different types of the learning styles. Field dependence and independence is one of the most widely studied classifications. It was proved that people who are field independent prefer deductive way of introducing a language, and achieve high level of proficiency in the classroom (Neiman et. al. 1978; Abraham 1985). The field dependent students do better in naturalistic language environment. Brown (1994) states that neither of styles decides about success or failure in the language learning. Both types of learners can achieve a lot but in the appropriate conditions of learning. He also suggests that field dependence/independence does not have to be a stable factor and some people can change their style in different contexts and situations.

Another classification is left-right-brain dominance, which is strongly related to field dependence/independence. Brown (1994) presents a table listing left and right- brain characteristics by Torrance (1980). Left-brain dominated students are intellectual, prefer established, certain information and rely on language in thinking and remembering while right-brain dominated students are intuitive, process information in a holistic way, rely on drawing and manipulating to help them think and learn. Reid (1987) identified four learning modalities: visual (seeing), auditory (listening), kinesthetic (moving) or tactile (touching). Visual learners learn through seeing. They prefer to see a teacher during a lesson, learn by visuals: pictures, wall displays, diagrams, videos. They make notes during lectures and use lists to organize their thoughts. Auditory learners learn through listening. They prefer verbal instructions, like dialogues, discussions and plays, solve problems by talking about them, use rhythm and sound as memory aids. Kinesthetic learners learn through moving

and doing. They learn best when they are active. It is difficult for them to sit still for long periods. Tactile learners learn through touching. They use writing and drawing. They learn well in hands-on activities like projects and demonstrations.

The other learning styles are described by Willing (1987), who distinguished:

1. Concrete learning style - It is the direct means of processing information; people-oriented; spontaneous; imaginative; emotional; dislikes routinized learning; prefers kinesthetic modality.
2. Analytical learning style - It focuses on specific problems and proceeds by means of hypothetical-deductive reasoning; object oriented; independent; dislikes failure; prefers logical, didactic presentation
3. Communicative learning style - It is fairly independent; highly adaptable and flexible; responsive to facts that do not fit; prefers social learning and a communicative approach; enjoys taking decisions.
4. Authority-oriented way of learning - It is reliant to other people; needs teacher's directions and explanations; likes a structured learning environment; intolerant to facts that do not fit; prefers a sequential progression; dislikes discovery learning (Ellis 1994, p.507).

#### **1.1.3.4 Motivation and Attitudes**

Motivation is one of the most important factors in second language acquisition. It is obvious that learners who want to learn are likely to achieve more than those who do not. The role of attitudes and motivation in SLA has been investigated by Gardner and Lambert (1972), who define motivation in terms of 'the learner's overall goal or orientation', and attitude as 'the persistence shown by the learner in striving for a goal' (Ellis, 1985, p.117). They distinguish two types of motivation:

a) integrative - when learners study a language because they are interested in the people and culture of the target language;

b) instrumental - when learners' goals for learning the second language are functional, for example they need the language to get a better job. It has been stated that learners can be influenced by both types of motivation. However, there are situations when one can be more effective than the other. Integrative motivation plays a major role where L2 is learned as a 'foreign language', while an instrumental motivation is more important where L2 functions as a 'second language'. Gardner (1979) links an integrative motivation to 'additive bilingualism' which means that learners add a second language to their skills with no harm to their mother tongue. Instrumental motivation is more likely to be linked to 'subtractive bilingualism', where the learners tend to replace the mother tongue by the target language (Ellis 1985).

Attitude is someone's view regarding something. Learners have different attitudes towards the course, teachers, evaluation process and language teaching as a whole. The learners who have positive attitude towards second language, its culture and the speakers of that language tend to be successful learners whereas those who are negatively influenced by the above mentioned factors feel difficulty to learn the language. Thus, attitude is also one of the determinants of SLA. Gardner and Lambert (1983) have investigated a number of different attitudes, which were classified by Stern (1983, p. 376-77) into three types:

- 1) Attitudes towards the community and people who speak L2,
- 2) Attitudes towards learning and language concerned,
- 3) Attitudes towards languages and language learning in general.

Certain personality characteristics and general interest in foreign languages of learners can influence them in a positive or negative way. It is

also important how they feel about learning a particular language in a particular course and from a particular teacher. It is obvious that learners who have positive attitudes learn more, but also learners who learn well acquire positive attitudes. There is no doubt that motivation and attitude are very important issues as far as second language learning is concerned. But they themselves are not the key to success. They depend on success, are not stable and can change during studying the second language. Teachers should be aware of that and try to develop positive motivation in their students by making the classroom itself an environment in which they experience success. The next part of this chapter presents the role of personality, which appears to be a very important factor in SLA and is closely related to motivation.

#### **1.1.3.5 Personality**

Personality has been described as a set of features that characterize an individual. It has been stated that this concept is difficult to define and measure because of its complicated nature. Studies which investigate personality traits are based on the belief that learners bring to the classroom not only their cognitive abilities but also affective states which influence the way they acquire a language. Some of them have been found as a benefit while the others as an obstacle in learning a second language. The most important personality factors are: introversion/extroversion, self-esteem, inhibition, risk-taking, anxiety and empathy.

##### **a. Self-esteem**

People need some degree of self-esteem, self-confidence in order to succeed in any activity. Coopersmith (1967, pp. 4-5, cited by Brown, 1994, p. 137) provided the following definition of self-esteem: “By self-esteem, we refer to the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself; it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which an individual

believes himself to be capable, significant, successful and worthy.” People develop their sense of self-esteem as a result of the information they receive about themselves from others. Brown (1994, p.137) described three levels of self-esteem: global, situational and task self-esteem. He claims that situational self-esteem “might refer to SLA in general, and task self-esteem might appropriately refer to one’s self-evaluation of a particular aspect of the process: speaking, writing, a particular class in a second language, or even a special kind of classroom exercise.”

### **b. Inhibition and Risk-taking**

The concept of inhibition is closely related to the notion of self-esteem. All people protect their ego by building sets of defenses. The higher self-esteem the lower walls of inhibition and greater success in learning a foreign language. It has been suggested that inhibition influences language learning in a negative way because it discourages the risk-taking, which is an essential element in this process. It is necessary to make mistakes if a person wants to learn a foreign language. People make hypotheses about the language and then test them out by trial and many errors. If learners do not want to speak until they are absolutely certain that they are correct they will never acquire communicative skills (Brown 1994). This is mainly a problem of adults who are more self-conscious than children are. A child adopts a new language and accent more rapidly than an older person who is less open to the influences and changes.

The next thing that language learners have to face is the loss of status. They must accept the fact of being depended on others and sometimes be prepared to reveal their weaknesses or look foolish. “An individual who is detached, self-critical, and has a sense of humour can cope with this demand of language learning better than a rigid or status-conscious individual who lacks self-awareness or humour” (Stern 1983, p.382). It has been also suggested that tolerance of ambiguity is an advantageous feature as learning a

second language is closely connected with baffling and confusing situations. “The learner who is capable of accepting with tolerance and patience the frustrations of ambiguity that second language learning inevitably involves is emotionally in a better position to cope with them in a problem-solving frame of mind than a student who feels frustrated or angry in ambiguous situations” (ibid.).

### **c. Anxiety**

Anxiety is another important aspect of personality that affects learning a foreign language. Brown (1994, p.141) describes anxiety as a state of mind connected with “feelings of uneasiness, frustration, self-doubt and worry.” MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) distinguish anxiety into: trait anxiety, when some people have some general predisposition to be anxious and state anxiety, which can be experienced in a particular situation. They also identify three components of foreign language anxiety: communication apprehension, fear of negative social evaluation and test anxiety. Their studies show that “foreign language anxiety can be distinguished from other types of anxiety and that it can have a negative effect on the language learning process” (ibid.p.112). It is important to differentiate between debilitating and facilitative anxiety. Although anxiety is regarded as a negative factor which must be avoided, the concept of facilitative anxiety, “a little nervous tension in the process”, is a positive factor. It must be remembered that “both too much and too little anxiety may hinder the process of successful second language learning” (Brown, 1994, p.143).

There has been some research that investigated the reasons of the state anxiety in the classroom. Bailey (1983) found that competitiveness among students, their relationship with a teacher and tests could increase anxiety. Skehan (1989) states that it is possible that anxiety can be a result of low achievement. Poor and average students are prompt to encounter failure because of

debilitative anxiety more often than high-ability students are. It was also suggested that different kinds of anxiety appear depending on the level of students. The more proficient learners are the more facilitating anxiety they experience (Scovel, 1978).

#### **d. Empathy and Extroversion/Introversion**

The other aspect of personality that has been studied is empathy – “the willingness and capacity to identify with others” (Stern 1993, p.381). It is perceived as an important factor in learning a foreign language but only as far as communication skills are concerned as it involves the participation in other people’s feelings and ideas. Some studies tried to link empathy with the acquisition of the native-like pronunciation but it is considered as “an essential factor in the overall ability to acquire a second language rather than simply in the ability to acquire an authentic pronunciation” (Schumann 1975, p.226). People need some basic predisposition in order to acquire a foreign language effectively.

Empathy and extroversion are personality characteristics that can influence language learning in a positive or negative way depending on the measured aspect. It is believed that extroverts, who are sociable and open to other people, are more successful in learning languages than introverts, because they have more contact with L2. On the other hand, well-organized and serious introverts are seen as better learners as far as the systematic study is concerned (Stern 1983). This assumption has been only partially confirmed by the research results. But, to be friendly and approachable does help in the development of communicative skills and has been supported by a few studies (for example Pritchard 1952; Pimsleur et al. 1966). Many researchers believe that personality has an important influence on success in language learning.

Ellis (1985) claims that the effects of personality on SLA are difficult to investigate because these factors are not easy to define and measure as

most of the tests used lack validity. Most of personality traits are not stable and may change depending of a situation. The same student may behave differently in a similar setting only because of some external reasons like mood or tiredness. Personality is said to influence only the acquisition of speaking skills and it cannot predict the overall success in learning a language. It is true that talkativeness and responsiveness help a lot to improve the acquisition of communicative competence but it does not mean at all that a shy person who prefers studying alone has no chance to master a language. Everything depends on how hard he works, how much time he spends studying a language and what motivates him to do it. It is important for a teacher to recognize students' personality in order to supply them with suitable instructions and create the accurate atmosphere for learning.

#### **1.1.4 Learning Strategies**

The word strategy comes from the Greek word 'strategia' which means steps or actions taken for the purpose of winning a war. The warlike meaning of strategia has fortunately fallen away. But the control and goal directedness remain in the modern version of the world (Oxford, 2003, p. 2).

Learning strategies are the internal processes which account for how learners handle input data and utilize second language resources in the production of message in second language. They are the techniques or deliberate actions that the learners use to make language learning more successful, self- directed. Rubin (1975, p. 43) defines learning strategies as the techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge (as cited in Larsen-Freeman 2007, p. 159). Cohen (1998, p. 4 as cited in Gass and Selinker, 2008, p. 518) writes: Language learning strategies are those processes which are consciously selected by learners and which may result in action taken to enhance the learning or use of a second or foreign language, through the storage, retention, recall, and application of information about the language.

Thus, the definition reveals that learning strategies are consciously decided and used by learners to enhance their second and foreign language acquisition and such strategies are mostly mental action.

According to Oxford (2003, p. 634), “Learning strategies are the specific behaviours or thoughts learners use to enhance their language learning”. Her definition is somehow similar to previous one. Likewise, Gass and Selinker (2008, p. 440) state that learning strategies clearly involve internal mental actions, but they may involve physical action as well.

Despite the fact that several theorists have expressed their views differently on learning strategies, the crux of all is the same, i.e. learning strategies are the deliberate actions of the learners selected in order to enhance their second or foreign language acquisition and such strategies can be mental as well as physical. Whatever the strategies the learners employ, neither are they good nor bad in themselves. First of all, the context of use should be understood in order to select the appropriate strategy. Oxford (2003, p. 522) mentions the following conditions to make the strategies useful:

- a. The strategy relates well to the L2 task at hand.
- b. The strategy fits to the particular students learning style preferences to one degree to another.
- c. The students employ the strategy effectively and link it with other relevant strategies.

Even though learning strategies have been stated variously, all the theorists have agreement on the point that learning strategies affect success rate of the learners. Even highly intelligent learners may sometimes fail to reach the target direction in absence of the appropriate strategy. Again, theorists do not have consensus on the types of learning strategies. O'Malley and Chamot, 1985, as cited in Ellis, (1985, pp. 168-189) have classified the learning strategies into main three types, namely meta-cognitive strategies, cognitive strategies and

socio-affective strategies. However, Stern (1992, pp. 262-266 as cited in Hismanoglu, 2000, p.5) has given five categories of learning strategies.

#### **1.1.4.1. Management and Planning Strategies**

These strategies are related with the learners' intention to direct their own learning. A learner can take charge of his own programme, when he/she is advised by the teacher. So, learners should decide their commitment to language learning, goals, methodology and even evaluate one's achievement.

#### **1.1.4.2 Cognitive Strategies**

Cognitive strategies are the steps or operations used in learning or problems solving that require direct analysis, synthesis or transformation of learning materials (Stern, *ibid*, 262). They include classification, verification, guessing, reasoning, memorization etc. Oxford (2003, p.12) also states that cognitive strategies enable the learners to manipulate the language materials in direct way.

#### **1.1.4.3 Communicative-Experimental Strategies**

Communication strategies are the techniques used by learners so as to keep a conversation going on or they are deliberate attempts used by learners to express meaning when faced difficulties in an ongoing communication. Such strategies avoid the interruption in the flow of communication. Example of such strategies can be circumlocution, gesture, paraphrase, repetition, exploration, etc.

#### **1.1.4.4 Interpersonal Strategies**

Interpersonal strategies are used to make contact with native speakers and cooperate with them. Learners should monitor their own development and evaluate their own performance. Along with linguistics knowledge, they must become acquainted with the target culture since language and culture are embedded with each other.

#### **1.1.4.5 Affective Strategies**

Language learning can be frustrating in some cases since some learners feel strangeness towards learning foreign language. In such cases, good learners try to create associations of positive effects towards the learning activities, which are called affective strategies. These strategies are especially related to solving emotional problems, for example; identifying one's mood, anxiety, talking about feeling, rewarding self etc.

However, this is not the final list of learning strategies. Such categorization differs from scholar to scholar. Oxford (2003, pp. 12-14) has classified them as cognitive, meta-cognitive, compensatory, affective, memory related and social strategies. Whatever the types might be, learning strategies have great impact upon learning. Some strategies might be taught by the teachers in course of teaching whereas some are automatically inserted by the learners into learning process.

#### **1.1.5 Learning Styles**

Every man is in certain respects (a) like other men, (b) like some other men, (c) like no other man. In order to understand the theory of learning styles it appears to be logical to start.

Learners learn a second language in many ways. Each learner prefers different learning styles and techniques. S/he has a mix of learning styles but may find that s/he has a dominant style of learning. It means that learners receive information through their senses and prefer some senses to others in specific situations. Usually, they learn more effectively when they learn through their own initiatives. When their learning styles are matched with appropriate teaching styles, their motivation and achievement increase and are enhanced.

Learning styles have been defined variously. Cornett (1983, p.9) defines learning styles as “the overall patterns that give general direction to learning behavior”. In the same way, Dunn and Griggs (1988) define learning style

as “the biologically and developmentally imposed set of characteristics that make the same teaching method wonderful for some and terrible for others” (p.3). From these definitions what is inferred is that learning styles are the general approaches that learners use in acquiring a new language or in learning any other subject. Learning styles are those educational conditions under which a student is most likely to learn. It implies that learning styles are not really concerned with what learners learn, but rather how they prefer to learn.

Reid (1995) defines learning styles as “internally based characteristics of individuals for the intake or understanding of new information”. Reid clarifies that learning styles are the learner’s cognitive, affective and physiological factors that indicate how a learner perceives, interacts with and responds to the learning environment. On the basis of all the above definitions, we can say that a learning style is a learner’s consistent way of responding to and using stimuli in the context of learning. The learner may prefer one or more styles over others.

To differentiate between learning styles and learning strategies, Weinstein and Mayer (1986, as quoted in Ellis, 1994) define learning strategies as “the behaviours and thoughts that a learner engages in during learning that are intended to influence the learner’s encoding process” (p. 531 ).

Similarly, in the view of O’Malley and Chamot (1990):

Learning strategies are complex procedures that individuals apply to tasks; consequently, they may be represented as procedural knowledge which may be acquired through cognitive, associative, and autonomous stages of learning. As with other procedural skills at the different stages of learning, the strategies may be conscious in early stages of learning and later be performed without the person’s awareness. (O’Malley and Chamot, 1990, p. 52)

Providing a wide range of definitions of Language Learning Strategies (LLS) proposed by experts in the field does not solve the problem of understanding what LLS are because LLS have usually been confused with learning styles. Reid (1998, p. 9) draws a distinction between learning styles and learning strategies by focusing in what way they are distinct from each other. She refers to the learning styles as "internally based characteristics, often not perceived or consciously used by learners, for the intake and comparison of new information" whereas learning strategies are defined as "external skills often used consciously by students to improve their learning".

What we can infer from these two definitions is that since learning styles are 'internally based characteristics', they explain a learner's preference to a learning situation. In addition, it can be said that they are relatively stable and not likely to change over time. This view is also supported by Oxford (1990, p.12) who states that some learner characteristics such as "learning styles and personality traits are difficult to change". Some studies such as Ellis (1989) revealed that learners abandoned their own learning styles and they adjusted themselves according to the teaching styles they were exposed to. The learning strategies, on the other hand, are said to be 'external skills' which indicates they are more problem oriented and conscious. This also implies that they are more liable to change over time and depending on the task and materials used in the learning environment. Oxford (1990, p.12) claims that "learning strategies are easier to teach, change and modify" through strategy training.

“Learning styles are general approaches for example, global, or analytic, auditory or visual that students use in acquiring a new language or in learning any other subjects” (Oxford, 2003, p. 2). Similarly, Gass and Selinker (2008, p. 432) say, “The term learning styles refers in broad term to the preferences that an individual has of obtaining, processing and retaining information”. Thus, learning styles are generally the different ways, approaches of retaining the information in course of SLA. They are the broad categories which refer to the manner in which people perceive, conceptualize, organize and recall

information. Gass and Selinker (ibid, p.432) state that learning style is interchangeably used with personality, although the former is undoubtedly more variable, whereas the latter refers to a trait of an individual. However, there has not been much effort to separate them.

Learning styles that learners employ are said to be biologically determined. They play crucial role to make second language learning successful although there may be the cases of failure owing to several reasons in spite of the fact that learning styles are carefully selected. Anyway, learning styles are the individual techniques and procedures used in learning second or foreign language. Regarding the types of learning styles, scholars have different opinions. I am dealing with the following various learning styles those are from various scholars used in this thesis.

#### **1.1.5.1 Visual Learners**

Visual learners are those who “like to read and obtain a great deal from visual stimulation” (Oxford, 2003). For them, lectures, conversations and oral directions without any visual backup can be very confusing. They learn things best through seeing them and like to keep an eye on the teacher by sitting in the front of the class and watching the lecture closely. Visual learners are those who take in information visually.

In other words, learners who learn better by seeing are called visual learners. Generally, such learners learn by seeing the body movement, facial expressions, and gestures of the teachers, blackboard use or power point representation. They tend to prefer sitting at the front of the classroom to avoid audio visual obstructions. Montemayer et al. (2009, p. 61) state that visual learners easily remember visual details and prefer to what they are learning.

#### **1.1.5.2 Auditory Learners**

Auditory learners are those who “enjoy and profit from unembellished lectures, conversations and oral directions” (Oxford, 2003). They are excited by

classroom interactions in role-plays and similar activities. They learn best through hearing. “Auditory learners are those who prefer to take in information auditorily” (Gass and Selinker, 2008, P. 437). The learners who learn best through listening are called auditory learners. Auditory or aural learners hear the lessons or subject matter and learn it.

Montemayer et al. (2009, p. 61) say that students with this learning style learn best through verbal lecture, discussion, taking things through listening to what others have said. They tend to talk to themselves while learning new information. They may have little knowledge until they hear it and devote their attention on voice, pitch, speech and other things. They prefer listening over reading

#### **1.1.5.3 Tactile/ Kinesthetic Learners**

Kinesthetic learners are those who like movement and enjoy working with tangible objects. They prefer frequent move around the room. They learn through experiencing or doing things. “Learners belonging to this category learn through moving, doing and touching” (Montemayer et al. 2009, p. 62). Kinesthetic or tactile learners learn better when the whole body is involved or when objects can be manipulated. They tend to feel difficulty to sit for long periods and learn only when they feel things, touch or play round them. Generally, kinesthetic and tactile learners belong to same category however; there is slight difference between them since the former is concerned with learning through movement whereas latter through touching. Beside these perceptual learning styles, the following are some other styles which are the interest of this study.

#### **1.1.5.4 Introversion and Extroversion**

Introvert learners are those who can do more work when they work alone. They learn best when they study alone. They think that it is fun to learn with classmates, but is hard to study with them. On the other hand, extrovert learners

enjoy joining in on class discussions. They prefer group work to working in isolation. If they have to decide something, they ask other people for their opinions. If they understand a problem, they like to help other learners understand it too.

The distinction between introversion and extroversion was first introduced by Jung and has been measured by Eysenck (1970, as cited in Stern, 1985, p.380). Stern (ibid. p.380) states that extroversion is a tendency to withdraw from social interaction and introversion is a tendency to be pre-occupied with inner thought and feelings. Likewise, Gass and Selinker (2008, p.432) refer that the stereotype of an introvert is someone who is much happier with a book than with other people, on the other hand, the stereotype of an extrovert is the opposite; someone happier with people than with a book.

Thus, extrovert learners are oriented towards the society whereas introvert towards inner mentality. It is generally believed that extrovert learners are more successful since they find it easier to make contact with other people, therefore, obtain more input and interactional feedback. Anyway, both of the personalities can be benefitted depending on the context.

#### **1.1.5.5 Risk-taking**

A risk taker is a learner who makes decision even when something is uncertain and they reach the possibility of failure. A learner's willingness to take risk depends upon situations. Risk taking has been defined as a situation where an individual has to make a decision involving choice between alternatives of different desirability, the outcome of the choice is uncertain; there is the possibility of failure (Beebe, 1983, p.39, as cited in Gass and Selinker, 2008, p. 433). Thus, risk-takers do not think about its consequences before doing anything. Researchers have found that individuals are generally risk-averse when contemplating a gain but risk-seeking when contemplating a loss.

### **1.1.5.6 Deductive and Inductive Learning Style**

This model or concept is more about the learning process than learning style. But I have found it useful for my research. Thus it is described here theoretically hence, let me introduce it. Deductive learning is an approach to language teaching in which learners are taught rules and given specific information about a language. Then, they apply these rules when they use the language. This may be contrasted with inductive learning in which learners are not taught rules directly, but are left to discover - or induce - rules from their experience of using the language (Richards et al, 1985).

Harmer (1989) ascertains that these two techniques encourage learners to compensate for the gap in second language knowledge by using a variety of communication strategies. A number of research studies, likewise, have reported that successful learners often adopt certain learning strategies such as seeking out practice opportunities or mouthing the questions put to other learners (Peck, 1988). Inductive and deductive models offer this chance to learners because these two models foster a cooperative atmosphere among students. According to Celce-Murcia (1997), the communicative classroom provides a better environment for second language learning than classrooms dominated by formal instruction.

### **1.1.5.7 Field Independence/Dependence**

Field independence has its origins in visual perception. It distinguishes individuals dichotomously as to whether or not they are dependent on a prevailing visual field. If an individual is dependent on the prevailing visual, she or he cannot see something right in front of them. On the other hand, those who are field-independent are better able to notice details outside of the prevailing visual object and are not dependent on that object. Some individuals are better at finding objects in the middle of clutter (field-independent), whereas others (field-dependent) cannot see things that may be obvious to those with

a field independent orientation. In other words, the “field” (surroundings) gets in the way of field dependent individuals.

The idea of field dependence/independence is related to cognitive style. Language learners differ in the manner in which they perceive, organize and recall information. Field dependents perceive the field as a whole (i.e. holistically ), whereas field independents perceive the field in terms of its component parts (i.e. analytically ).

Witkin et al. (1971, p. 4) provide the following description:

In a field-dependent mode of perceiving, perception is strongly dominated by all the overall organization of the surrounding field, and parts of the field are experienced as ‘fused’. In a field-independent mode of perceiving, parts of the field are experienced as discrete from organization ground.

Gass and Selinker (1994, p.435) “In a review of a literature, Johnson, Prior, and Artuso (2000) report that field independents are, in general, better at performing cognitive tasks, but Chapelle (1995) pointed out that those who are field dependent have an orientation that might be deemed more interpersonal and more sensitive to the social context. This would certainly have importance for their differential role in interaction studies. It would be predicted that field-dependent individuals would be more sensitive to implicit feedback than field-independent individuals and would, as a result benefit more from interactions”.

## **1.2 Review of Related Literature**

A number of studies have been done in foreign context; some of them are reviewed below:

Reid (1987) conducted a research on learning style preferences of ESL students using questionnaire and found that students varied significantly in

their sensory preferences and people from different cultures preferred different types of modalities in learning for example; students from South Asian cultures were highly visual, Korean mostly visual and Hispanic often the auditory.

Castro and Peck (2005) conducted a research on learning styles and learning difficulties that foreign language students face at college level. It was hypothesized that learning style preference had impact over classroom learning. The result did not show any significant difference on final achievement of the students due to learning style preferences.

Similarly, Montemayer et al. (2009) studied learning styles of high and low academic achieving freshman teacher education students of the University of the Cordilleras. The descriptive-comparative method was used to analyze the data. The findings showed that there were not any significant differences in the achievement.

Mulalic et al. (2009) explored the perceptual learning styles of ESL students in Malaysia. The perceptual learning style preference questionnaire was used in data collection. The difference in learning styles and learning preferences were observed. The result showed that most preferred learning styles were kinesthetic.

Renou (2009) studied perceptual learning styles and achievement in a university level foreign language courses. She had used the questionnaire as a tool for data collection. She concluded that if we teach in the three sensory models, namely auditory, visual and tactile, we could help our students retain and retrieve for more information than they would if we exposed them to only on sensory mode of learning. Thus, the result showed the positive impact.

SLA is a newly introduced discipline in the Department of English Education. So, the numbers of studies done under this field are very few in comparison to other subjects. However, several studies have been done on the topics like learning strategies, motivation, personalities, anxiety, and learner autonomy in

Nepalese scenario. But the studies in learning styles are very few. Therefore, I have selected this topic.

Regmi (2006) studied perceptual learning styles of secondary level students. His objectives were to find out the learning styles, most frequent mode and provide some pedagogical suggestions. He used questionnaire to collect the data from primary sources. He found that almost all the perceptual learning styles were used by students and perceptual as well as individual learning styles were found to be frequently used by majority or the students.

Similarly, Bhatta (2012) studied the learning styles of masters' level students of T.U. Her objectives were to find out the learning styles of the students studying M. Ed. and to find out the gender differences and she found it variant and slight variation in genders and the gender does not seem to affect in the selection of appropriate styles.

In this way, these studies show mixed results on the relationship between learning style preferences of the students and their achievement in learning a language. However, most of the studies have shown the positive effect. The present study focuses on the learning styles of the bachelor level students studying English in Nepalese context from the far western part of Nepal i.e. Dadeldhura. Therefore, it is different from the existing research works.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of the study were:

- a. To find out the learning styles adopted by bachelor level students in learning English.
- b. To find out the frequency of learning styles.
- c. To provide some pedagogical implications.

#### **1.4 Significance of the Study**

The study is expected to be useful for those who are primarily involved in teaching English as a second or foreign language. When they go through this study, they might use the findings and suggestions that will be provided in this study as the feedback to their teaching. Learning styles of the students should be recognized by the educators so that it helps them to modify or gear their teaching methodologies accordingly. It also helps them in their classroom management and selection of appropriate materials. Particularly speaking learning styles play the significant role in the learning activities of the students. The teachers may develop a chance of their awareness when they go through this work. This might serve as a motive for such teachers in that, the teacher may be aware of the need to use all sorts of styles to make their teaching effective.

Likewise, the study will equally be beneficial for the students of English as a second or foreign language. Going through this study, they would get chance to be aware in their learning preferences. Besides, the study would be helpful for the curriculum developers, course designers, textbook writers and material producers in the field of language teaching, language testers, policy makers and planners.

## **CHAPTER – TWO**

### **METHODOLOGY**

In order to accomplish my study, I had used the following methodology

#### **2.1 Sources of Data**

I used both the primary and secondary sources of data to accomplish the study.

##### **2.1.1 Primary Sources of Data**

The primary sources of data were the students of Dadeldhura district .The students were of the bachelor level of Dadeldhura Education Campus, Dadeldhura.

##### **2.1.2 Secondary Sources of Data**

As the secondary sources of data, I used the various sources, viz: Stern (1983), Ellis (1985), Omally and Chamot (1990), Richards and Rodgers (2001), Mitchell and Miles (2004), Kumar (2006), Harmer (2007), Gass and Selinker (2008), Ortega (2009), Cohen et al. (2010), etc. In the same way I used the various articles, reports and websites concerned to the topic.

#### **2.2 Population of the Study**

The population of this study were all the students/ learners of bachelor level from Dadeldhura.

#### **2.3 Sampling Procedure**

In the research, sampling is the process of selecting a few from a large group for the purpose of finding the new facts related to the group as a whole. In this study, I had selected Dadeldhura district using purposive non random sampling procedure at first. Then following the same, purposive non-random sampling procedure I had selected Dadeldhura Education Campus from where I had selected 60 bachelor level students twenty from each first, second and third

year group respectively using the same purposive non-random sampling procedure.

#### **2.4 Tools for Data Collection**

To collect the data from the primary sources of the study, I had used the questionnaire given in Appendix-A as the tool for the study. The questionnaire was based on the framework developed by Cohen, Oxford, and Chi (2001).

#### **2.5 Process of Data Collection**

For the collection of the primary data, I visited Dadeldhura Education Campus, and asked for the permission from the administration. Then I established rapport with the students. After that, I explained to them about my study and purpose. At last, I distributed the questionnaire and took their opinions for about twenty-five minutes.

#### **2.6 Limitations of the Study**

The study had the following limitations:

- i. The study was limited to Dadeldhura district.
- ii. It was limited to the bachelor level students.
- iii. It was limited to sixty students only.
- iv. It was limited to the survey questionnaire only.
- v. It was limited to the perceptual, deductive-inductive, field-dependent and field-independent language learning styles only.
- vi. It was limited to the learning styles of the learners.

#### **2.7 Procedure of Data Analysis**

In order to meet the objectives of my study, I divided the analysis and interpretation of the data into two sections. In first section, the information collected from the students were presented on the frequency and percentage

basis and finally arithmetic average, i.e. weighted mean was calculated in order to find out the learning styles of the students using the following formula:

$$\text{Weighted mean } (\bar{X}_w) = \frac{\sum wx}{\sum w}$$

Where  $\Sigma$  stands for summation, w for the frequency of the responses and x for the weight assigned to each points in the likert scale.

In order to find out the mean, the five points in the likert scales were assigned the weight being based on Kumar (2006). In this process, always, often, sometimes, rarely and never were assigned 5,4,3,2 and 1 weightages respectively. It was on the basis of positive and negative degree that the points in the scale carry. Thus, the interpretation of the data was done on the basis of frequency, percentage and weighted mean. If the weighted mean was below 2.5, it was taken to be less significant whereas above 4 was taken to be highly significant.

## **CHAPTER - THREE**

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

This chapter is solely devoted to the analysis and interpretation of the data. The data were analyzed and interpreted through quantitative- descriptive methodology. For my convenience, it was divided into five categories. This was done on the basis of the learning modes used by the students in learning English. All the styles are presented clearly in the tables. The five categories are:

1. Analysis of visual learning styles
2. Analysis of auditory learning styles
3. Analysis of kinesthetic learning styles
4. Analysis of field dependent and independent learning styles
5. Analysis of deductive and inductive learning styles

#### **3.1 Analysis of Visual Learning Styles**

Visual learning styles are those approaches to learning whereby the students get the information by seeing. This category of the questionnaire consists of six items. The themes of those six items were as follows:

- remember something better if they write that down.
- take detailed notes during the lecture or the classes.
- while listening, they visualize pictures, numbers or word in their head.
- preferences to learn with TV or video rather than other media.
- look at the people to understand what they say.
- understand the lectures or the classes better when teachers write on the board.

After the careful observation of the responses provided by the respondents, the frequencies, weighted means were found as shown in the table no. one:

**Table No. 1**  
**Visual Learning Styles of the Students**

No.	Responses										Weighted mean
	1		2		3		4		5		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1.	-	-	3	5	11	18.33	17	28.33	29	48.34	4.20
2.	1	1.67	3	5	11	18.33	24	40	21	35	4.01
3.	1	1.67	6	10	23	38.33	7	11.67	23	38.33	3.75
4.	1	1.67	5	8.33	14	23.33	20	33.33	20	33.34	3.88
5.	2	3.33	7	11.67	20	33.33	6	10	25	41.67	3.75
6.	1	1.67	5	8.33	11	18.33	17	28.33	26	43.34	3.03

The first item in the questionnaire included the visual learning style related to whether the students remember something better if they write that down.

Careful observation and analysis of the responses to the item shows that 48.34% of the students always adopted this style. Likewise, 28.33% of the students often and 18.33% of the students sometimes used this style. Looking at the weighted mean which is calculated 4.20, indicates that majority of the students used this style. Similarly, the second item was the inquiry on whether the students take detailed notes during the lecture or the classes. It has been found that majority of the students, i.e. 40 % often used this style. In the same way, 35 % always and 18.33 % sometimes used this style. In over all, the weighted mean 4.01, marks that it was used by higher number of students.

The third items in the questionnaire was to discover if the students listen, visualize pictures, numbers or words in their head. The above table clearly reflects that 38.33% of the students always, 11.67 % often and 38.33 % sometimes adopted this style in learning English. In addition to this, 10 % used the style rarely. The weighted mean was calculated to be 3.75 marking that not

the high majority of the students preferred the style. Similarly, the fourth item was the inquiry on if the students prefer to learn with TV or video rather than other media. Observations of the respondents provided by the students reveal that 33.34%, of the students always adopted this style similarly 33.33 % often, 23.33 % sometimes and 8.33 % rarely used it. In overall, the weighted mean 3.88 indicates that the average students preferred this style in learning English.

The fifth item in the questionnaire was to know whether the students look at the people to understand what they say. Nearly, 33.33 % of the students sometimes used this style. However, 41.67 % always, 10 % often and 11.67 % rarely adopted this style in their learning. Looking at the weighted mean which is calculated 3.75 indicates that it is the least used style in their learning. In the similar vein, the sixth item inquired on whether the students understand the lectures or the classes better when the professors or the teachers write on the board. The table clearly demonstrates that 43.34% of the students always, 28.33% often, 18.33% sometimes and 8.33 % rarely used this style. The weighted mean 4.03 proves that the style was preferred by the higher no. of students.

### **3.2 Analysis of Auditory Learning Styles**

The aim of the second part of the questionnaire was to find out the auditory learning styles used by the students. Auditory learning styles are those approaches to learning whereby the students get the information through listening. Auditory learning style consists of the following six categories:

- remember things better if they discuss them with someone.
- preferences to learn by listening to the lecture rather than reading.
- preference to background sound to help thinking.
- understand what people say even when they cannot see them.
- easily remember jokes that they hear.
- identify people by their voices (e.g. on phone).

After the careful observation and analysis of the responses given by the informants, the following results can be drawn as shown in the following table:

**Table No. 2**  
**Auditory Learning Styles of the Students**

No.	Responses										Weighted mean
	1		2		3		4		5		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
7.	2	3.33	10	16.67	13	21.67	12	20	12	20	3.55
8.	5	8.33	2	3.33	17	28.33	19	31.67	17	28.34	3.68
9.	6	10	11	18.33	18	30	13	21.67	13	21.67	3.25
10.	4	6.67	12	20	20	33.33	12	20	12	20	3.26
11.	1	1.67	10	16.67	23	38.33	8	13.33	18	30	3.53
12.	4	6.67	3	5	18	30	23	38.33	23	38.33	3.78

The seventh item in this part of questionnaire was associated to remember things better if they discuss them with someone. Approximately, 38.33% of the students adopted this style often 21.67% only sometimes, whereas 20% used it always. Only 16.67% rarely used it. The weighted mean 3.55 indicates that a good portion of the students adopted this style in their learning. The eighth item was preferences to learn by listening to the lecture rather than reading. Approximately, 28.34% students always and 31.67% often used the style whereas 28.33% used it sometimes and 3.33% used it rarely. However, 8.33% never used the style. But in average, the weighted mean 3.68 indicates that it was the second most preferred style among auditory learning styles.

The ninth item sought to find out the preference to background sound if it helps thinking. The figures presented in the table clearly verify that 20%, of the students used that style often whereas 21.67% always and 30% sometimes used the style. Looking at the weighted mean 3.25 shows that the style was preferred by higher no. of the students.

In similar vein, the tenth item was meant to know whether the students understand what people say even when they cannot see them. The analysis of the responses proves that it was also a dominant style under auditory learning mode since the weighted mean is 3.26. It was used always by 20% of the students, often by 20% and sometimes by 33.33%. Wherever 6.67% never and 20% of the students rarely used this style.

The eleventh item in the questionnaire was if they easily remember jokes that they hear. It is shown that 38.33% of the students, majority of the students, sometimes used the style whereas 30% always and 13.33% often used this style. The style was adopted by majority of the students can be proved through the weighted mean which is calculated 3.53.

Likewise, item no. twelve was meant to identify people by their voices (e.g. on phone). The table shows that 38.33% always, 20% often and 30% of the students sometimes used the style. The weighted mean 3.78 proves that almost all the students preferred this style which is the most preferred auditory learning style.

### **3.3 Analysis of Kinesthetic Learning Styles**

Kinesthetic learning styles are those approaches to learning whereby the students learn through moving, doing and touching things. The third part of the questionnaire was aimed to find out the kinesthetic learning styles adopted by the students. Likewise other categories, it also consists of six items. Those six items were to discover the learning styles related to:

- they need to eat something when they read or study.
- if they have choice between sitting and standing they would rather stand.
- getting nervous when they sit still too long.
- thinking better when they move around (e.g. pacing or tapping feet).
- play with or bite on their pens during lectures or classes.
- moving their hands when they speak.

Careful observation and analysis of the responses provided by the informants has given the result as shown in table no. three:

**Table No. 3**  
**Kinesthetic Learning Styles of the Students**

No.	Responses										Weighted mean
	5		4		3		2		1		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
13.	8	13.33	7	11.67	14	23.33	10	16.67	21	35	3.48
14.	7	11.67	14	23.33	21	35	12	20	6	10	2.93
15.	2	3.33	4	6.67	22	36.67	11	18.33	21	35	3.75
16.	2	3.33	9	15	21	36	12	20	16	26.67	3.51
17.	-	-	12	20	16	26.67	24	40	8	13.33	3.46
18.	5	8.33	4	6.67	15	25	17	28.33	19	31.67	3.68

The thirteenth item in the questionnaire was used to discover whether the students need to eat something when they read or study. The analysis of the responses provided by the learners reveals that majority of the students, i.e. 35% always, 16.67% often, 23.33% sometimes and 11.67% rarely employed this style whereas 13.33% students never used it. The weighted mean 3.48 shows that nearly the average students adopted it. Similarly, the fourteenth item meant to know whether the students have choice between sitting and standing they'd rather stand. The table demonstrates that 20% students often used it whereas 10% always and 35% sometimes used it. In average 2.93 weighted mean indicates the adoption of this style by least of the students.

The fifteenth item was used to getting nervous when they sit still too long. Nearly 36.67% students often and 35% always used that style. The weighted mean 3.75 indicates that a vast majority adopted this style. It also seems that the style was most preferred among all the Kinesthetic learning styles.

Likewise, the sixteenth item was the inquiry on thinking better when they move

around (e.g. pacing or tapping their feet). It seems that 35% sometimes, 26.67% always, 20% often and 15% rarely used that style whereas 3.33% never used it. The weighted mean, 3.51 proves that it is also the average preferred style among all the styles of this category.

The seventeenth item was an inquiry on whether the students play with or bite on their pens during lectures or classes. It has been found that majority, i.e. 40% students often, 13.33% always and 26.67% sometimes adopted this style. However, the weighted mean 3.46 shows that it was liked by a good portion of students. The last item in this category was meant to know whether the students move their hands when they speak or not. The table reveals that 28.33% students often used it. Likewise, 31.67% always and 25% students sometimes used it. In average, 3.68 weighted mean indicates that most of the students used the style in their learning of English.

### **3.4 Analysis of Field Independent and Field Dependent Learning Styles**

The aim of the fourth part of the questionnaire was to find out the field dependency and independency of the learners. Field independence has its origins in visual perception. It distinguishes individuals dichotomously as to whether or not they are dependent on a prevailing visual field. If an individual is dependent on the prevailing visual, she or he cannot see something right in front of them. On the other hand, those who are field-independent are better able to notice details outside of the prevailing visual object and are not dependent on that object.

As similar to other styles, it also consists of six categories to discover the styles. The first three are of field independent and the latter three are of field dependent learning styles. They are about:

- either they like to go from general patterns to the specific examples in learning a target language.
- if they like to start with rules and theories rather the examples.

- if they like to begin with generalization and then find experiences that relate to those generalizations
- if they like to learn rules of language indirectly by being exposed to examples of grammatical structures and other language features.
- if they don't really care if they hear a rule stated since they don't remember rules very well anyway..
- if they figure out rules based on the way they see language from behaving over time.

Careful observation and analysis of the responses provided by the informants has given the result as shown in table no. four:

**Table No. 4**  
**Field Independent and Field Dependent Learning Styles of the Students**

No.	Responses										Weighted mean
	1		2		3		4		5		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
19.	8	13.33	8	13.33	4	6.67	22	36.67	18	30	3.56
20.	3	5	8	13.33	9	15	14	23.33	26	43.34	3.86
21.	3	5	8	13.33	13	21.67	19	31.67	17	28.33	3.65
22.	7	11.67	6	10	11	18.33	13	21.67	23	38.33	3.64
23.	8	13.33	14	23.33	10	16.67	15	25	13	21.67	3.18
24.	5	8.33	7	11.67	17	28.33	19	31.67	12	20	3.43

Item no. nineteenth, which was related to field independent learning style, was used as the inquiry on either the students like to go from general patterns to the specific examples in learning a target language. The figures given in the table no. four clearly present that a good portion of the students adopted this style since the weighted mean is 3.56. It was used often by 36.67%, majority of the students and always by 30% of the students. The twentieth item, which was related to field independent learning style, was meant to know if they like to start with rules and theories rather the examples. Careful observation and

analysis of the responses provided by the learners indicate that it was the most preferred style among all the categories under field dependent and independent learning style since the weighted mean is 3.86. It also shows that majority of the students, i.e. 43.34% always adopted that style.

Item no. twenty one which was related to field independent learning style sought to determine if they like to begin with generalization and then find experiences that relate to those generalizations. The presented data proves that the adoption of this style was satisfactory among the students since 21.67% sometimes, 31.67% often and 28.33% students always adopted the style. However, the weighted mean is 3.65.

Item no. twenty two, which was related to field dependent learning style, aimed to discover if they like to learn rules of language indirectly by being exposed to examples of grammatical structures and other language features. It seems that this was also the average preferred style since the weighted mean is 3.64. However, 38.33% students always, 21.67% often, 18.33% sometimes and 10% rarely used that style. In addition to 11.67% never used that style.

Item no. twenty three, which was related to field independent learning style, was used to find out whether if they do not really care if they hear a rule stated since they don't remember rules very well anyway. If we look at the response given by the students, it can be seen that 25% students often, 21.67% always, 16.67% sometimes and 23.33% rarely employed that. The mean calculated is 3.18 marking the agreement of majority upon its adoption. The last item under field dependent and independent styles sought to determine whether the students figure out rules based on the way they see language from behaving over time. About 28.33% students sometimes, only 20% always and 31.67% often used that in their learning. This is also not the least preferred style among all the categories under field dependent and independent styles since the weighted mean is 3.43.

### **3.5 Analysis of Deductive and Inductive Learning Styles**

Deductive learning is an approach to language teaching in which learners are taught rules and given specific information about a language. Then, they apply these rules when they use the language. This may be contrasted with inductive learning in which learners are not taught rules directly, but are left to discover - or induce - rules from their experience of using the language. This part of questionnaire also consists of six items. The first three are related to deductive and the latter three are related to inductive language learning styles. They are associated with:

- whether they can separate out the relevant and important information in the given context even when distracting information is present.
- when they produce an oral or written message in the target language, they make sure that all the grammatical structures are in agreement with each other.
- they not only attend to grammar but check for appropriate level of formality and politeness
- when speaking or writing, a focus on grammar would be at the expense of attention to the content of the message.
- it is a challenge for them to both focus on communication in speech or writing at the same time paying attention to grammatical agreement (e.g., person, number, tense or gender).
- when they were using lengthy sentences in a target language, they get distracted and neglect aspects of grammar and style.

Careful observation and analysis of the responses provided by the learners provides the result as shown in the table no. five below:

**Table No.5**  
**Deductive and Inductive Learning Styles of the Students**

No.	Responses										Weighted mean
	1		2		3		4		5		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
25.	3	5	7	11.67	18	30	17	28.33	15	25	3.56
26.	3	5	14	23.33	19	31.67	13	21.67	11	18.33	3.25
27.	3	5	8	13.33	10	16.67	13	21.67	26	43.33	3.85
28.	1	1.67	3	5	12	20	17	28.33	27	45	4.09
29.	1	1.67	10	16.67	17	28.33	16	26.67	16	26.66	3.60
30.	2	3.33	4	6.67	18	30	21	35	15	25	3.46

Item no. twenty five, which was related deductive language learning style, was the discovery on whether the students can separate out the relevant and important information in the given context even when distracting information is present. The result as shown in the table no. nine demonstrate that approximately 25% of the students always 28.33% often and 30% sometimes adopted that style in their learning. In addition to, the weighted mean 3.56 indicates that it was the most preferred style among all the styles under this category. Similarly, item no. twenty six, which was related to deductive language learning style, sought to know whether the students when they produce an oral or written message in the target language, they make sure that all the grammatical structures are in agreement with each other. The analysis of students' responses provides that 21.67% of the students often, 31.67% sometimes and 18.33% always adopted that style. However, 5% never used it. Nevertheless, the weighted mean 3.25 indicates satisfactory use of that style among the students.

Item no. twenty seven, which was related deductive language learning style, was the discovery on if they not only attend to grammar but check for

appropriate level of formality and politeness. Careful analysis of the students' responses demonstrates that 21.67% of the students often used that style. However, maximum number of students 43.33% always, 16.67% sometimes and 13.33% rarely used it. The weighted mean 3.85 marks its adaptation in satisfactory manner.

In similar vein, item no. twenty eight, which was related to inductive language learning style, aimed to find out that when speaking or writing, a focus on grammar would be at the expense of attention to the content of the message. The table shows that 5% rarely, 20% sometimes, 28.33% often and only 45% always adopted that style. Thus, the weighted mean 4.09 marks that majority of the students adopted that style.

The twenty ninth item, which was related to inductive language learning style, was the inquiry on whether the students had a challenge for them to both focus on communication in speech or writing at the same time paying attention to grammatical agreement (e.g., person, number, tense or gender). The weighted mean is 3.60 which signal that it was the average preferred style of this category. The last item of this category and of my questionnaire, which was related to inductive language learning style, was the inquiry on whether the students when they were using lengthy sentences in a target language get distracted and neglect aspects of grammar and style. It seems that majority of the students, i.e. 35% often adopted that style. Likewise, 25% always, 30% sometimes 6.67% rarely used it. Thus, the weighted mean is 3.46 which clarify the preference of this style in an average by most of the students.

## **CHAPTER - FOUR**

### **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **4.1 Findings**

On the basis of careful observation, analysis and interpretation of the responses of the students to survey questionnaire, the following major findings were drawn:

- i. The most frequently used visual learning style was to remember something better if they write that down, which was always used by 48.34% of the students whereas the least used visual learning style was the preference to learn with the TV or video rather than other media though 33.34% students always favored it.
- ii. Under auditory learning style, identifying people by the voices (e.g., on phone ) was the most frequent mode because 38.33% of the students always preferred it whereas understanding what people say even when students could not see them was the least used, i.e. only 20% students preferred it.
- iii. To talk about the kinesthetic learning styles, getting nervous when they sit still too long was found to be the most frequent mode always favored by 35% of the students; but standing, if students had a choice between sitting and standing, was least preferred kinesthetic and overall learning style i.e. only 10%.
- iv. The most frequent field dependent learning style was found to be learn rules of language indirectly by being exposed to examples of grammatical structures and other language features always favored by 38.33% of the students whereas figure out rules based on the way they see language from behaving over time was the least used style, i.e. only 20% students used it always.

- v. Among all the categories of deductive and inductive learning styles, preference to not only attend to grammar but check for appropriate level of formality and politeness was seen the most frequent whereas when they produce an oral or written message in the target language, they make sure that all the grammatical structures are in agreement with each other was the least used style with the regular favors of 43.33% and 18.33% students respectively.
- vi. To compare the learning styles mentioned in the questionnaire, visual style was found to be the most frequent style with the overall mean 23.62 whereas field dependent style was the least used style with 20.50 overall mean.
- vii. Almost all the learning styles mentioned in the questionnaire, viz. perceptual styles, deductive, inductive and field dependent and independent were found to be used by almost all the students though the degree of use was variant from one-another but not in a large difference.
- viii. Among all the thirty items mentioned in the questionnaire, highlighting the important information under visual learning style i.e. remembering something better if they write that down was found to be the most favored mode yielding 4.20 weighted mean. Instead, if they had a choice between sitting and standing, they would rather stand was the least preferred mode yielding only 2.93 weighted mean.

## **4.2 Recommendations**

On the basis of the findings listed above, I would like to put forward some recommendations:

- i. Before instructing the learners, the instructors are suggested to assess and recognize the styles employed by the students to meet the latter's needs so that both of the parties could be facilitated.

- ii. The instructors are recommended to bring variation in teaching rather than always depending on lecture method only.
- iii. Instead of emphasizing in individual study much, group work, pair work, discussion and interaction techniques should be used regularly so that field dependent learners benefit much.
- iv. The instructors should always remember that no single L<sub>2</sub> methodology fits all the students.
- v. Teachers should encourage the students to take charge of their learning by expanding their preferred styles to meet the teaching methods used in class.
- vi. The administrators are suggested to manage the classroom environment in such a way that all types of learners could benefit from teaching.
- vii. Students should also use multiple sense of learning to have more access to the language presented through multiple methods.
- viii. Students' achievement should be assessed through different ways to respect different styles of expressions.