



AMERICAN JOURNAL OF
**EDUCATION AND
TECHNOLOGY (AJET)**

ISSN: 2832-9481 (ONLINE)

VOLUME 1 ISSUE 4 (2023)



PUBLISHED BY: E-PALLI, DELAWARE, USA



Language Learning Strategies and Learning Styles Among BSED Students of SJCBI

Jimboy B. Pagalilauan^{1*}

Article Information

Received: December 23, 2022

Accepted: December 29, 2022

Published: January 05, 2023

Keywords

*Bachelor of Secondary Education,
Language Learning, Strategies,
Styles, Saint Joseph's College of
Baggao*

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to identify the learning styles and learning strategies among students under the Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English Program, College of Arts and Sciences and Teacher Education, Saint Joseph's College of Baggao Inc. Descriptive research design was used in the study. Data from the 155 participants were gathered using the Perceptual Learning Styles Preference Questionnaire (PLSPQ) by Reid (1984) and the Strategy Inventory Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1990). Frequency, percentages, mean score, standard deviation, and Pearson Correlation were used in analyzing the data. Findings of the study showed that most of the participants are fourth year students, speak Ilocano and females. They studied in a public secondary school. 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. Furthermore, auditory learning is typically preferred, followed by kinesthetic and visual learning. Additionally, analysis shows a substantial correlation between the respondents' profile factors and their language learning approaches and learning preferences. The study concludes that rather than requiring the cerebral processing of language learning, the participants promote language learning through focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities, reducing fear, boosting cooperation, and developing empathy. The students' language learning methods and learning preferences are unaffected by the participant profiles.

INTRODUCTION

One of the key elements that affects how - and how well - our students learn a second or foreign language is their language learning methods and styles. A second language is one that is studied in an environment where it is widely used for everyday communication and where there is an abundance of input in it. A language that is being studied as a foreign language is one that is not used frequently for daily communication and where input is limited.

Every second language learner assimilates information in a different way. Some people pick things up faster than others. This illustrates that students use a range of strategies when they consider them to be valuable and important. It is also clear that not every student learns in the same way. They employ a method of learning that they are most comfortable with. If the learner is aware of language learning approaches, they will be better equipped to perform language exercises. This has supported the claim that the mode of education favors efficacy made by Cohen (2003) and Oxford (1990). In other words, learners will be more proficient and effective the more conscious they are of the tactics they use. On the other side, learning style enables people to interact more effectively in a learning setting. It is clear that learning preferences are now having a significant impact on students' academic performance (Cassidy, 2004). The terms learning strategy and learning style might be confusing. We can set learning style apart from learning strategy to make its meaning obvious. According to Ellis (2005), situational considerations and learner variations, such as learning style, "influence learners' choice of learning strategies" (p.52).

As the main focus of 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 (Dornyei, 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 (Dornyei, 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 (Dornyei, 2005).

¹ Head of Department of the General Education and the Director of Research of the Saint Joseph's College of Baggao, Inc. Cagayan Valley, Philippines

* Corresponding author's e-mail: jimpagalilauan10@gmail.com

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 (Dornyei, 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.

Based on this premise, the researcher is driven to identify the language learning approaches and learning preferences of the English-major Bachelor of Secondary Education students at Saint Joseph's College of Baggao's College of Arts and Sciences. The outcome would be extremely beneficial in improving the teaching strategies, curricula, and assessments for both the program within the college and the entire institution as a whole.

Statement of The Problem

Generally, this study aimed to identify the learning styles and language learning strategies of the BSED major in English students under the College of Arts and Sciences, and Teacher Education for the academic year 2022-2023. 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;
2. Determine the most frequently used language learning strategies by the participants;
3. Determine 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.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

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

Participants

The participants of the study were the officially enrolled

students from the Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English for the academic year 2022- 2023. Total population technique was employed in choosing the 155 participants.

Instrumentation

Two primary instruments were used in the study. The first tool was The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), created by Oxford in 1990. It contains 50 items that suggest various language learning strategies, including memory strategies that are reflected in statements 1 to 9, cognitive strategies that are reflected in statements 10 to 23, compensation strategies that are reflected in statements 24 to 29, metacognitive strategies that are reflected in statements 30 through 38, affective strategies that are reflected in statements 39 to 44, and social strategies that are reflected in statements 45 to 50. The Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire (PLSPQ), created by Joy Reid, served as the second measurement tool (1987).

This instrument consists of 30 randomly ordered statements and participants respond based on 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 elements of perceptual learning styles are assessed using the following questions: 6, 10, 12, 24, and 29 (visual); 1, 7, 9, 17, and 20 (aural); 2, 8, 15, and 26 (kinesthetic); 11, 14, 16, and 25 (tactile); 3, 4, 5, and 21 and 23 (group learning); and 13, 18, 27, 28, and 30 (perceptual) (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) suggests 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 "high" levels of strategy use. The Oxford Strategy Inventory for Language Learning's six subscales were used to classify the 50-item questionnaire's 50 items in order to determine the respondents' most and least popular language learning strategies (1990). Using the aforesaid methodology, the participant responses were tallied and analyzed to produce the interpretation on a 5-point Likert scale. To determine the ranking of the language learning approach utilized, the means of each statement and each subscale were also calculated. The association between the profile characteristics, learning styles, and language learning methodologies was ascertained using Pearson Correlation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The table displays the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents by sex. As shown in the table, there were 121 or 78.1 out of 155 respondents who identified as female, compared to 34 or 21.9 who identified as male. This proves that the BSED English program is dominated by women. This demonstrates

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

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	34	21.9
Female	121	78.1
Total	155	100

even more how women are driven to the Department of Teacher Education's programs due to the possibility of job after graduation. The table presents the frequency

and percentage distribution of the participants according to year level. As gleaned from the table, fourth year has the highest enrollees with a frequency of 54 or 34.8

Table 2: Frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to year level

Sex	Frequency	Percent
First Year	19	12.3
Second Year	33	21.3
Third Year	49	31.6
Fourth Year	54	34.8
Total	155	100

percent, followed by third year which has a frequency of 49 or 31.6 percent, second year with a frequency of 33 or 21.3 percent while the least is the first year which has

a frequency of 19 or 12.3 percent. The data reveal that fourth year has the highest number of enrollees for the academic year 2022-2023.

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

School Graduated From	Frequency	Percent
Private	76	49
Public	79	51
Total	155	100

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 enrollees in the department had finished their high school education in a public school. This shows that students pursuing their tertiary education at Saint Joseph's College of Baggao

have an average family income. SJCBI has a scholarship program given by the government such as the Tertiary Education Subsidy (TES), Tulong-Dunong Program and more which attracts more students most especially those who come from poor family yet interested to finish their studies

Table 4: Frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to fathers' highest educational attainment

Father's Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
College Graduate	19	12.3
College Level	8	5.2
High School Graduate	37	23.9
High School Level	28	18.1
Elementary Graduate	22	14.2
Elementary Level	41	26.1
No Response	0	0
Total	155	100

Table 4 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to fathers' highest educational attainment. As gleaned from the table, out of 155 respondents 41(26.1%) of them have fathers who had not finished their elementary school and had only 19 (12.3%) from those who pursued their college studies, followed by high school graduate and elementary graduate with 37(23.9) and 22(14.2) respectively. The data simply display that the participants' fathers are not equipped with the knowledge needed in guiding their children because most of them are undergraduate of elementary school. Fathers need technical skills that could be of great help academically to their children.

Table 5 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to mothers' highest educational attainment. As gleaned from the table, majority of the mothers had completed their secondary education with a frequency of 40(25.8%), followed high school level with 28(18.1%), college level with 14 (9%), College graduate with 13 (8.4%), Elementary graduate with 21(13.5%), and elementary with 35(22.6%). With MA/MS Units was the least with a frequency of 2(1.3%). On the other hand, there are also 2 or 1.3 % who did not respond because according to them they are not confident of their mother's educational background. The data displays that the respondents' mothers are able to guide their children as

Table 5: Frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to mothers' highest educational attainment

Mother's Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
With MA units	2	1.3
College Graduate	13	8.4
College Level	14	9
High School Graduate	40	25.8
High School Level	28	18.1
Elementary Graduate	21	13.5
Elementary Level	35	22.6
No Response	2	1.3
Total	155	100

they pursue their academic endeavor.

Table 6 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the participants according to language used at home. As shown in the table, most of the participants are Ilocano

with a frequency of 148 or 95.5%. This confirms the findings of Suyu (2015) that migration made Ilocano the dominant 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 used at home	Frequency	Percent
Iloco	148	95.5
Filipino	7	4.5
English	0	0
Total	155	100

Table 7: 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.	3.03	Moderate	
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can re-member them.	3	Moderate	
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help remember the word.	2.88	Moderate	
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	2.91	Moderate	
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.	2.66	Moderate	
6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.	2.33	Low	
7. I physically act out new English words.	2.65	Moderate	
8. I review English lessons often.	2.94	Moderate	
9. I remember new English words or phrases by re-remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	2.85	Moderate	
Sub-Weighted Mean	2.81	Moderate	6
Cognitive Strategies			
10. I say or write new English words several times.	2.84	Moderate	
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	2.85	Moderate	
12. I practice the sounds of English.	3.16	Moderate	
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	3.03	Moderate	
14. I start conversations in English.	2.84	Moderate	
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	3.10	Moderate	
16. I read for pleasure in English.	2.85	Moderate	
17. I write notes, messages, letter, and reports in English.	3.03	Moderate	
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the pas-sage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3.03	Moderate	
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	2.84	Moderate	
20. I try to find patterns in English.	2.81	Moderate	
21. I find the meaning of an English word by divid-ing it into parts that I understand.	2.80	Moderate	
22. I try not to translate word-for -word.	2.77	Moderate	
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English	2.94	Moderate	
Sub-Weighted Mean	2.92	Moderate	4

Compensation strategies			
24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	2.90	Moderate	
25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	3.00	Moderate	
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	2.91	Moderate	
27. I read English without looking up every new words.	2.56	Low	
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	2.84	Moderate	
29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	3.18	Moderate	
Sub-Weighted Mean	2.89	Moderate	
Metacognition Strategies			
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English	3.25	Moderate	
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	3.38	Moderate	
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	3.41	High	
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	3.45	High	
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	2.72	Moderate	
35. I look for people I can talk to in English	2.72	Moderate	
36. I look for opportunities to read much as possible in English	3.07	Moderate	
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	3.33	Moderate	
38. I think about my process in learning English	3.28	Moderate	
Sub-Weighted Mean	3.18	Moderate	1
Affective strategies			
39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English	3.19	Moderate	
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	3.34	Moderate	
41. I give myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	3.27	Moderate	
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	3.07	Moderate	
43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	2.47	Moderate	
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	2.86	Moderate	
Sub-Weighted Mean	3.03	Moderate	3
Social Strategies			
45. If do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	3.36	Moderate	
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	3.27	Moderate	
47. I practice English with other students.	3.06	Moderate	
48. I ask for help from English speakers.	3.07	Moderate	
49. I ask questions in English.	3.03	Moderate	
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	3.04	Moderate	
Sub-Weighted Mean	3.14	Moderate	2

Descriptive Statistics of the Language Learning Strategies

Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics of six learning strategies. As shown in the table. The overall weighted mean is 2.99 (Moderate). This means that the participants utilize varied language learning strategies in order to learn. Metacognition rated first among the tactics used in this study, participants most frequently, with a mean score of 3.18. (Moderate). This may indicate that students have a stronger intrinsic motivation to organize, manage, and maximize their own learning. They emphasize concentrating learning so that attention can be focused on certain linguistic skills or activities. To maximize the return on their time and effort, they organize and arrange their learning. They then take learning evaluation into account. They can track mistakes and assess their development thanks to this.

Social methods are utilized the second-most, on average, at 3.14. (Moderate). This demonstrates that they regularly engage in conversation, collaborate with others, and have empathy for others. The best way to learn and get

closer to understanding anything is to ask questions. By eliciting responses from the other participants and demonstrating interest and involvement, it facilitates discourse. Additionally, collaboration with others eliminates competitiveness and replaces it with a sense of community. According to studies, cooperative learning boosts confidence, self-esteem, and academic progress quickly.

Affective strategies came in third with a mean of 3.03 (Moderate). This demonstrates how the participants can manage their attitudes and feelings toward learning. They are aware that unfavorable emotions hinder learning. Due to their high frequencies, these three suggest that pupils prefer using indirect tactics over direct ones. This implies that rather of "requiring the mental processing of language learning," they help language learning by "focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities, managing fear, enhancing cooperation, and improving empathy" (Oxford, 1990).

Similar conclusions were reached by Ella (2018) in her study, which found that among the six language learning

strategies, metacognitive strategies were employed the most frequently and memory strategies the least. The motivation a student exhibits in learning a language can be used to explain this metacognitive choice. Among the many internal and external variables, Oxford, and Nyikos (1989) claim that motivation has the strongest impact on the decision of which approach to choose. Additionally, it implies a connection between a learner's motivation level and the quantity of tactics employed. In contrast, learners prefer to use more methods the more motivated they are. Between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation has been proven to have an impact on strategy utilization, according to Nokoopour and Farsani (2010). They established that Iranian EFL learners' enhanced use

of metacognitive and cognitive methods is significantly influenced by intrinsic motivation.

The results of the current study support the study of Manuel (2020) entitled Language Learning Strategies and Learning Styles. He discovered that metacognition was the most frequently used language learning strategy among ESL learners in their study, "Learning Styles, Language Learning Strategies, and Fields of Study among ESL Learners." Alcazaren (2016) confirmed the findings of the study, which found that metacognitive was the most frequently used strategic category, followed by cognitive, social, compensation, memory, and affective. His study was titled "Language Learning Strategies: The Case of Foreign Multilinguals in a Philippine Secondary Schools."

Table 8: Descriptive statistics of Learning Styles

Visual Learning	Mean	DV	Rank
I learn better by reading what the teacher writes on the chalkboard.	4.10	Agree	
When I read instructions, I remember them better.	4.20	Agree	
I understand better when I read instructions.	4.32	Strongly agree	
I learn better by reading than by listening to someone.	3.88	Agree	
I learn more by reading textbooks than by listening to lectures.	3.68	Agree	
Sub-Weighted Mean	4.04	Agree	3
Auditory Learning style	Mean	DV	Rank
When the teacher tells me the instructions, I understand better.	4.24	Strongly Agree	
I learn better by reading what the teacher writes on the chalkboard.	4.09	Agree	
When I do things in class, I learn better.	4.20	Agree	
I learn better in class when the teacher gives a lecture.	4.34	Strongly agree	
I learn better in class when I listen to someone.	4.03	Agree	
Sub-Weighted Mean	4.18	Agree	1
Kinesthetic Learning Style	Mean	DV	Rank
I prefer to learn by doing something in class.	4.06	Agree	
When I do things in class, I learn better.	4.12	Agree	
I enjoy learning in class by doing experiments.	3.90	Agree	
I understand things better in class when I participate in role-playing.	4.08	Agree	
I learn best in class when I can participate in related activities.	4.22	Strongly agree	
Sub-Weighted Mean	4.07	Agree	2
Tactile Learning Style	Mean	DV	Rank
I learn more when I can make a model of something.	3.79	Agree	
I learn more when I make something for a class project.	3.89	Agree	
I learn better when I make drawings as I study.	3.57	Agree	
When I build something, I remember what I have learned better.	3.97	Agree	
I learn better by reading than by listening to someone.	3.84	Agree	
Sub-Weighted Mean	3.81	Agree	6
Group Learning Style	Mean	DV	Rank
I get more work done when I work with others.	4.01	Agree	
I learn more when I study with a group.	4.06	Agree	
In class, I learn best when I work with others.	4.0	Agree	
I enjoy working on an assignment with two or three classmates.	3.81	Agree	
I prefer to study with others.	3.75	Agree	
Sub-Weighted Mean	3.93	Agree	5
Individual Learning Style	Mean	DV	Rank
When I study alone, I remember things better.	4.26	Strongly agree	
When I work alone, I learn better.	4.08	Agree	
In class, I work better when I work alone.	3.80	Agree	
I prefer working on projects by myself.	3.89	Agree	
I prefer to work by myself.	3.93	Agree	
Sub-Weighted Mean	3.99	Agree	4
Over All Weighted Mean	4.00	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)

The findings of the present study, however, differ with those of Al-Hebaishi (2012), who conducted research on female EFL majors at Taibak University using the Language Learning Style Questionnaire and SILL on 88 participants. In the current study, memory strategy was the least liked, while affective strategy was ranked three. He claims that memory and emotive techniques were the participants' top preferences for learning strategies.

Table 8 presents the overall mean score values of the 155 participants and their learning styles. As gleaned from the table, the mean score is 4.00 (Agree). The table demonstrates that students' methods for processing information vary. This merely suggests that educators may change their pedagogical approaches, homework, and instructional methods.

Based on the table, the auditory learning method received the highest mean score, 4.18 (Agree), followed by the kinesthetic (4.07 (Agree) and the visual (4.04). (Agree). This indicates that auditory learners prefer classroom activities like simulation and debate and learn knowledge through listening. When knowledge is delivered orally, they are more likely to remember it.

Furthermore, Manuel (2020) said in his study that auditory learners will be among the most attentive and engaged students in any classroom. They have a talent for understanding tone of voice changes, are adept at giving oral reports and class presentations, aren't afraid to speak up in class, follow verbal instructions well, are great study group members, are talented storytellers, and can verbally solve complex problems.

On the other hand, kinesthetic learners benefit from active learning when they are physically involved in the learning process. They struggle to learn in traditional lecture-based classrooms because their bodies don't understand that they are doing anything while they are simply listening. Although their bodies are not actively involved, their minds are, which makes it more challenging for them to digest the information.

These students, in short, are superb experimenters, have excellent motor memory, excellent hand-eye coordination,

excel in sports, perform well in art and theatre, and have high levels of energy.

Manuel (2020) agreed with the study's conclusions. He discovered that the most popular LS among respondents who were Communication students was the auditory style. This demonstrates unequivocally that the study's participants learn best when they actively participate in tasks like role-playing and conversation. For successful learning to occur, communication students love working on projects and communicating with others.

The study's conclusions closely resemble those of a 2013 Indian study by Karthigeyan & Nirmala titled "Learning Style Preference of English Language Learners." They discovered that students learn second languages primarily by visual learning, followed by auditory learning. The visual learning mode was placed third in this study, whereas auditory learning was the most popular. Although the kinesthetic learning strategy was the second most popular in this survey, it was also the least desired by the students in that study, which is an essential point to make. When Peacock (2011) conducted research on learning and teaching styles based on Reid's two main hypotheses, his findings supported those of the study. Reid's Perceptual Learning Style Questionnaire and interviews with 206 EFL students and 46 EFL teachers at Hong Kong university were conducted as part of his study. He discovered from the study that most students preferred tactile, auditory, and group learning.

Moreover, Ong (2006; Reid, 1987a; Peacock, 2011; and other PLS studies generally demonstrate that the majority of ESL students are kinesthetic. Related studies (Reid, 1987b) have supported the findings of the present research that ESL students varied significantly in their sensory preferences. Asian students were frequently very visual, with Koreans being the most visual and Spanish speakers favoring visual and auditory learning.

Table 9 presents Correlation between language learning strategies and the participants' profile variables. As shown in the table, there are no significant differences in the respondents' language learning strategies when

Table 9: Correlation between language learning strategies and the participants' profile variables

Demographic Profile vs Learning Strategies	Pearson R Test Value	language Learning Strategies	language Learning Styles
Sex	r- value	.017	-.051
	p- value	.714	.279
Year level	r- value	.149**	.179**
	p- value	.001	.000
High School Graduat-ed From	r- value	.017	.128**
	p- value	.718	.006
Father's Highest Educ. Attainment	r- value	-.018	.999*
	p- value	.700	.035
Mother's Highest Educ. Attainment	r- value	-.073	-.058
	p- value	.118	.218
Language Used at Home	r- value	-.008	-.034
	p- value	.867	.468

*Correlation significant at .05

grouped according to their profile factors because the p-values for all variables, with the exception of year level, are bigger than alpha (.05). However, the year level's p-value is smaller than alpha (.05), indicating that there is a significant difference between the year level and the participants' language learning tactics and learning preferences.

Moreover, there is a substantial correlation between the respondents' language learning preferences and the p-value of the father's highest level of education. This suggests that each student's view of language learning tactics and learning preferences differs significantly depending on their grade level. The father's highest level of education also has a substantial impact on their learning methods, and this is also true. This indicates that the respondents had various ways of learning languages

CONCLUSION

Based on the study's findings, indirect strategies—metacognition being the most frequently used, followed by social and affective strategies—are what participants use to learn languages the most frequently. Additionally, auditory learning is most popular, followed by kinesthetic and visual learning. Thus, the participants' profiles would similarly influence their language learning approaches and learning preferences. As a result, though the study is only limited to English Major students, the researcher advises educators to develop creative teaching approaches that incorporate both the students' preferred learning styles and common language learning strategies. In order to incorporate best practice tactics into their everyday activities, curricula, and evaluations, educators must be aware of the variations in the language learning strategies and learning styles of their students. Moreover, the study concludes that participants facilitate language acquisition by focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities, lowering fear, fostering cooperation, and growing empathy rather than by needing the intellectual processing of language learning. The participant profiles have no bearing on the students' preferred learning styles or approaches for picking up new languages.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions made in this study, the researcher therefore recommends the following:

1. For the Teachers, in order to create innovative teaching tactics that include both the students' personal learning styles and common language learning strategies, teachers must consistently invest in their professional development through seminars and trainings.
2. For the school to emphasize the need for faculty training that would enable them to be more effective and productive.
3. For the future researchers to conduct the same study in the future but with a larger scope.

Acknowledgment

The researcher is grateful to Dr. Roy D. Tumaneng, Vice President for Research, Quality Assurance and

Accreditation, for his encouragement in starting this research project. He also wants to express his gratitude to Dr. Jomel B. Manuel of Cagayan State University, his colleagues, and the Saint Joseph's College of Baguio students for their extraordinary support and collaboration during the study's execution.

REFERENCES

- Al-Hebaishi, SafaaMohammed. (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.
- Alcazaren, Holden Kenneth. (2016). Language learning Strategies: The Case of Foreign Multilinguals in a Philippine Secondary Schools. *The International Academic Forum*. www.iafor.org
- Cohen, A. (2003). *Strategy training for second language learners*. Retrieved on May 10, 2005, from the World Wide web: <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/0302cohen.htm>
- Cassidy, S. (2004). Learning Styles: An Overview of theories, models, and measures, *Educational Psychology*, 24(4) 219-244.
- Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 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 December 28, 2022.
- Ellis, R. (2005). *The study of second language acquisition*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Education Press.
- Manuel, J. B., (2020). Language Learning Strategies and Learning Styles among First Students of Cagayan State University. *Global Scientific Journals*, 8(7).
- Nokoopour, J. &Farsani, M. (2010). On the relationship between language learning strategies and personalitytypes among Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of English Studies*, 1(1), 81-101.
- Oxford, R. L., (1996a). *Language learning strategies around the world: cross-cultural perspectives*. Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.
- Ong, A., Rajendram, S.C., and Mohd. Sffian Md. Yusof. (2006). *Learning Style Preferences and English Proficiency among Cohort 3 Students in IPBA*. Retrieved December 23, 2022 from <http://apps.emoe.gov.my/ipba/Research/stdntseminar/pg23to36pdf>.
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. and Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal*, 72(3), 291-300.
- Oxford, Rebecca L. (2001). Language learning styles and strategies. In *Celce-Murcia, Marianne (ed). Teaching*

- English as a Second or Foreign Language*. 3rd ed., pp. 359-366. USA: Heinle & Heinle Thomson Learning.
- Peacock, M. (2011). Match or mismatch? Learning styles and teaching styles in EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 1-20.
- Reid, J. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students, *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 87-111.
- Reid, J. (1987). The Learning Style Preferences of ESL Students, *TESOL Learning Journal*. 39,43-55.
- Suyu, Estrella. (2015). Cagayan Valley: *The Ibanag*. Retrieved December 23, 2022 from <https://ncca.gov.ph/about-ncca-3/subcommissions/subcommission-on-cultural-cmmunities-and-traditional-arts-northern>.
- Tupas, T. Ruanni F.(2004). Second Language Teaching. *UP Open University*. 180-182
- Troike, Muriel Saville. (2006). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 93. Retrieved December 23, 2022 from <https://www.thoughtco.com/auditory-learning-style-p3-3212038> Retrieved December 23, 2022 from [https://www/thoughtco.com/the-kinesthetic-learning-style-3212046](https://www.thoughtco.com/the-kinesthetic-learning-style-3212046)