# THE CORRELATION BETWEEN STUDENTS' LEARNING STYLE AND STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT

**Muhammad Faris Fahrudin**

English Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya
farisfahrudin3@gmail.com

**Him'mawan Adi Nugroho**

English Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya

## Abstrak

Terdapat sejumlah faktor yang memengaruhi keberhasilan belajar bahasa asing, termasuk gaya belajar siswa. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah ada hubungan yang signifikan antara gaya belajar siswa dan prestasi berbicara siswa kelas XII SMA Negeri 1 Tumpang tahun ajaran 2014/2015. 34 siswa kelas XII IA 3 menjadi subjek penelitian korelasional ini. Selain itu, metode kuantitatif digunakan dengan catatan lapangan, angket dan skor berbicara sebagai instrumen. Hasil mengungkap bahwa gaya belajar *auditory* adalah gaya belajar yang paling banyak diterapkan siswa, diikuti oleh gaya belajar *kinesthetic* dan gaya belajar *visual*. Namun, analisis ANOVA menunjukkan bahwa tidak ada hubungan yang signifikan antara gaya belajar siswa dan pencapaian berbicara siswa kelas XII IA 3 SMA Negeri 1 Tumpang. Hal ini dibuktikan dengan *p.value* (0,259) yang lebih tinggi dari nilai signifikansi (0,05).
**Kata Kunci:** korelasi, gaya belajar, berbicara.

## Abstract

There are a number of factors which influence the success of learning foreign language including students' learning styles. Thus, this study aimed at finding out whether there is a significant correlation between students' learning styles and students' speaking achievement of the twelfth graders of SMA Negeri 1 Tumpang in the academic year of 2014/2015. 34 students of XII IA 3 class were involved as the participants of this correlational research. In addition, quantitative method was employed by using field notes, questionnaire and students' speaking scores as the instruments. It was found that auditory learning style was the most preferred learning style, followed by kinesthetic learning style and visual learning style. However, the ANOVA analysis showed that there is no significant correlation between learning styles and speaking achievement of XII IA 3 students of SMA Negeri 1 Tumpang since the p.value (0.259) obtained is higher than the significance value (0.05).
**Keywords:** correlation, learning style, speaking.

## INTRODUCTION

In case of acquiring foreign language, Ahmed (2012) stated that there are a number of factors which influence the success of learning foreign language, including learning styles. Regarding these, studies have been undertaken to investigate the correlation between students' learning styles and students' outcomes. Alkubaidi (2014) found that there is no relationship between learning style and writing score in Saudi English Major University Students. Also, Pratiwi, Arifin, and Novita (2011) found that there is no significant correlation between students' learning styles and students' reading comprehension of the fourth semester students of English education program of FKIP UNTAN Pontianak. In addition, Naning and Hayati (2011) found that there is no correlation between the learning styles of the English Education Study Program Students of Sriwijaya University and their listening achievement. The findings from the previous studies take an important role in designing this research. While the previous studies focused on the relationship between students' learning styles and students' writing, reading and listening achievement, this current research has been coonducted to investigate the correlation between students' learning style and students' speaking achievement.

## RESEARCH METHODS

This study was a quantitative correlation research since the researcher identifies variables and looks for relationship among them but does not manipulate the variables (Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Razavieh, 2010). An advantage of correlation research is that it provides information about the strength of relationships between variables (Ary et al., 2010). Besides, correlation research methods are used to assess relationships and patterns of relationship among variables in a single group of subjects (Ary et al., 2010).

There are two variables used in this study, namely students' learning styles as the independent variable and students' speaking achievement as the dependent variable. The participants were 34 students of XII IA 3 of SMA Negeri 1 Tumpang. The data were students' learning styles and students' speaking achievement. Furthermore, uunstructured observation sheets, questionnaire and students' speaking scores were employed as the research instruments.

The observation on the teaching and learning activities was done in three meetings. During the observation, fields notes or unstructured observation sheets adapted from Susanto (2010) that recorded the teaching and learning activities were written. The unstructured observation sheet was used to describe the teaching and learning activities in the classroom. After they were described, comments were written to interpret the three main learning styles applied by the students. Next, the questionnaire used in this study was self-designed questionnaire. Items of the questionnaire were arranged to find out the learning style from each student. After that, it was tested for the reliability and spread to the students then analyzed by using cronbach's alpha in SPSS In additiion, speaking scores were copied from the teacher and analyzed by using One-Way Analysis of Variance in SPSS 16.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

To reveal the correlation between students' learning style and students' speaking achievement, the table of the reliability test of the questionnaire items and the tables of Anova analysis are shown as follow.

### Result of the Reliability Test of the Questionnaire Items

Table 1. Reliability Statistics

**Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|---|---|---|
| .639 | .647 | 15 |

From the above table, it can be seen that Cronbach's Alpha is found as many as 0.639 which means that the all variables scale in this study achieve Alpha of 0.639 that is satisfactory (Sax, 1989).

## Interpretation of the ANOVA Analysis

Table 2. Descriptive

**Descriptives**

SPKSCORE

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | | |
| Visual | 8 | 71.2500 | 6.94365 | 2.45495 | 65.4450 | 77.0550 | 65.00 | 85.00 |
| Auditory | 15 | 71.6667 | 9.38591 | 2.42343 | 66.4689 | 76.8644 | 65.00 | 90.00 |
| Kinesthetic | 11 | 76.3636 | 5.95437 | 1.79531 | 72.3634 | 80.3638 | 65.00 | 85.00 |
| Total | 34 | 73.0882 | 7.97864 | 1.36832 | 70.3044 | 75.8721 | 65.00 | 90.00 |

From the above output, it can be seen that from the total of 34 students, there were 8 who employed visual learning styles with the mean score of speaking 71.25. The lowest score achieved by the students of this group was 65 and the highest score was 85. Meanwhile, the number of students who employed auditory learning style was found as many as 15 students with the mean score of speaking 71.6667. The lowest score achieved by the students of this group was 65 and the highest score was 90. In addition, the number of students who employed kinesthetic learning style was found as many as 11 students with the mean score of speaking 76.3636. The lowest score achieved by the students of this group was 65 and the highest score was 85.

Table 3. Test of Homegeneity of Variances

**Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

SPKSCORE

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.640 | 2 | 31 | .210 |

The significance value (Sig.) for Levene's test is 0.210. Since this number is greater than .05, the assumption of homogeneity of variance is not violated.

Table 4. ANOVA

**ANOVA**

SPKSCORE

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 175.357 | 2 | 87.678 | 1.412 | .259 |
| Within Groups | 1925.379 | 31 | 62.109 | | |
| Total | 2100.735 | 33 | | | |

Since the Sig. value of 0.259 is more than 0.05, it means that there is no significant difference somewhere among the mean scores on the dependent variable (speaking score) for the three groups. The fourth table is multiple comparison showing significant differences of overall ANOVA.

Table 5. Multiple Comparisons

**Post Hoc Tests**

**Multiple Comparisons**

SPKSCORE
Tukey HSD

| (I) LSTYLE | (J) LSTYLE | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Visual | Auditory | -.41667 | 3.45025 | .992 | -8.9084 | 8.0750 |
| | Kinesthetic | -5.11364 | 3.66195 | .355 | -14.1264 | 3.8991 |
| Auditory | Visual | .41667 | 3.45025 | .992 | -8.0750 | 8.9084 |
| | Kinesthetic | -4.69697 | 3.12840 | .304 | -12.3965 | 3.0026 |
| Kinesthetic | Visual | 5.11364 | 3.66195 | .355 | -3.8991 | 14.1264 |
| | Auditory | 4.69697 | 3.12840 | .304 | -3.0026 | 12.3965 |

The table shows that all of the significant values are higher than 0.05. The above post-hoc tests in this table tell exactly where the differences among the groups occur. Since there are not any asterisks (*) on the Mean Difference, this means that the three groups being compared are not significantly different from one another at the p>.05 level. The exact significance value is given in the column labeled Sig. In the results presented above, there is no group which is statistically significantly different from one another. In another word, students with visual, auditory and kinesthetic group are not significantly different in terms of their speaking score. To find out the effect size of the above result, eta squared is calculated as follows:

Eta squared = Sum of squares between groups : Total sum of squares

= 175.357 : 2100.735

= 0.08

The resulting eta squared value is 0.08 that is considered medium (Cohen, 1988). The analysis did not obtain a statistically significant result, but the actual difference in the mean scores of the groups was quite huge (71.25, 71.66, 76.36). This is evident in the medium effect size obtained (eta squared = 0.08). With a very small sample (in this case, N = 34) quite huge differences cannot become statistically significant (Pallant, 2010).

**Discussion**

From the above result, it is clear that students' learning style and students' speaking score has no significant correlation. In another word, someone's learning style does not significantly affect his or her success in learning a language, specifically in learning speaking. This is contradictory to Ahmed (2012) who believes that there are a number of factors which influence the success of language learning, including learning styles and learning strategies. At the same time, the result of this study upholds the findings from Dincer and Yesilyurt (2013) who found that factor affecting students' speaking comes from the students themselves as some students feel incompetent in oral communication though they have different motivational orientation about English speaking skill. Consequently, some students have their difficulties in case of motivation or self confidence. Regarding this factor, Hamad (2013) added that students find themselves loss when they asked to deliver speech in front of the class, also they hesitate when they have to get conversation with native outside their classroom.

Besides, the other affecting factors of difficulties in speaking come from problem in issues like sound recognition, connected speech, and the relation between spelling and sounds which was clearly noticed when examining students performance in English (Adayleh, 2013).

Also, instructors can be one of the factors affecting speaking, for example whether or not they encourage the students to answer in English language, whether they only use English language to communicate with the students inside the class or whether they let the students use their L1 sometimes to express what they can't in English (Hamad, 2013). Besides, the way teacher explains the material also can be one of factors affecting students' speaking achievement (Richard, 1990). Moreover, the way the teacher gives the test, whether it was conducted in an oral or written test form, might also affect the students' speaking achievement since it was found that some students are under more stress in an oral test than they would be in a written test because they are nervous (A. Ahmed, Pollitt, & Rose, 1999).

Additionally, problem in speaking might come from the curriculum, as well. For instance, it does not contain enough exercises for speaking skills or the exercises in text book strength the other three skills more than speaking skills (Hamad, 2013). In addition, problem might also be caused by the effectiveness of the teaching media. Regarding this, Roblyer and Doering (2010) states that media such as slides and films delivered information in more concrete and therefore more effective ways than lectures and books did. Thus, student's achievement in speaking has nothing to do with his preference in using specific learning style.

Furthermore, the result of this study supports the findings from Neuhauser (2002) who figured out that there were no significant differences between students' learning styles and grades in an online and face-to-face section. It was found that 40 % online section students who get A or A– grade applied visual as their learning styles, while the rest who got the same grade preferred kinesthetic as their learning styles. Besides, 43% face-to-face section students with A or A– grade employed visual as their preferred style and the rest applied kinesthetic as their preferred styles. He concluded that there was no relation between the preferred styles of learning and final grades in either group. Besides, this adds to the discussion of the similar studies undertaken to measure the correlation between students' learning styles and the other three skills such as reading (Pratiwi et al., 2011) writing (Alkubaidi, 2014) and listening (Naning & Hayati, 2011).

**CONCLUSIONS**

The above results and discussions become the sources of drawing the conclusion of this study. Concerning the correlation between students' learning styles and students' speaking score, it was found that

students' learning styles have no correlation with students' speaking score of the twelfth grade in SMA Negeri 1 Tumpang. The reason why the three learning styles do not significantly affect students' speaking score might be caused by some other factors that could not be explained by this Anova analysis. In another word, the success of students' speaking may come from the internal factor such as the students themselves and the external factors like the role of the instructor, teaching media, the design of the curriculum or the way the test was conducted. In conclusion, students' success in speaking is not significantly affected by their preference to employ particular learning style.

## REFERENCES

Adayleh, H. (2013). The Difficulties Faced by English Language and Literature Students at Mu'tah University in Mastering English Language Pronunciation. *European Journal of social science, 38*(2).

Ahmed, A., Pollitt, A., & Rose, L. (1999). *Assessing Thinking and Understanding: Can Oral Assessment Provide a Clearer Perspective?* Paper presented at the 8th International Conference on Thinking, Edmonton Canada.

Ahmed, O. N. (2012). The Effect of Different Learning Styles on Developing Writing Skills of Saudi Learners. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences, 5*(2).

Alkubaidi, M. A. (2014). The Relationship between Saudi English Major University Students' Writing Performance and Their Learning Style and Strategy Use. *English Language Teaching, 7*(4).

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education*. Belmont: Wadsworth, Cengange learning.

Cohen. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2 ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dincer, A., & Yesilyurt, S. (2013). Pre-Service English Teachers' Beliefs on Speaking Skills Based on Motivational Orientations. *English Language Teaching, 6*(7), 88-95.

Hamad, M. M. (2013). Factors Negatively Affecting Speaking Skills at Saudi Colleges for Girls in The south. *Canadian Center of Science Education, 6*(12).

Naning, Z. A., & Hayati, R. (2011). The Correlation between Learning Style and Listening Achievement of English Education Study Program Students of Sriwijaya University. *Jurnal Holistics, 3*(5).

Neuhauser, C. (2002). Learning Style and Effectiveness of Online and Face-to-Face Instruction. *American Journal of Distance Education, 16*(2), 99-13.

Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS SURVIVAL MANUAL A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (4 ed.). England: Mc Graw Hill.

Pratiwi, S. W., Arifin, Z., & Novita, D. (2011). *The Correlation Between Learning Style and Stdents' Reading Comprehension*. UNTAN. Pontianak.

Richard, J. C. (1990). The Language Teaching Matrix (pp. 67-85). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Roblyer, M. D., & Doering, A. H. (2010). *Integrating Educational Technology into Teaching* (5 ed.). United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.

Sax, G. (1989). *Principles of educational and psychological measurement and evaluation* (3 ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Susanto. (2010). *Konsep Penelitian Tindakan Kelas dan Penerapannya*. Surabaya: Lembaga Penerbitan FBS UNESA