

Students' Perceptual Learning Styles and Attitudes Toward Communicative Language Teaching

Mary Rose A. Natividad

Isabela State University, Isabela Philippines

arenamaryrose@yahoo.com

Boyet L. Batang

Isabela State University, Isabela Philippines

bbatang827@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigated the perceptual learning styles and attitudes of students towards the communicative language teaching approach of Isabela State University freshmen as ESL students. This was done to probe the following subjects' data: profiles (age, gender, course and ethnicity); their perceptual learning styles and attitudes in line with their profiles; the significant differences of their styles and attitudes across profiles, and; the significant relationship among different perceptual learning styles such as visual, tactile and auditory, among others. Results of the study revealed that late adolescents preferred auditory, kinesthetic, group, tactile and visual, whereas the early adulthood subjects favored auditory; that gender played a role in determining their learning styles; that there is a variety of preferences across courses; that learning styles vary across ethnic groups; that Filipino learners learn best through spoken language; that grammar is not a preferred subject of study and CLT, favored, and, among others; that students learn best by using the six sensory modes.

Keywords: perceptual learning styles, communicative language teaching approach

Introduction

Learning styles and attitude play an important role in language teaching and learning process. This is especially true for ESL learners. It has been pointed out in the study of Mulalic, et. al (2009) that the contemporary practices in education are very often idealized from the administrative and pedagogical perspective. It must also be taken note, however, that a majority of lecturers and teachers are not aware of their students' learning styles. This often leads to lack of sensitivity to the learners' needs and state of mind. Due to such insensitivity to the frame of mind of the learners, adverse and unanticipated consequences may ensue and undesirable results may obstruct the teaching-learning process and the process of language acquisition.

Apparently, students' learning styles have been ignored and have been considered as an insignificant component of the pedagogical process. As a consequence, language learning has been regarded as uninteresting, mundane and dry. In line with this, Dunn (1993) held that teachers cannot identify student's styles without using a multidimensional instrument (that is, an instrument for the measure of cognitive style).

These are but a few of the reasons why Caneo (2001) and Savignon and Wang (2011), among others, took steps in probing into questions of perceptual learning styles and attitudes and their relationship and impact on the teaching-learning process. These authors, among many others, have laid down scaffolds of this study.

On Effective Language Teaching

According to Caneo (2001), a large body of empirical literature on educational approaches deals on constructs of effective teaching that offer options for learning in individually satisfying ways. In this context, teachers present

content through a variety of teaching strategies to attract individual students' interests and to respond to their learning preferences. The usual focus of attention in such studies is the process that takes place between the teacher and the students within and outside the classroom. Teachers are expected to possess excellent knowledge of content and of pedagogy; however, expertise goes beyond the competencies grounded on an effective teaching style.

A teacher's predominant teaching style affects the way he or she presents information and how he or she interacts with students. The manner and pattern of those interactions with students clearly shows his or her effectiveness in promoting student learning and self-esteem (Caneo, 2001, p. 1). The crucial question is how teachers make sense of the teaching – learning process; how well they deliver the message, based on their understanding of how the brain works. Educational philosophies of teachers encompass an abstract level of knowledge, a belief system, which forms their choice of teaching style. Furthermore, this pedagogical knowledge and belief system include when to use different techniques, when to choose particular materials, and when to vary the pace of teaching.

On Communicative Language Teaching

On a broader subject connected to that of Caneo (2001), Savignon and Wang (2011) discussed whether communicative language teaching is seen to be difficult, effective, or is rejected as inappropriate, reports on its implementation have been based mainly on teachers' perceptions of communicative language teaching (Li, 1998). Only a few studies have investigated learners' views (for example, Schulz, 1996), and fewer still, learner views of communicative practices in the classroom. And yet, as Savignon (1997: 107) asserts, "if all the variables in L2 acquisition could be identified and the many intricate patterns of interaction between learner and learning context described, ultimate success in learning to use a second language most likely would be seen to depend on the attitude of the learner". Learner views of learning cannot be ignored, in particular, when there is a mismatch between teacher beliefs and learner beliefs (Schulz, 1996).

Richards (2006) also drew attention to the goal of language learning with an emphasis on communicative competence. For him, the goal of language learning is to know how to use this language for a range of different purposes and functions. Relevant questions are how to vary the use of language according to setting and participants, how to produce and understand different text types and how to maintain communication despite the limitations occurring in the speaker's knowledge of the foreign language. With a major focus on developing learner ability to use language appropriately in context, communicative language teaching (CLT) contrasts sharply with established traditions that emphasize learner knowledge of formal features. Not surprisingly, innovations in various English as Foreign Language (EFL) and English as Second Language (ESL) contexts developed in consonance with the underpinnings of communicative language teaching have faced major challenges (see, for example, Anderson 1993; Bhatia 2003; Cheng 2002; Dam and Gabrielsen 1988; Li 1998; LoCastro 1996; Nunan 1993; Sato and Kleinsasser 1999; Savignon 2002, 2003; Yano 2003).

The personal reflection on how one acquires language, could serve as a key to an academic mastering of the native tongue, and the learning of the second language. This study, consequently, is premised to identify student's perceptual learning styles (PLS) and attitudes of ESL students toward communicative language teaching. This study, therefore, considering the foregoing discussions, the researchers has decided to set this study into motion. This is not only to investigate the perceptual learning styles and attitudes towards communicative language teaching of learners within a smaller scale and in a different context but also to demonstrate the importance of the perceptual learning styles of ESL students as well as the need for additional research on potential impact of different factors.

In order to achieve its ends, the main issues to be solved are:

1. whether or not learners' ages, sexes, courses and ethnicities reveal something about their perceptual learning styles and their attitudes toward communicative language teaching;
2. whether or not there are significance differences or relationships among these learning styles and attitudes across ages, sexes, courses and ethnicities, and;
3. whether or not these profiles reveal any significant relationship across different learning styles such as visual, tactile and auditory, among others.

Methods

The Research: Its Design and Subjects

This study employed a descriptive-correlational method of research that attempted to characterize the perceptual learning styles and attitudes of ESL students toward communicative language teaching. Particularly, comparative type was utilized to compare the perceptual learning styles and attitudes toward communicative language teaching of ESL students by age, gender, course, and ethnicity while correlation type was used to determine the relationship among the following perceptual learning styles. Proportionate Allocation sampling was utilized in selecting the freshmen subjects in the study. A total of 163 subjects were taken from the total population of which 5% from each of the total population in the different clustered programs at the Isabela State University Cauayan Campus namely: education, arts and sciences, business, mechanical, and agriculture.

The Instrument

A modified 30-item Perceptual Learning Styles Preference Questionnaire Inventory (PLSPQI) was utilized in the study. It was patterned after the scale developed by Reid (1987), Salem (2001) and Soliven (2001). The questionnaire assessed the preferred learning styles of the students based on how students learn best using their perceptions: *visual*, *auditory*, *kinesthetic*, and *tactile* preferences, and two social aspects of learning: *group* and *individual* preferences. On the other hand, a 24 items inventory was used to determine the subjects' attitudes toward communicative language teaching. It was adapted from Karavas-Doukas in 1996 and Chang 2011 with five-point scale in the likert format.

Data Gathering

Arrangement of the schedule in administering personally the questionnaires was made so that they can explain well the content of the two questionnaires to the different identified students who were enrolled in the clustered courses in the Isabela State University, Cauayan Campus, Cauayan, Isabela. The researchers also sought some assistance from the English lecturers who have been teaching or handling freshmen students for at least five years to validate the adapted instruments. During the administration of the questionnaires, a time for orientation and proper instructions were allotted to the respondents on how to answer the questionnaires.

Statistical Tools

The data were treated using the following statistical tools/ measures: Simple frequency count and percentage were utilized to describe the profile of the subjects relative to their age, gender, course, and ethnicity. On the other hand, weighted mean and standard deviation were used to measure the perceptual learning styles and attitudes of ESL students toward communicative language teaching when they are classified according to age, gender, course and ethnicity. Likewise, independent samples t-test was utilized to determine the difference between the perceptual learning styles of ESL students by age and gender.

Moreover, one-way analysis of variance was used to measure the difference between the perceptual learning styles of ESL students by course, and ethnicity, and difference in the attitudes toward communicative language teaching of students by age, gender, course, and ethnicity. Furthermore, Tukey HSD was used as the post hoc analysis to find comparison of a combination of means; and finally, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the significant relationship among the following perceptual learning styles: visual, tactile, auditory, group, kinesthetic, and individual.

Results and Discussion

After exhausting all possible scientific and statistical strategies in gather pieces of information to answer the problems intended to solve, or at least define, the researchers has finally arrived with pertinent data. These are discussed below.

Profile of the Subjects

A majority of the subjects were on the late adolescent stage (142 or 87.1%) and there were more males than females. This can be attributed to the Philippines having one of the most numbers of children and the current prevalent system of education (Basic Education Curriculum). In terms of their majorship, most were enrolled in business courses

(65 or 39.9%) while relatively few students enrolled in agriculture with the lowest frequency (10 or 6.1%). This may be appreciated in light of the fact that there are four departments under “business courses” while the agriculture course only has two.

Majority of the subjects in the study were Ilocanos (119 or 72.6%) and only few were Gaddangs (4 or 2.5%). This could be based on the fact that most people in the northern Luzon were Ilocanos. As reflected in the Geographic Names Standardization Policy for the Philippines (2013), one of the five major ethnic groups of the Philippines is Ilocano who are the inhabitants of lowlands, and coastal areas of northern Luzon. This was also proven as stated by the Philippine Census that there is 68.71% Ilocano settlers in Cagayan Valley.

Students' Perceptual Learning Style

In general, it can be observed that the students enrolled in various courses have the tendency to learn concepts in a different manner. These findings are supported by Csapo and Hayen (2006) when they mentioned that patterns in learning style type have been identified in select occupations and academic programs. In addition, their research has shown that individuals have adopted the learning style characteristics of those they work closely with, also contributing to an occupational pattern of learning style types.

Table 1.0 shows that, as a whole, as a whole, the freshmen students' were auditory (mean = 39.35), kinesthetic (mean = 38.96), group (mean = 38.17) and visual (mean = 38) learners. This implies that Filipino learners learn best through spoken language. This could be attributed from the fact English is a language subject and the students can participate successfully in a language task through listening to the spoken language.

Another factor that contributes to the result that college students are basically auditory learners could be the fact that most of the teachers in the Philippines are still traditional and focus mainly on rote memorization and teachers' lectures in teaching concepts. Southeast Asian students in general as stressed by Park (2000) tend to be passive and nonverbal in class because the classrooms were highly structured. The students would usually listen to a teacher's lecture, take notes copiously, and answer teachers' questions. The teachers do not have adequate instructional materials or training for diverse teaching and learning strategies.

According to Age

Findings relative to age(s) show that late adolescent students can learn best through the use of spoken language actual experience, by working in groups, hands-on activities and seeing visual materials. On the other hand, they have the tendency not to learn well by working alone. Furthermore, as students grow old, they tend to learn much through hearing the concepts taught by the teacher. This finding is consistent with the study of Ghada et al. (2011) that 82.4% of the students between the age of 16 and 18 prefer for the auditory learning style while this percentage is higher (88.0%) for students in the 19-21 year old group who are older. The third group, (22-24 years old), has preference for auditory (90.9%). The results indicate that the auditory learning style is more dominant with older students. They also show that the percentage of the students who exhibited a preference for auditory is increasing as the age group increases.

According to Sex

Data gathered regarding perceptual learning styles relative to sex are in line with the study of Peacock (2001) who found out that learners favored kinesthetic and auditory styles and disfavored individual and group styles. Male students can learn concepts best through hearing oral explanations but they do not function well when they are doing hands-on activities or working alone. Although gender has been identified as one of the characteristics that differentiates learning styles of individuals (Dunn and Honigsfeld, 2003), it appeared that in the present study both the female and the male students can learn concepts best through the information that they hear and direct involvement in what they are learning. The present study supported the study of Ghada (2011) which revealed that both Lebanese males and females favored auditory, kinesthetic and tactile learning styles.

According to Course

It can be observed that the students enrolled in various courses have the tendency to learn concepts in a different manner. These findings are supported by Csapo and Hayen (2006) when they mentioned that patterns in learning style type have been identified in select occupations and academic programs. In addition, their research has

shown that individuals have adopted the learning style characteristics of those they work closely with, also contributing to an occupational pattern of learning style types.

According to Ethnicity

As a whole, it can be observed that Ibanag, Ilocano and Tagalog students have the tendency to respond well to lecture and discussion while the Gaddang students learn best through working alone. In her article on learning styles and culture published in Kleinfield (2001) purported that the concept of cultural reaming styles is also helpful when it reminds teachers to pay attention to the ways of life in the communities in which they teach, especially when these are culturally distinctive communities. Based on the results, students in different cultural or ethnic background may not have the same perceptual learning in communicative learning.

Table 1.0 Students' Perceptual Learning Styles According to Courses

Data relative to		Findings
AGES	15-18-year old subjects	Auditory (mean = 39.55), kinesthetic (mean = 39.28), group (mean = 38.48), tactile (mean = 38.17), and visual (mean 38.10)
	19-24-year-old subjects	Auditory (mean = 38)
SEXES	Female Subjects	Auditory (mean = 38.94) and kinesthetic (mean = 38.68) than visual (mean = 37.55), tactile (mean = 37.52), group (mean = 37.35), and kinesthetic (mean = 37.844)
	Male Subjects	Auditory (mean = 39.35), kinesthetic (mean = 39.08), group (mean = 38.61), and visual (mean = 38.27)
COURSES		
Agriculture		Auditory (mean = 41.80), tactile (mean = 40.80), individual (mean = 40.20), visual (mean = 39.60), and kinesthetic (mean = 38.20)
		Note: Difficulties when in groups (mean = 37.60).
Education		Working auditory (mean = 38)
		Note: Difficulties with hands-on activities (mean = 33.18) and working in groups (mean = 33.18)
IT		Group (mean = 39.55), auditory (mean = 39.45), and kinesthetic (mean – 38.36) styles.
		Note: Difficulties with individual tasks.
Arts and Sciences		Tactile (mean = 41.75), auditory (mean = 41.67), kinesthetic (mean = 41.58), visual (mean = 41.42), individual (mean = 41.33), and group (mean = 39.67)
	Mechanics	Hearing (mean = 38.56).

	Business	Kinesthetic (mean = 39.26), auditory (mean = 38.74), and group (mean = 38.68)
ETHNICITY	Ibanag	Auditory (mean = 39.67), using kinesthetic style (mean = 38.33), and by working in a group (mean = 38)
	Ilocano	Auditory (mean = 39.33), kinesthetic (mean = 38.92), and group (mean = 38.12)
	Gaddang	Individual (mean = 41.50), tactile (mean = 40.50), kinesthetic (mean = 40.50), auditory (mean = 39.50), and group (mean = 39)
	Tagalog	Visual (mean = 38.24), auditory (mean = 39.35), by working in groups (mean = 38.39), and experiential (mean = 39.00).

Students' Attitude toward Communicative Language Teaching In General

Table 2.0 show that students have favorable attitudes particularly on the statements that group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.15), learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.14), and textbook alone is not able to cater to all the needs and interests of the students because the teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students (mean = 4.03). Meanwhile, they manifested unfavorable attitudes on the statements that grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged (mean = 1.89), teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make because if errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning (mean = 1.90), and the role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing, and example (mean = 1.91). In general, it can be said that the first year college students have moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.98). This implies that the learners are generally in favor with CLT because activities or tasks are designed to engage them in making meaning orally or in writing offers an opportunity to learn English by using the language in context rather but they do not support the idea that learning should simply focus on recognizing or memorizing grammatical rules.

According to Age

The late adolescent students are in favor that group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.18), the learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.14), group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning (mean = 4.03), and textbook alone is not able to cater to all the needs and interests of the students because the teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students (mean = 4.03).

On the other hand, they are unfavorable that grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged (mean = 1.86), the role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart

knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing, and example (mean = 1.89), and the teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make because if errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning (mean = 1.92). In general, the late adolescent students have moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.98). This implies that the students have favorable attitudes toward CLT because it advocates group activities and it is learner-centered but they dislike using traditional grammar teaching that requires the students to memorize numerous grammar rules.

On the part of the early adulthood students, they are in favor that the learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.14), textbook alone is not able to cater to all the needs and interests of the students because the teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students (mean = 4.05), and group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning (mean = 4.00). However, the subjects have unfavorable attitudes on the statements that the teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make because if errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning (mean = 1.76), direct instruction in the rules and terminology of grammar is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively (mean = 1.90), and the role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing, and example (mean = 2.00). Thus, the early adulthood students have moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.95). This means that the early adulthood students support CLT because it acknowledges the role and contribution of learners in the learning process but they are not in favor on putting much emphasis on checking grammatical errors.

In general, it can be inferred that both the late adolescent and early adulthood subjects have moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT.

According to Sex

Female subjects are in favor that the learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.23), textbook alone is not able to cater to all the needs and interests of the students because the teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students (mean = 4.23), and group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for cooperative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.21). But they are not in favor that the teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make because if errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning (mean = 1.77), the role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing, and example (mean = 1.77), and it is impossible in a large class of students to organize your teaching so as to suit the needs of all (mean = 1.92). Thus, females have moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.98). This indicates that the female students have favorable attitudes toward placing importance on the role and contribution of learners in the learning process but they have unfavorable attitudes on the importance of grammar.

On the part of the male subjects, they are in favor that group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.11), the learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.09), and group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning (mean = 3.99). However, they have unfavorable attitudes on the statements that grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged (mean = 1.86), direct instruction in the rules and terminology of grammar is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively (mean = 1.95), and the teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make because if errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning (mean = 1.98). Hence, the male students also have moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.98). This denotes that the male students support CLT because it focuses on the development of the students' abilities to use the target language while they are not in favor that grammatical correctness should be given much importance.

According to Course

Agriculture students are in favor that group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for cooperative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.20), knowledge

of the rules of a language does not guarantee ability to use the language (mean = 4.20), tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students' needs rather than imposed on them (mean = 4.20), and textbook alone is not able to cater to all the needs and interests of the students because the teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students (mean = 4.20). Meanwhile, they are unfavorable that the communicative approach to language teaching produces fluent but inaccurate learners (mean = 1.60), the role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing, and example (mean = 1.60), and grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged (mean = 1.70). Hence, the agriculture students have moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.99). This means that the agriculture students are in favor with CLT because it advocates group or pair work activities which are designed to promote communication in the classrooms but they are not in favor in placing much importance to grammatical correctness.

On the part of the education students, they are in favor that textbook alone is not able to cater to all the needs and interests of the students that is why the teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students (mean = 4.29), learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.12), and group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning (mean = 4.06). But they are not in favor that the role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing, and example (mean = 1.65), grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged (mean = 1.71), and teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make because if errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning (mean = 1.76). Thus, the education students have moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.92). This indicates that the education students have favorable attitudes toward CLT because the teachers expose the students to the target language in order to acquire the language that is why they are not in favor that the role of the teacher is just to impart knowledge.

Likewise, the information technology students are highly in favor that the learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.50), they are also in favor that group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.27), group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning (mean = 4.05), and textbook alone is not able to cater to all the needs and interests of the students because the teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students (mean = 4.05). However, they are not in favor that grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged (mean = 1.59), teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make because if errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning (mean = 1.64), and training learners to take responsibility for their own learning is futile since learners are not used to such an approach (mean = 1.91). Thus, information technology students manifested moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.96). This indicates that the information technology students are in favor with CLT because it can help develop learner-autonomy while their attitudes are unfavorable on putting much emphasis on grammatical correctness.

Meanwhile, the arts and sciences students are in favor that group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.25), learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.08), and group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning (mean = 4.08). Although, they are not in favor that grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged (mean = 1.67), direct instruction in the rules and terminology of grammar is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively (mean = 1.67), and training learners to take responsibility for their own learning is futile since learners are not used to such an approach (mean = 1.75). Therefore, the arts and sciences students had shown moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.97). This means that the arts and sciences students have favorable attitudes on group works but unfavorable attitudes on importance of grammar.

In terms of the attitudes toward CLT of the mechanical students, they are in favor that group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning (mean =

4.12), group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.08), and learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.00). Nonetheless, they are not in favor that the teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make (mean = 1.96), grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged (mean = 2.00), and students do their best when taught as a whole class by the teacher since small group work may occasionally be useful to vary the routine, but it can never replace sound formal instruction by a competent teacher (mean = 2.16). Hence, the mechanical students have moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 3.02). This implies that the mechanical students are in favor with group works but they are not in favor that grammatical correctness should be given much emphasis.

Lastly, the business students are in favor that group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.14), learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.12), and teacher as transmitter of knowledge is only one of the many different roles he/she must perform during the course of a lesson (mean = 4.09). But they are not in favor that it is impossible in a large class of students to organize the teachers' teaching so as to suit the needs of all (mean = 1.88), the role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing, and example (mean = 1.89), and direct instruction in the rules and terminology of grammar is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively (mean = 1.89). Hence, they demonstrated moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.99). This means that the business students have favorable attitudes toward CLT because it does not only enhance the learners' English proficiency, but creates a classroom atmosphere that encourages risk-taking and cooperative relationship in group while they do not support the role of the teacher in the classroom.

According to Ethnicity

Ibanag students are in favor that group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.00), learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.00), group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning (mean = 3.83), and textbook alone is not able to cater to all the needs and interests of the students because the teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students (mean = 3.83). However, they are not in favor that students become fully capable of communicating with a native speaker by mastering the rules of grammar (mean = 1.83), it is impossible in a large class of students to organize your teaching so as to suit the needs of all (mean = 2.00), and direct instruction in the rules and terminology of grammar is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively (mean = 2.00). Hence, they demonstrated moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.90). This implies that the Ibanag students like CLT because the students are involved in different kinds of group activities that require practicing various skills to understand their peers and make themselves understood by others but they dislike the idea that mastering grammar should be the focus.

On the part of the Ilocano learners, they are in favor that learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.13), group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for cooperative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.10), and group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning (mean = 4.01). However, they are not in favor that grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged (mean = 1.82), teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make because if errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning (mean = 1.88), and the role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing, and example (mean = 1.89). Thus, the Ilocano learners have moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.96). This indicates that the students support CLT for the reason that the students can develop their language as well as social skills when they work together with their group members to achieve a common goal. However, they do not like the idea that much emphasis should be given to grammatical correctness.

On the other hand, the Gaddang learners have very favorable attitude that group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.50), and learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.50). However, they are not in favor that it is impossible in a large class of students to organize the teaching of the teacher so as to suit the needs of all (mean = 1.50), students become fully capable of communicating with a native speaker by mastering the rules of grammar (mean = 1.50), and group work activities have little use since it is very difficult for the teacher to monitor the students' performance and prevent them from using their mother tongue (mean = 1.50). Therefore, the Gaddang learners have moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 2.94). This indicates that the Gaddang students support CLT because it places importance on group works and the students can explore knowledge themselves and find their own answer instead of being spoon-fed by the teacher.

Finally, the Tagalog learners are in favor that group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students (mean = 4.29), learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential (mean = 4.18), teacher as transmitter of knowledge is only one of the many different roles he/she must perform during the course of a lesson (mean = 4.18), and textbook alone is not able to cater to all the needs and interests of the students because the teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students (mean = 4.18). But they demonstrated unfavorable attitudes particularly on the statements that the role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing, and example (mean = 1.82), the teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make because if errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning (mean = 1.85), and direct instruction in the rules and terminology of grammar is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively (mean = 1.85). Hence, the Tagalog students have moderately favorable attitudes toward CLT (mean = 3.06).

Table 2.0 Students' attitudes toward communicative language teaching

Data relative to		Findings
AGES	15-18-year old subjects	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 2.98)
	19-24-year-old subjects	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 2.95)
SEXES	Female Subjects	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 2.98)
	Male Subjects	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 2.98)
COURSES		
	Agriculture	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 2.99)
	Education	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 2.92)
	IT	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 2.96)

	Arts and Sciences	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 2.97)
	Mechanics	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 3.02)
	Business	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 2.99)
ETHNICITY	Ibanag	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 2.90)
	Ilocano	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 2.96)
	Gaddang	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 2.94)
	Tagalog	Moderately favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (mean = 3.06)

Significant Differences in the Perceptual Learning Styles of students across ages, sexes, courses and ethnicities According to Age

As can be seen from the table, there is a significant difference between the tactile learning style of the students when grouped according to their age ($t = 2.478$, p -value = 0.014). In particular, the 15–18 years old (mean = 38.17) can learn better by hands-on experiences with materials than the 19 – 24 years old subjects (mean = 34.76). In the same manner, the 15 – 18 years old students (mean = 39.28) have the tendency to learn concepts better through actual experience than the 19 – 24 years old students (mean = 36.76); $t = 1.999$, p -value = 0.047. Thus, the younger students can learn English better through hands-on activities. This could be attributed to the fact that the younger students have the tendency to be more manipulative. This is in line with the study of Kinsella as cited by Ghada et al.(2011) that age is an affective variable that can alter or modify the learning style of the learner. Furthermore, she stressed that children have a strong preference for kinesthetic and tactile learning styles, but they develop a preference for auditory and visual as they grow older.

On the other hand, there is no significant difference between the learning of students in terms of visual when classified according to their ages. These results, although not statistically significant, are similar to the results Reid as cited by Ghada (2011) who found no significant differences resulting from statistical analysis for age; however, age is a variable that needs to be considered. The above results indicate that students can learn by using visual learning styles regardless of their age

According to Sex

The table shows that there is no significant difference between the learning styles when classified according to gender. Studies have documented that males and females learn in different ways due to their distinct emotional, environmental, sociological, perceptual and physiological attributes (Dunn & Honigsfeld, 2003) but the present study claims otherwise. The perceptual learning styles of female students are statistically the same with that of the male students. This means that the students have the capability to acquire information in the same manner regardless of their

gender. The result is similar with the finding of Obračić and Azamat (2012) that there was no significant difference between male and female students regarding their study preferences.

According to Courses

Furthermore, there is a significant difference between the learning style of the subjects who can learn by seeing ($F = 3.589$, p-value = 0.004), through hands-on experiences ($F = 5.538$, p-value < 0.005), by working with a group ($F = 3.368$, p-value = 0.006), and working individually ($F = 2.849$, p-value = 0.017) relative to their course. On the other hand, the subjects can learn from hearing ($F = 2.089$, p-value = 0.070) and in using kinesthetic style ($F = 1.987$, p-value = 0.083) regardless of their course. This implies that students who are enrolled in various courses have the same possibility to acquire information successfully through listening to lectures and discussion and through direct involvement of what they are learning.

According to Ethnicity

Finally, it is also shown that there is no significant difference between the learning styles of auditory ($F = 0.010$, p-value = 0.999), group ($F = 0.036$, p-value = 0.991), visual ($F = 0.073$, p-value = 0.974), kinesthetic ($F = 0.133$, p-value = 0.940), tactile ($F = 0.363$, p-value = 0.780), and individual ($F = 0.930$, p-value = 0.428) learners from different ethnic groups. Thus, students with different ethnicity have the tendency to learn concepts in the same manner.

Table 3.0 Means and p-values of the subjects' perceptual learning styles across ages, sexes, courses and ethnicities

Data relative to	Findings
AGES	Significant differences between tactile learning style and ages ($t = 1.999$, p-value = 0.047) Significant differences between kinesthetic styles and ages ($t = 2.478$, p-value = 0.014)
SEXES	No significant difference between any perceptual learning styles and sexes
COURSES	Significant differences between visual learning styles and courses ($F = 3.589$, p-value = 0.004) Significant differences between tactile visual learning styles and courses ($F = 5.538$, p-value = 0.000) Significant differences between group learning styles and courses ($F = 3.368$, p-value = 0.006) Significant differences between individual learning styles and courses ($F = 2.849$, p-value = 0.017)
ETHNICITY	No significant difference between perceptual learning styles and ethnicities

Significant differences in Attitudes toward communicative language teaching across ages, sexes, courses and ethnicities

Data gathered also showed that there exists a significant difference between the attitudes toward CLT of the students when grouped according to their ethnicity; $F = 5.368$, $p = 0.002$. This implies that the students from different ethnic groups have different attitudes toward communicative language teaching.

On the other hand, no significant differences exists between the attitudes toward communicative language teaching of the subjects relative to their age ($F = 0.824$, p-value = 0.365), gender ($F = 0.007$, p-value = 0.935), and courses ($F = 1.327$, p-value = 0.256). This indicates that teachers may disregard the subjects' age, gender and course in implementing CLT.

These are shown in Table 4.0 below.

Table 4.0 Means and p-values of the students' attitudes toward CLT relative to their profile variables

Profile Variables	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	F	p-value
Age	15-18	2.99	Moderately Favorable	0.824 ^{ns}
	19-24	2.95	Moderately Favorable	
Gender	Female	2.98	Moderately Favorable	0.007 ^{ns}
	Male	2.98	Moderately Favorable	
Courses	Agriculture	2.99	Moderately Favorable	1.327 ^{ns}
	Education	2.92	Moderately Favorable	
	Information Technology	2.96	Moderately Favorable	
	Arts and Sciences	2.97	Moderately Favorable	
	Mechanical	3.02	Moderately Favorable	
Ethnicity	Business	2.99	Moderately Favorable	5.368*
	Ibanag	2.90	Moderately Favorable	
	Ilocano	2.96	Moderately Favorable	
	Gaddang	2.94	Moderately Favorable	
	Tagalog	3.06	Moderately Favorable	

Further statistical investigation also shows, as reflected by Table 5.0, that the significant difference that exists between the attitudes toward CLT of the subjects relative to their ethnicity can be attributed to the fact that the Tagalog students appear to have significantly better attitude toward communicative language teaching than the Ibanag (mean difference = 0.158, p-value = 0.048) and Ilocano students (mean difference = 0.098, p-value = 0.002). This implies that the Tagalog students are more supportive to CLT than the students from other ethnic groups.

Table 5.0 Mean differences and p-values of the students' attitudes toward CLT relative to their ethnicity

Ethnicity	Mean Difference	p-value
Ibanag	Ilocano	-0.060 ^{ns}
	Gaddang	-0.034 ^{ns}
	Tagalog	-0.158*
Ilocano	Gaddang	0.026 ^{ns}
	Tagalog	-0.098*
	Tagalog	-0.124 ^{ns}
Gaddang		0.319

Relationship among the following perceptual learning styles: visual, tactile, auditory, group, kinesthetic and individual

As can be gleaned from the next table, multiple correlations revealed that all the six learning styles are interrelated. In particular, the individual and tactile learning styles have the strongest correlation ($r = 0.696$, $p\text{-value} < 0.005$). This implies that the individual learners have a moderately high tendency to learn well using hands-on experiences. On the other hand, weakest relationship exists between individual and group learning styles ($r = 0.242$, $p\text{-value} = 0.002$). The moderately low correlation between the two variables implies that those who can learn well by themselves can less likely learn with group.

As cited by Renou (2008) in Nilson (2003) he said that “all learners learn more and better from multiple-sense, multiple-method instruction”. Hence, it seems reasonable to claim that if a teacher teach employing the six sensory modes—visual, tactile, auditory, group, kinesthetic, and individual it would help the students retain and retrieve far more information than they would if they are exposed to only one sensory mode of learning.

Table 6.0 Pearson r- values and p-values of the perceptual learning styles

Perceptual Learning Styles		Visual	Tactile	Auditory	Group	Kinesthetic
Tactile	Pearson r	0.646*				
	p – value	0.000				
Auditory	Pearson r	0.602*	0.580*			
	p – value	0.000	0.000			
Group	Pearson r	0.524*	0.502*	0.518*		
	p – value	0.000	0.000	0.000		
Kinesthetic	Pearson r	0.586*	0.680*	0.648*	0.588*	
	p – value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
Individual	Pearson r	0.635*	0.696*	0.490*	0.242*	0.450*
	p – value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.000

Conclusion

The study was able to establish the perceptual learning styles and attitudes toward communicative language teaching of Isabela State University Freshmen as English second language students (ESL) who are enrolled in the second semester of school year 2013-2014. It can be concluded therefore that learning style varies in every learner. It is important that the teacher may not only know and understand that the students have individual learning styles. They must be adept in various methods as well as addressing the learning styles of the students. By doing so, the student's capability will be harnessed to the fullest and the transfer of learning will be a success.

As a result, the teacher may also impart the lessons in a manner that will match the learning styles of the students. She might need to tailor her methods according to the needs of the students. Similarly, the teacher can use her knowledge about her students to adjust or multiply strategies; though a learning style is unique to every learner, it doesn't mean that they have to stick with it all the time. The teacher may encourage them to broaden their abilities by accommodating other learning style. The teacher may familiarize students about communicative learning approach and its feature since many of the subjects seem to be uncertain about some questionnaire items about this approach.

References

- Adey, P., Fairbrother, R., Wiliam, D., Johnson, B., & Jones, C. (1999). Learning styles and strategies: A review of research. London: King's College London.
- Aitkin, M., & Zuzovsky, R. (1994). Multilevel interaction models and their use in the analysis of large-scale school effectiveness studies. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 5, 45-73.
- Allen, R. (1988). The relationship between learning style and teaching style of secondary teachers in south central Kansas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS.
- Allinson, C. W., & Hayes, J. (1996). The Cognitive Style Index: A measure of Intuition-Analysis for organizational research. *Journal of Management Studies*, 33(11), 119-135.
- Atkinson, S. (2004). A comparison of pupil learning and achievement in computer aided learning and traditionally taught situations with special reference to cognitive style and gender issues. *Educational Psychology*, 24(5), 659-679.
- Betoret, F. D. (2006). Testing an instructional model in a university educational setting from the student's perspective. *Learning and Instruction*, 16, 450-466.
- Britzman, D. (2003). Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach (Revised ed.). New York: State University of New York Press.

- Brookfield, S. (1990). The skillful teacher: On technique, trust, and responsiveness in the classroom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Byra, (2000). A review of spectrum research: The contributions of two eras. *Quest*, 52, 229-245.
- Casey, B., Murphy, J. H., & Young, J. D. (1996). Field dependence/independence and undergraduates' academic performance in an information management program. *College Student Journal*, 31(1), 45-50.
- Chaytor, D. V., Murphy, H. J., Boyd, M., & LaFleche, R. (1991). A multi-centre study of student performance on the Group Embedded Figures Test and the Impression/Die Matching Test. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Association of Dental Schools.
- Coffield, F., Moseley, D., Hall, E., & Ecclestone, K. (2004). Should we be using learning styles? What research has to say to practice. London, UK: The Learning and Skills Research Centre, UK, www.lsda.org.uk/files/PDF/1540.pdf.
- Conti, G. J. (1985). Assessing teaching style in adult education: How and why? *Lifelong Learning: An Omnibus of Practice and Research*, 8(8), 7-11, 28.
- Conti, G. J. (2004). Identifying your teaching style. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult Learning Methods: A Guide for Effective Instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 7591). FL: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Conti, G. J., & Welborn, R. B. (1986). Teaching-learning styles and the adult learner. *Lifelong Learning: An Omnibus of Practice and Research*, 9(8), 2024.
- Cook, C., Hunsaker, P., & Coffey, R. (1997). *Management and organizational behavior* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Cothran, D. J., Kulinna, P. H., Banville, D., Choi, E., Amade-Escot, C., MacPhail, A., Macdonald, D., Richard, J., Sarmento, P., & Kirk, D. (2005). A cross-cultural investigation of the use of teaching styles. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 76(2), 193-201.
- Cothran, D. J., Kulinna, P. H., & Garrahy, D. A. (2003). This is kind of giving a secret away ... students' perspectives on effective classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 435-444.
- Cox, T., & Beale, R. (1997). Developing competency to manage diversity. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Doherty, J. (2003). Teaching styles in physical education and Mosston's Spectrum. Retrieved December 21, 2006, from <http://www.sportsmedia.org/sportapolianewsletter23newlook.htm>.
- Doucette, P. A., Kelleher, W. E., Murphy, H. J., & Young, J. D. (1998). Cognitive style and law students in eastern Canada: Preliminary Findings. *College Student Journal*, 32(2), 206-214.
- Doucette, P. A., Kelleher, W. E., MacGillivray, A. C., Murphy, H. J., Reid, J. G., & Young, J. D. (1999). Practicing lawyers in Nova Scotia: Cognitive style and preferences for practice. *Proceedings of the Atlantic Schools of Business Conference*, Halifax, Canada.
- Doyle, W., Fisher, R., & Young, J. D. (2002). Entrepreneurs: Relationships between cognitive style and entrepreneurial drive. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 16(2), 2-20.
- Dunn, R. S., & Dunn, K. J. (1979). Learning styles/teaching styles: Should they ... can they ... be matched? *Educational Leadership*, 36(4), 238-244.
- Evans, C. (2004). Exploring the relationship between cognitive style and teaching style. *Educational Psychology*, 24(4), 509-530.
- Evans, C., & Waring, M. (2006). Towards inclusive teacher education: Sensitising individuals to how they learn. *Educational Psychology*, 26(4), 499-518.
- Evans, C., & Waring, M. (2007). A comparison on the cognitive styles and notions of differentiation amongst trainee teachers. *Proceedings of the 12th Annual Conference of the European Learning Styles Information Network*, (pp. 165-177). Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.
- Evans, C., & Waring, M. (in press). Using the CSI in educational settings. *Danish Journal of Cognition and Pedagogy*.
- Finn, P. (1999). *Literacy with an attitude: Educating working-class children in their own self-interest*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Genc, E., & Ogan-Bekiroglu, F. (2004). Patterns in teaching styles of Science teachers in Florida and factors influencing their preferences. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED490781&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=eric_accno&accno=ED490781.

- Grasha, A. F. (2003). The dynamics of one-on-one teaching. *Social Studies*, 94(4), 179-187.
- Hargreaves, A. (2003). *Teaching in the knowledge society: Education in the age of insecurity*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harkins, M. J. (1997). Early childhood preservice teacher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada.
- Harkins, M. J., Evans, C., & Young, J. D. (2007). School teachers and workplace learning: Cognitive styles and learning preferences linkages. *Proceedings of the American Society of Business and Behavioral Sciences*, USA, 14(1), 685-699.
- Hayes, J., Allinson, C. W., Hudson, R. S., & Keasey, K. (2003). Further reflections on the nature of intuition-analysis and the construct validity of the Cognitive Style Index. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 76(1), 1-14.
- J. E. (1990). Measuring teaching style: A correlational study between the VanTilburg/Heimlich sensitivity measure and the Myers-Briggs Personality Indicator on adult educators in central Ohio. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Henson, K. T., & Borthwick, P. (1984). Matching styles: A historical look. *Theory into Practice*, 23, 3-9.
- Jarvis, P. (1985). Thinking critically in an information society: A sociological analysis. *Lifelong-Learning*, 8(6), 11-14.
- Kaplan, E. J., & Kies, D. A. (1995). Teaching and learning styles: Which came first? *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 22(1), 29-33.
- Kulinna, P. H., & Cothran, D. J. (2003). Physical education teachers' self-reported use and perceptions of various teaching styles. *Learning and Instruction*, 31(6), 597-609.
- Kulinna, P. H., Cothran, D. J., & Zhu, W. (2000). Teacher's experiences with and perceptions of Mosston's Spectrum: How do they compare with students? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Lacey, C. H., Saleh, A., & Gorman, R. (1998). Teaching nine to five: A study of the teaching styles of male and female professors. Paper presented at the Annual Women in Educational Leadership Conference, Lincoln, NE.
- Ladd, P. D. (1995). The learning and teaching styles of Tennessee secondary business education teachers. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 37(1), 29-45.
- Lawrence, M. V. M. (1997). Secondary school teachers and learning style preferences: Action or watching in the classroom? *Educational Psychology*, 17(1-2), 157-170.
- Lenz, E. (1982). *The art of teaching adults*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Masse, M. H., & Popovich, M. N. (2006). He said, she said: A national study of gender differences in the teaching of writing. *The Coaching Corner Online Edition*, 3(1). Retrieved January 5, 2007, from <http://jdwritingctr.iweb.bsu.edu/cc.html>.
- May Oi, E. W., & Stimpson, P. (1994). Teaching styles of Hong Kong's environmental educators in secondary schools. *Research in Education*, 52(1), 1-12.
- Messick, S. (1976). Personality consistencies in cognition and creativity. In S. Messick and Associates (Eds.). *Individuality in learning* (pp. 4-22). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Murphy, H. J., Doucette, P. A., Kelleher, W. E., & Young, J. D. (1998). Test-retest reliability and construct validity of the Cognitive Style Index for business undergraduates. *Psychological Reports*, 82, 595-600.
- Murphy, H. J., Doucette, P. A., Kelleher, W. E., Reid, J. E., & Young, J. D. (2001). The Cognitive Style Index and the legal profession in Nova Scotia: A factor-analytic study. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 3(1), 123-130.
- Nielson, T. (2007). Implementation of learning styles in adult teaching: A suggestion for an approach. *Proceedings of the 12th Annual Conference of the European Learning Styles Information Network* (pp. 91 - 101). Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.
- Opdenakker, M. C., & Van Damme, J. (2006). Teacher characteristics and teaching styles as effectiveness enhancing factors of classroom practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(1), 1-21.
- Pedler, M. (1988). Applying self-development in organisations. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 20(2), 19-22.
- Richards, J. C. (1998). *Beyond training*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Riding, R. J. (1991). Cognitive styles analysis. Birmingham, UK: Learning and training Technology.
- Riding, R. J. (1997). On the nature of cognitive style. *Educational Psychology*, 17(1-2), 29-49.

- Riding, R. J. (2002). School learning and cognitive style. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Riding, R. J., & Cheema, I. (1991). Cognitive styles: an overview and integration. *Educational Psychology*, 11, 193-215.
- Riding, R. J., & Rayner, S. G. (1998). Cognitives styles and learning strategies. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Riding, R., & Read, G. (1996). Cognitive style and pupil learning preferences. *Educational Psychology*, 16(1), 81-106.
- Robinson, R. D. (1979). Helping adults learn and change. Milwaukee, Wis.: Omnibook Company.
- Rosenfeld, M., & Rosenfeld, S. (2004). Developing teacher sensitivity to individual learning differences. *Educational Psychology*, 24(4), 465-487.
- Rosenfeld, M., & Rosenfeld, S. (2007). Developing effective teacher beliefs about learners: the role of sensitizing teachers to individual learning differences (ILDs) Proceedings of the 12th Annual Conference of the European Learning Styles Information Network (268-292). Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.
- Sadler-Smith, E., Allinson, C. W., & Hayes, J. (2000). Learning preferences and cognitive style: Some implications for continuing professional development. *Management Learning*, 31(2), 239-256.
- Saracho, O. N. (1991). Students' preference for field dependence-independence teacher characteristics. *Educational Psychology*, 11(3/4), 323-332. Retrieved December 21, 2006, from Academic Search Premier Database (9707160500).
- Seidel, T., & Prenzel, M. (2006). Stability of teaching patterns in physics instruction: Findings from a video study. *Learning and Instruction*, 16, 228-240.
- Snyder, D. S. A. (2006). An examination of the relationship between teaching style and teaching philosophy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2005). Differentiated instruction as way to achieve equity and excellence in today's schools. Building inclusive schools: A search for solutions. Conference Report Canadian Teachers' Federation Conference (19-21). Ottawa, Ontario.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Education culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Whetten, D. A., & Cameron, K. S. (2005). Developing management skills (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Witkin, Herman A. (1976). Cognitive style in academic performance and in yeacher-student relations. In S. Messick (Ed.), Individuality in Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zhang, L., & Sternberg, R. J. (2004). Thinking styles and teachers' characteristics. *International Journal of Psychology*, 37(1), 3-12.
- Zinn, L. M. (2004). Exploring your philosophical orientation. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), Adult learning methods: A guide for effective instruction (3rd ed., pp. 39-74). FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

About the Authors

Mary Rose A. Natividad is presently an English Instructor teaching undergraduate English courses at the Isabela State University, Cauayan City, Isabela. She obtained her Master's degree in Education major in English at the Isabela State University, Cabagan, Isabela. She is currently a PhD student in Linguistics and Rhetoric at Saint Paul University Philippines, Tuguegarao City, Cagayan.

Boyet L. Batang is a Full Professor teaching English and Language Education both in the undergraduate and graduate courses at the Isabela State University and Cagayan State University. He obtained his PhD degree in English Language Studies at the Royal and Pontifical University of Santo Tomas, Manila. His research interests include Language Teaching and Learning, Sociolinguistics and Reading.