



ENGLISH TEACHERS' TEACHING STYLES AND METHODS AND STUDENTS' LEARNING STYLES AND STRATEGIES IN SELECTED SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE DIVISION OF PUERTO PRINCESA CITY, PHILIPPINES

Sheila B. Tindog¹,
Arlyn B. Celestial²,

Principal II, San Rafael National High School, City Division of Puerto Princesa¹,
Assistant Professor IV, College of Education, Western Philippines University²

Article history:	Abstract:
<p>Received 26th April 2021 Accepted: 10th May 2021 Published: 7th June 2021</p>	<p>The study determined the correlation between teachers' teaching styles of the Junior High School students' learning styles, strategies in English in the Division of Puerto Princesa City.</p> <p>Data were obtained through the use of survey questionnaire. Frequency, percentage, mean, Analysis of Variance and t-test were applied in the treatment of data.</p> <p>Results of the study showed that directing was evident and was the dominant teaching style among the English teachers while the students considered delegating as the dominant teaching style evident among their English teachers. As to teaching method, both the teachers and the students considered student-centered method as the dominant teaching method often utilized by the teachers in teaching English.</p> <p>The dominant area was the psychological style in language learning while along learning strategy, the students moderately agreed on affective strategy.</p> <p>The students moderately agreed on the metacognitive, cognitive and social strategies in language learning.</p> <p>Significant correlation existed between teachers' teaching methods and students' learning strategies and their academic performance in English.</p> <p>Significant difference existed on the students' assessments on their environmental physiological and psychological styles in language learning when they are grouped according to gender.</p> <p>When grouped according to grade level, students' environmental, physiological styles in language learning significantly differed.</p> <p>Significant difference also existed in the students and teachers' assessments of the teachers' teaching methods.</p>

Keywords: Learning Styles, Strategies, Teaching Styles

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Learning process has been one of the important aspects of human life. Student's learning styles are among the acquired factors. Learning is dependent on the pedagogical approaches' teachers use in the classroom. The teaching approaches used in the K to 12 are based on Sec. 5 RA 10533 which mandates the use of pedagogical approaches such as constructivism, inquiry-based, reflective, collaborative, and integrative. These pedagogical approaches are learner-centered considering the learners' nature, innate faculties, or abilities, how they learn, their developmental stage, multiple intelligences, learning styles, needs concerns, interests, feelings, home, and educational background in the choice of teaching method and technique. Stronger integration of knowledge and values within and across the learning areas are the focal points to master the both the content and performance standards (DepEd, 2012).

The teachers using the K to 12 pedagogical approaches in a teaching-learning environment act as facilitators who coach learners toward meaningful learning goals.

A variety of pedagogical approaches are common in schools, but some strategies are more effective and appropriate than others. The effectiveness of pedagogy often depends on the subject matter to be taught, on understanding the diverse needs of different learners, and on adapting to the on-the-ground conditions in the

classroom and the surrounding context. In general, the best teachers believe in the capacity of their students to learn, and carefully utilize a range of pedagogical approaches to ensure this learning occurs (Grasha, 2010).

In English language classrooms, students use different approaches to carry out English learning tasks. Language learning styles, which generally refer to learners' preferred modes of language learning, have been widely researched and discussed in the fields of second language acquisition (SLA) and educational psychology. Understanding the learning style preferences of students can help teachers cope with students' subject-related learning difficulties and ultimately help alleviate their frustration levels (Heimlich & Norland, 2012).

Another important concept is teaching styles, which refers to teachers' classroom behavior based on their teaching beliefs, is commonly associated with learning styles in language education research. Teaching style is vital for providing students with good learning experiences and improving students' academic outcomes (Akbari & Allvar, 2010).

However, some teachers are ignoring the fact that language learners use different learning styles and strategies and apply specific actions and behaviors that help them learn. Teachers do not always consider these styles in writing daily lesson plans.

Every student uses his or her own unique learning style. Often students use a combination of them. However, quite often the student is not aware of specific styles of learning.

Some students prefer to learn by themselves in their own pace, in familiar surrounding rather than in groups. Students tend to perceive information differently, such as by "viewing and listening, reflection and action, to reasoning logically and intuitively and also scrutinizing and visualizing" (Felder & Henriques, 2010). In addition, teachers will many times teach to a specific style that may not be most suitable for students.

It is the teacher who is perhaps the most important catalyst in bringing about the learners' self-awareness, and it is the teacher who may be in the best position to empower students by showing them how to empower themselves.

Raising students' awareness regarding their learning styles and strategies might make them not only more prepared for learning but also more analytic about their learning styles and the strategies they make use of. Developing an understanding of learning environments and styles will enable students to take control of their learning and to maximise their potential for learning. Students must be encouraged to "stretch" their learning styles so that they will be more empowered in a variety of learning situations hence teachers should allow their students to become aware of their learning strengths and weaknesses.

The City Schools Division of Puerto Princesa is bent towards developing lifelong learners who are proficient in English both in written and spoken media. This is in done in response to the global education, which require Philippine education to overhaul its basic education curriculum to be at par with education systems worldwide, the implementation of the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum.

In the context of the City Schools Division of Puerto Princesa, for several years, the students at most junior high schools in the City Division consistently registered low performance in the National Achievement Test in English and even in most of the other subjects tested. The results were carefully analyzed and discussed by the teachers and administrators of the different schools. They concluded that the poor student performance was probably due to students' low proficiency in English which may be due to several factors, one of which may be their styles and strategies in learning English.

It is a fact that language proficiency especially in English among students is a global problem. Students' language proficiency has been part of every teacher dilemma. This has been experienced by the researcher herself because in her area of assignment, there are several students in school who can't comprehend simple English.

Considering that most of the books and references in other subject areas are written in English. This is aside from the fact that national tests like diagnostic, achievement, and aptitude tests are also written in English. This warrants immediate attention and action on the part of the English teachers to pay closer attention on assessing their students' styles and strategies in learning English so that immediate interventions be done to address the problem, hence this study was conducted.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. describe the teachers' teaching styles in terms of the following:
 - a. directing.
 - b. discussing; and
 - c. delegating
2. describe the teachers' teaching methods along:
 - a. teacher- centered method; and
 - b. student- centered methods
3. determine the learning styles of the students in learning English in terms of the following elements:
 - a. environmental.
 - b. emotional.
 - c. sociological.
 - d. physiological; and
 - e. psychological

4. find out students' strategies in learning English in terms of the following elements:
 - a. memory strategies.
 - b. cognitive strategies.
 - c. compensation strategies.
 - d. affective strategies; and
 - e. social strategies
5. find out the significant relationship between the teachers' teaching styles and.
 - a. students' learning strategies in English.
 - b. students' learning styles in English; and
 - c. students' academic performance in English

SCOPE AND DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

Respondents were the 244 Junior High School students and the 103 English Teachers in the Division of Puerto Princesa City, the teaching styles of teachers were delimited to directing, discussing, and delegating and teachers' methods to teachers-centered and students'-centered, the learning styles in learning English of the Junior High School students were delimited to the following: environmental, emotionality, sociological and physical.

On the other hand, students' strategies in learning English were delimited to the following: memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies.

METHODOLOGY

The respondents of the study included the 103 English Teachers and the 244 out of 20,635 students enrolled in the twenty (20) public Junior High Schools under the K to 12 Curriculum in the Division of Puerto Princesa City.

Two sets of survey questionnaires were prepared. The five-point Likert type structured questionnaire for teachers was composed of two parts. Part I asked about their profile.

The 30 item survey indicators for teaching styles and the 20 item indicators for teaching methods were patterned from Sheryl Riechmann-Hruska of the University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati. The indicators were modified to facilitate understanding of the respondents.

The following statistical tools were used in this study: 1) percentage and frequency count was used to determine the respondents' learning styles and students' strategies in learning English; 2) Pearson's Product Correlation Coefficient (r) and Korin's correlation were used to find out relationships of the learning styles and strategies of the students and 3) ANOVA was employed to find out significant difference on the teachers and students' assessments on the teachers' teaching styles and teaching methods.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Teachers' Teaching Styles as Assessed by Teachers Themselves

The study presents the teachers' assessments of their teaching styles. The over-all mean of 3.99 describes directing, discussing, and delegating teaching styles as *evident* among the English teachers. Directing has the highest mean of (4.03) while both discussing and delegating teaching styles have means of (3.98) each.

In terms of directing, the statement, "I explain the topic for students to acquire a broader perspective on the issues in that area" is described as *very evident* with the highest mean (4.51). The lowest mean (3.81) described as *evident is* in the statement "Lecturing is a significant part of how I teach each of the class sessions".

The findings imply that the English teachers take full responsibility of explaining and demonstrating to the students the topics for students to acquire a broader perspective on the issues that would allow them to remember things better on their own first instead of relying on teachers.

For teaching styles in terms of discussing, the statements which are described as *evident* "Activities in this class encourage students to develop their own ideas about content issues." and "Demonstration is done to give in-depth explanation of the lessons." obtain the highest mean (4.20). The lowest mean (4.11) described as *evident* is obtained by the statement "I assume the role of a resource person who is available to students whenever they need help.

The findings indicate that teachers conduct demonstrations and guide students' work by asking questions, exploring options, and suggesting alternative ways to do things, assume the resource person role are done to enhance students' initiative and creativity through provision of differentiated tasks whereby developing students' ability to think critically.

In terms of teachers' delegating styles the statement obtaining the highest mean of (4.29) is "I prefer to give students opportunities to ask and respond to questions." This is described as *evident* among English teachers. The lowest mean (3.75) along delegating is in the statement "I give students lots of guidelines and reference materials when giving assignments". This is also described as *evident* among English teachers.

From the findings, it appears that the English teachers encourage critical thinking among students by giving students opportunities to ask and respond to questions through small group discussions, activities that allow students to explore topics which they are interested in.

Table 1. Mean Distribution on How Evident are the Teaching Styles of the English Teachers as Assessed by the Teachers (N = 103)

Statement	Mean	DI
A. Directing	4.03	Evident
I do model appropriate ways for students to think about issues in the content.	3.96	Evident
I ask students to construct something helps them remember things better. (E.g., writing and organizing their own notes for revision.)	4.15	Evident
I explain the topic for students to acquire a broader perspective on the issues in that area.	4.51	Very Evident
Students would describe my standards and expectations as somewhat strict and rigid.	3.52	Evident
I show students how and what to do to master course content.	4.16	Evident
I want students to leave this course well prepared for further work in this area.	4.09	Evident
It is my responsibility to define what students must learn and how they should learn it.	4.16	Evident
Examples from my personal experiences are often used to illustrate points about the material.	3.85	Evident
Lecturing is a significant part of how I teach each of the class sessions.	3.81	Evident
I encourage students to find out more about a topic which they are interested in on their own first, instead of relying on teachers.	4.11	Evident
B. Discussing	3.98	Evident
Students typically work on course projects alone with little Supervision from me.	3.50	Moderately Evident
Activities in this class encourage students to develop their own ideas about content issues.	4.20	Evident
I spend time consulting with students on how to improve their work on individual and/or group projects.	3.93	Evident
I guide students' work on course projects by asking questions, exploring options, and suggesting alternative ways to do things.	4.16	Evident
Students' initiative and creativity are enhanced through provision of differentiated tasks.	4.14	Evident
Demonstration is done to give in-depth explanation of the lessons.	4.20	Evident
My expertise is typically used to resolve disagreements about content issues.	3.94	Evident
Students set their own pace for completing independent and/or group projects.	3.65	Evident
My standards and expectations help students develop the discipline the need to learn.	3.96	Evident
I assume the role of a resource person who is available to students whenever they need help.	4.11	Evident
C. Delegating	3.98	Evident
Small group discussions are employed to help students develop their ability to think critically.	4.11	Evident
Students design one of more self-directed learning experiences.	3.53	Evident
Having personal consultation with my students helps them understand new concepts or things that they do not understand.	3.97	Evident

In class, when I present new concepts, I only give and explain the instructions then delegate the task to the students then monitor their outputs.	3.81	Evident
When possible, I give students models of successful work from other people when giving assignments.	3.98	Evident
I give students lots of guidelines and reference materials when giving assignments.	3.75	Evident
I prefer to give students opportunities to ask and respond to	4.29	Evident

questions.		
I show my students how they can apply different language concepts in different situations.	4.05	Evident
	4.10	Evident
I design activities that allow students to explore topics which they are interested in.	3.99	Evident

Students’ Assessment of Teachers’ Teaching Styles

Table 2 presents that the students assess their teachers’ teaching styles as *evident*. This is revealed in the over-all mean of 4.20. In terms of directing, the students assess their teachers’ teaching styles as *evident*. This is reflected in the mean of 4.18. The statement with the highest mean (4.57) is obtained by the statement “My English teacher considers lecturing as an important part of each of the class topics.” The students assessed this indicator as *very evident* among their English teachers. The lowest mean (3.74) which describes the teachers’ directing style as *evident* is the statement “My English teacher tells his/her standards and expectations as somewhat strict and rigid. The results mean that the English teachers assume the role of the director of student learning.

Along discussing as a variable of teaching styles, students perceive this as *evident* as shown in the mean of 4.19. The highest mean of 4.47 is noted in the statement “My English teacher guides students' work on topic projects by asking questions, exploring options, and suggesting simple ways to do things while the statement “My English teacher allows us to work on topic projects alone with little supervision from my teacher.” obtained the lowest mean of 3.95. These indicators of discussing teaching styles are evident among English teachers based on the students’ assessments.

Along delegating, the students perceive this variable of teaching styles as *evident* (4.22). The statement with the highest mean of (4.52) is found in the statement “My English teacher likes to give students chances to ask and respond to questions. “The students describe this statement as very evident among their English teachers.

The findings imply that the English teachers assume the role of a facilitator of learning because they provide students opportunities and activities that enhance their students’ initiative and creativity.

Table 2. Mean Distribution on How Evident are the teaching Styles of English Teachers as Assessed by Students (N = 244)

Statement	Mean	DI
A. Directing -My English teacher...	4.18	E
shows appropriate ways for students to think about issues in the content.	4.38	Evident
displays an attitude that asking students to construct something helps them remember things better. (E.g., writing and organizing their own notes for revision.)	4.30	Evident
explains the topic for students to acquire a broader perspective on the issues in that area.	4.39	Evident
tells his/her standards and expectations as somewhat strict and rigid.	3.74	Evident
shows students how and what to do to master subject matter.	4.28	Evident
wants students to leave subject matter/topic well prepared for further group activity.	3.76	Evident
makes it as his/her responsibility to define what students must learn and how they should learn it.	4.22	Evident
uses his/her personal experiences to show idea of the material use for the topic/lesson.	4.27	Evident
considers lecturing as an important part of each of the class topics.	4.57	Very Evident
encourages students to find out a topic which they are interested in instead of relying on teachers.	3.88	Evident
B. Discussing- My English teacher...	4.19	Evident
allows us to work on topic projects alone with little supervision from my teacher.	3.95	Evident
gives class activities that develop our own ideas about issues on a particular topic.	4.40	Evident
spends time consulting with students on how to improve their work on individual and/or group projects.	4.24	Evident
guides students' work on topic projects by asking questions, exploring options, and suggesting simple ways to do things.	4.47	Evident
provides simple but helpful tasks to develop our initiative and creativity.	4.34	Evident
does demonstration to give in-depth explanation of the lessons.	4.11	Evident
uses his/her expertise to resolve disagreements about topic issues.	3.98	Evident

allows us to set our own steps for completing independent and/or group projects.	4.05	Evident
helps us develop the discipline we need to learn according to his/her standards and expectations.	4.29	Evident
assumes the role of a resource person who is available to students whenever they need help.	4.02	Evident
C. Delegating - My English teacher...	4.22	Evident
employs small group discussions to help us develop our ability to think critically.	4.39	Evident
encourages us to figure things out for ourselves first when we don't understand something	4.36	Evident
allows us to plan one of more self-directed learning experiences.	3.93	Evident
teaches us that having personal consultation with his/her students helps them understand new concepts or things that they do not understand.	4.27	Evident
gives, explain the instructions then delegate the task to the us then monitor our outputs when he/she presents new concepts.	4.30	Evident
<hr/>		
models to the students' successful work of other people when giving assignments.	4.21	Evident
likes to give students lots of rules and orientation of materials to be used when giving assignments.	3.97	Evident
likes to give students chances to ask and respond to questions.	4.52	Very Evident
likes showing students how they can apply different language ideas in different situations.	4.03	Evident
likes planning activities that allow students to discover topics which they are interested in.	4.20	Evident
Overall	4.20	Evident

Teachers' Teaching Methods

Result presents the teachers' assessments of their teaching methods which are often used as shown in the over-all mean of 3.64.

Teacher-centered teaching methods perceived to be sometimes used by the teachers as revealed in the mean of 3.38. Along this variable, the statement "I tell the students to be quiet in the class because a noisy class means that the teacher cannot manage the class" obtain the highest mean of 4.20 and is often used by the English teachers while the statement "I frequently refer to and use information found in curriculum frameworks or standards documents" obtain the lowest mean of (2.90) This is *sometimes* used by the English teachers.

The findings indicate that the teaching and learning process is passive where the teacher does talk, and students are just made to listen. Class involvement is not encouraged in this scenario.

In terms of student- centered method, the statement "I allow the students to develop their own knowledge by using critical thinking, and problem solving" obtain the highest mean of (4.34). This is often used based on the teachers' assessments. The lowest mean of (3.60) described to be *often* used by teachers is in the statement "I made few changes in the routine of my teaching".

The findings imply that the English teachers often allow the students to develop their own knowledge; provide students with opportunity to learn real life situations by using critical thinking, and problem-solving activities and question and answer sessions to enhance students' competencies.

Table 3. Mean Distribution on the Teacher's Assessment of their Teaching Methods (N = 103)

Statements	Mean	DI
A. Teacher-Centered	3.38	Sometimes
I talk and the students do not do much conversing or collaborating.	2.99	Sometimes
I tell the students to be quiet in the class because a noisy class means that the teacher cannot manage the class.	4.20	Often
I frequently refer to and use information found in curriculum frameworks or standards documents	2.90	Sometimes
I take responsibility for all the paperwork and organization.	4.15	Often
I view the student as passive receiver of information.	2.07	Seldom
I make the rules and posts them for all students.	3.05	Sometimes
I provide or evaluate information to monitor learners to get the right		

answer.	3.51	Often
My desired learning is assessed indirectly through objective tests.	3.61	Often
I directly answer the questions without students' involvement.	3.64	Often
I use the chalkboard as aid in teaching.	3.64	Often
B. Student-Centered		
I ensure that students are actively involved in constructing information.	3.91	Often
I focus on what students know or want to know.	4.19	Often
I ensure that desired learning is assessed directly through papers, projects, performances, portfolios.	4.00	Often
I allow the students to pick a subject and start experimenting without any guidance.	4.17	Often
I provide students with differentiated assignment and homework.	2.63	Sometimes
I am strongly convinced that students have better performance when they are asked to think about the matters instead of doing the thinking for them.	3.79	Often
I allow the students to develop their own knowledge by using critical thinking, and problem solving.	3.99	Often
I give the students the opportunity to learn directly from materials related to their real life.	4.34	Often
I made few changes in the routine of my teaching.	4.27	Often
I always begin the class by asking more questions from students rather than provide answers.	3.60	Often
Over-all	4.13	Often
	3.64	Often

Students' Assessment of Teacher's Teaching Methods

Based on students' assessment, their English teachers often use teacher –centered with a mean of (4.05) and student-centered teaching methods having a mean of (4.07). Though both methods are *often* used as shown by the over-all mean of (4.06), student-centered teaching methods obtain the higher mean.

Along teacher –centered methods, the statements with the highest mean of (4.38) described as *often* use is: "My English teacher uses the chalkboard as help in teaching" while the lowest mean of (3.07) along this area is in the statement "My English teacher directly answers the questions without students' involvement". This is sometimes used by the English teachers.

The results imply that as the English teachers often use teacher-centered method, students see them as the sole source of information, where the scenario appears to be teachers talk, students listen, hence learning is passive.

Along student –centered methods, there are statements with the highest mean of (4.36) described as *often* used is in the statement "My English teacher allows the students to develop their own knowledge by communicating, critical thinking, and problem solving" while the lowest mean of (3.32) along this area is in the statement "My English teacher allows the students to pick a subject matter and start testing without any guidance". This is often used by the teachers.

The results indicate that as the English teachers often use student-centered method, students see them as facilitators of learning where learners are encouraged to participate in the class thus learning is active.

Table 4. Mean Distribution on the Students' Assessment of Teacher's Teaching Methods (N = 244)

Statement	Mean	DI
A. Teacher – Centered - My English teacher...	4.05	Often
talks and the students don't do much talking or a "work together" activity.	3.93	Often
repeatedly refers to and use information found in program reference or criteria papers.	4.23	Often
views the student as passive receiver of information.	4.13	Often
provides or evaluates information to monitor learners to get the right answer.	4.21	Often
directly answers the questions without students' involvement.	3.07	Sometimes
tells the students to be quiet in the class because a noisy class means the teacher cannot manage it.	4.34	Often
takes responsibility for all the paper works and organization.	4.20	Often
makes the rules and posts them for all students.	4.14	Often
believes that the desired learning is assessed indirectly through objective type of tests.	3.89	Often
uses the chalkboard as help in teaching.	4.38	Often
B. Student – Centered - My English teacher...	4.07	Often

makes sure that students are actively involved in making information.	4.34	Often
focuses on what students know or want to know.	4.26	Often
makes sure that desired learning is measured directly through papers, projects, performances, portfolios.	4.27	Often
allows the students to pick a subject matter and start testing without any guidance.	3.32	Often
provides students with differentiated assignment and homework.	3.62	Often
believes that students have better performance when they are asked to think about instead of doing the thinking for them.	4.26	Often
allows the students to develop their own knowledge by communicating, critical thinking, and problem solving.	4.36	Often
allows the students the opportunity to learn directly from materials related to their real life.	3.97	Often
starts with small changes in the repetitive style of teaching.	4.13	Often
asks more questions in the class from students rather than providing answers.	4.16	Often
Over-all	4.06	Often

Students’ Styles in Learning English

Learning styles which include variables such as individual responses to sound, light, temperature, design, perception, intake, chronological highs and lows, mobility needs, and persistence, motivation, responsibility (conformity) and need for structure (Clenton, 2005).

The result shows that students moderately agree on their learning styles in English. This is supported by the over-all mean of 4.04. Among the indicators of the students’ learning styles, the highest mean of 4.16 is psychological area.

Along environmental styles in learning English, the highest mean (4.42) which students *moderately agree* is statement” It is hard for me to think when the classroom is noisy” while the lowest mean (3.19) where the students are *undecided* is the statement “I cannot concentrate on lessons when classroom decorations are plain and unobtrusive”.

In terms of students’ emotional styles in learning English, they *moderately agree* in the statement: “I am motivated to learn every time the teacher uses a new teaching strategy” which obtains the highest mean (4.34). The statement which the students are *undecided* obtains the lowest mean (3.39).

In terms of students’ sociological styles in learning English, they *moderately agree* on the statement “I easily understand the topic when my teacher or classmate explains this to me in my own dialect,” which has the highest mean of 4.17 while the statement “I easily understand the topic if either of my parents translates it to the dialect spoken at home has the lowest mean of 3.56.

In terms of students’ physiological styles in learning English, they *moderately agree* on the statement:” I prefer to study and learn English when I am not hungry “ has the highest mean of 4.42 while the statement “When I write things down I push hard on my pen or pencil and feel the flow and shape of the words as I form them obtains the lowest mean of 3.67 which the students also *moderately agree*.

Along students’ psychological styles in learning English, they *moderately agree* on the statement: “I easily understand what I read when I am interested in the topic” with the highest mean of (4.45) while the statement with the lowest mean of (3.77) which the students also *moderately agree* is “I am an auditory rather than a visual learner.”

The findings mean that the junior high school students learn English faster and better in a quiet, well lighted, and ventilated learning area; they are motivated, responsible persistent and sensitive language learners. From the findings, it appears that the junior high school students learn language faster and better with the assistance of people with expertise in the field; in a variety of ways and they learn language faster and better by listening rather than speaking and reading about the language.

Students learn best in different ways. They have preferences on how they can apply the learning task. Educators just need to find out their learners’ learning styles. Yet, despite the individual strengths and tendencies of students to learn a certain way, it should never be forgotten that they always use a combination of senses to learn. Students can have more than one learning style. They can be a combination of different learning styles or depending on the need or the task demanded of them.

Table 5. Mean Distribution on the Student’s Styles in Learning English (N = 244)

Statement	Mean	D I
A. Environmental	3.92	Moderately Agree
I cannot concentrate on lessons, when I am hungry.	3.91	Moderately Agree
I study and learn English in a quiet place.	4.25	Moderately Agree
I study and learn English in a room with enough light.	3.94	Moderately Agree
I study and learn English in a room with warm temperature.	3.54	Moderately Agree

I study and learn English in a room with enough ventilation and conducive to learning.	3.95	Moderately Agree
It is hard for me to think when the classroom is noisy.	4.42	Moderately Agree
I study and learn English when I arrange or re-arrange the environment to suit my learning style.	3.89	Moderately Agree
I cannot concentrate on lessons when classroom decorations are plain and unobtrusive.	3.19	Undecided
I learn faster and better when the desks are arranged in traditional straight lines.	3.91	Moderately Agree
I learn faster and better when there is cohesive classroom environment	4.20	Moderately Agree
B. Emotional	3.88	Moderately Agree
I learn English if I am motivated.	4.03	Moderately Agree
I learn English with high persistence.	4.02	Moderately Agree
I learn English with high responsibility.	4.20	Moderately Agree
I learn English if I am in a good mood.	3.81	Moderately Agree
I tend to be tense in learning English.	3.51	Moderately Agree
I learn English by studying lesson one at a time.	3.85	Moderately Agree
I learn English without being told or reminded.	3.69	Moderately Agree
I easily recognize at people's reactions every time I try to learn English.	3.91	Moderately Agree
I easily get bothered if the teacher's voice is too loud.	3.39	Undecided
I am motivated to learn every time the teacher uses a new teaching strategy.	4.34	Moderately Agree
C. Sociological	3.88	Moderately Agree
I prefer to study and learn English alone.	3.87	Moderately Agree
I prefer to study and learn English with peers.	3.70	Moderately Agree
I learn better if someone can show me how I can apply different language concepts in different situations.	4.10	Moderately Agree
I prefer to study and learn English in several ways.	4.02	Moderately Agree
I prefer to study and learn English with proficient English speakers present.	4.05	Moderately Agree
I remember more about something new or difficult by talking about it rather than reading about it.	3.99	Moderately Agree
I prefer to study and learn English alone.	3.87	Moderately Agree
I prefer to study and learn English with peers.	3.70	Moderately Agree
I learn better if someone can show me how I can apply different language concepts in different situations.	4.10	Moderately Agree
I prefer to study and learn English in several ways.	4.02	Moderately Agree
I prefer to study and learn English with proficient English speakers present.	4.05	Moderately Agree
I remember more about something new or difficult by talking about it rather than reading about it.	3.99	Moderately Agree
I easily understand the topic when my teacher or classmate explains this to me in my own dialect	4.17	Moderately Agree
I easily understand the topic if either of my parents translates it to the dialect spoken at home.	3.56	Moderately Agree
I am engrossed in understanding the lesson because of the influence of my peers and classmates.	3.70	Moderately Agree
I draw pictures or diagrams to help me understand the topic.	3.63	Moderately Agree
D. Physiological	4.05	Moderately Agree
If I have to solve a new or difficult problem, I use my entire body move objects to help me think	3.92	Moderately Agree
I learn something new or difficult by making posters, models, or doing some other creative tasks related to the topic.	3.91	Moderately Agree
I best learn something new or difficult by working with my hands and making things related to the topic	4.21	Moderately Agree

When I write things down, I push hard on my pen or pencil and feel the flow and shape of the words as I form them.	3.67	Moderately Agree
I look at someone telling or showing me something new or difficult really helps me to stay focused.	4.27	Moderately Agree
I prefer to study and learn English with my preferred time.	4.02	Moderately Agree
I prefer to study and learn English when I am not hungry.	4.42	Moderately Agree
I learn English very well when I my eyes are not strained from watching television.	3.95	Moderately Agree
I learn English when I see the material in order to understand it.	4.08	Moderately Agree
I reevaluate my assumptions when I get confused of what I am learning.	4.10	Moderately Agree
I learn English when I see the material in order to understand it.	4.08	Moderately Agree
E. Psychological	4.16	Moderately Agree
When I have to solve a new or difficult problem, I like to draw diagrams and use sketches to help me find a solution.	3.74	Moderately Agree
I like English teacher to be more specific in giving out instructions.	4.41	Moderately Agree
I enjoy learning about a new or difficult topic by reading about them.	4.33	Moderately Agree
I change strategies when I fail to understand.	4.02	Moderately Agree
I can easily comprehend the topic if I am interested in it.	4.27	Moderately Agree
I usually find myself sometimes agreeing and disagreeing with the author/writer's views.	4.06	Moderately Agree
I easily understand what I read when I am interested in the topic.	4.45	Moderately Agree
I pause for a while to analyze when I encounter important information in the lesson.	4.30	Moderately Agree
I always ask myself before teaching if the things I am about to teach is related to what I already know.	4.29	Moderately Agree
I am an auditory rather than a visual learner.	3.77	Moderately Agree
Over- all	4.04	Moderately Agree

Student's Learning Strategies in Learning English

Table 7 reveals that students *moderately agree* on their learning strategies in English. This is supported by the over-all mean of 4.04. Among the indicators of the students' learning strategies, the highest mean of 4.18 is metacognitive area.

Students *moderately agree* along their memory strategies in learning English, with a mean of 4.00. The statement "I use key English words in sentences so that I can remember them." obtains the highest mean of 4.34 which the students *moderately agree* while the lowest mean of 3.27 which the students are undecided, is in the statement "I use flash cards to remember new English words."

This conforms with the findings of Sozler (2012) who pointed out that memory strategies enable students to study on the vocabularies in such a way that they can not only deal with the unknown words and discover their meaning but also use them meaningfully in a context and have little chance to forget them. Therefore, the students need to be trained about the memory strategies and encouraged to apply them. Memory based strategies are helpful for them to learn the vocabularies and remember them in the long term.

Students *moderately agree* in terms of students' cognitive strategies in learning English, with a mean of 4.13. They *moderately agree* in the statement "I practice the sounds of English" has the highest mean (4.34). The statement "I look for words in my own language that are similar to new English words" which the students *moderately agree* has the lowest mean (3.92)

The findings are parallel to the findings of Khezrlou (2012) that effect of teacher's explicit training on learners' cognitive strategy use and their improvement in reading comprehension. The training provided by the teacher contributes to the FLL process, and learners' awareness of the accurate use of the cognitive strategy increases. Teachers' explicit instruction and assistance of learners' strategy use during a particular activity are linked with the learners' effective use of strategies.

Students *moderately agree* along compensation strategies in learning English with a mean of 3.96. They *moderately agree* on the statement "I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English" has the highest mean of 4.14. The statement "I read English without looking up every new word" which the students *moderately agree* has the lowest mean (3.67).

The findings conform with Taheri and Davoudi (2016) that self-reception, direct appeal for help and approximation are the most frequently used strategies; there is a significant relationship between the frequency of compensation strategies use and proficiency.

Students *moderately agree* on their metacognitive strategies in learning English, with a mean of 4.18. They *moderately agree* on the statement "I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better/improve my performance" with the highest mean of 4.45 while the statement "I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English" has the lowest mean of 3.77.

The findings conform with Ikeda and Takeuchi (2005) negative feelings retard learning. Teachers can help generate positive feeling in class by giving students more responsibility, increasing the amount of natural communication, and teaching affective strategies.

Students *moderately agree* on their affective strategies in learning English, with a mean of 3.94. They *moderately agree* on the statement, "I always think positive every time I am asked to speak or answer in English especially in front of the class", which got the highest mean of 4.34, while students also moderately agree on the statement "I am not confident in using English either in speaking or writing because of my limited vocabulary" which has a mean of 3.40.

Rossiter (2013) remarked that good language learners control their attitudes and emotions about learning and understand that negative feelings retard learning. Teachers can help generate positive feeling in class by giving students more responsibility, increasing the amount of natural communication, and teaching affective strategies.

Students *moderately agree* on their students' social strategies in learning English, with a mean of 4.05. They *moderately agree* on the statement, "I pay attention when someone is speaking English." and "I practice speaking English just like how native speakers do.", "I pay attention when someone is speaking English." with the highest mean of 4.27. The statement "I prefer to talk with a native-speaking conversation partner" which the students *moderately agree* obtain the lowest mean of 3.75.

From the findings, it can be said that the memory strategies of the junior high school students in learning English include word association and clueing using mnemonic device especially in learning the sound new words. It can also be said that the students' cognitive strategies include listening, pronunciation of new words, reading and writing that is, macro skills in English are utilized; it appears that students' compensation strategies involve writing summaries, use of synonyms, chunking, and substitution. The students' affective strategies include their ability to conquer their fear of committing mistakes in speaking activities, incorrect use of grammar.

Table 6. Mean Distribution on the Student's Learning Strategies in Learning English

Statement	Mean	DI
A. Memory	4.00	Moderately Agree
I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	4.27	Moderately Agree
I use key English words in sentences so that I can remember them.	4.34	Moderately Agree
I associate the sound of a new English word with its image or picture to help me remember it.	3.98	Moderately Agree
I remember a new English word by taking a mental picture of a situation or context in which the word might be used.	4.02	Moderately Agree
I use rhymes to remember new English words.	3.97	Moderately Agree
I use flash cards to remember new English words.	3.27	Undecided
I physically act out English words.	3.84	Moderately Agree
I often review English lessons.	4.12	Moderately Agree
I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their locations on the page, the board or on a street sign.	4.04	Moderately Agree
I read for pleasure in English.	4.14	Moderately Agree
B. Cognitive	4.13	Moderately Agree
I say or write new English words several times.	3.98	Moderately Agree
I try to talk like a native English speaker.	4.01	Moderately Agree
I practice the sounds of English.	4.34	Moderately Agree
I use the English words I know in different ways.	4.19	Moderately Agree
I initiate conversations in English.	4.00	Moderately Agree
I watch TV programs in English or go to movies spoken in English.	4.08	Moderately Agree
I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	4.23	Moderately Agree

I look for words in my own language that are like new English words.	3.92	Moderately Agree
I try to find study methods that improve my performance in English.	4.32	Moderately Agree
C. Compensation	3.96	Moderately Agree
I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	4.04	Moderately Agree
I try not to translate word for word when I am studying English.	4.03	Moderately Agree
I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	4.14	Moderately Agree
To understand unfamiliar English words, I use guesses.	3.84	Moderately Agree
When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	3.82	Moderately Agree
I make up new words if I don't know the right ones in English.	3.89	Moderately Agree
I read English without looking up every new word.	3.67	Moderately Agree
I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	4.02	Moderately Agree
If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or a phrase that means the same thing.	4.11	Moderately Agree
I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	4.02	Moderately Agree
D. Metacognitive	4.18	Moderately Agree
I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	4.28	Moderately Agree
I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better/improve my performance.	4.45	Moderately Agree
I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	4.37	Moderately Agree
I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	4.27	Moderately Agree
I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	3.77	Moderately Agree
I look for people I can talk to in English.	3.78	Moderately Agree
I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	4.21	Moderately Agree
I have a strong motivation to read what I can in English.	4.20	Moderately Agree
I think of ways to further my progress in learning English.	4.21	Moderately Agree
I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	4.27	Moderately Agree
E. Affective	3.94	Moderately Agree
I encourage myself to speak English even I am afraid of making a mistake.	4.22	Moderately Agree
I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	3.73	Moderately Agree
I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	3.82	Moderately Agree
I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	3.73	Moderately Agree
I write my own feelings in a language learning diary.	3.79	Moderately Agree
I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	3.71	Moderately Agree
I learn English when I am in a good mood.	3.89	Moderately Agree
I am not confident in using English either in speaking or writing because of my limited vocabulary.	3.40	Moderately Agree
I always encourage myself to speak English even if my grammar is incorrect.	4.25	Moderately Agree
I always think positive every time I am asked to speak or answer in English especially in front of the class.	4.34	Moderately Agree
I feel elated when people appreciate my efforts in learning English.	4.30	Moderately Agree
F. Social	4.05	Moderately Agree
I ask English speakers to correct me when I speak.	4.26	Moderately Agree
I practice English with my classmates.	3.88	Moderately Agree
I ask for help from English speakers.	4.06	Moderately Agree
I ask questions in English for an explanation.	4.13	Moderately Agree
I try to learn about the culture of English speakers	3.82	Moderately Agree

I prefer to talk with a native-speaking conversation partner.	3.75	Moderately Agree
I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	4.27	Moderately Agree
I practice speaking English just like how native speakers do.	4.27	Moderately Agree
I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	4.07	Moderately Agree
I try to talk like native speakers.	4.01	Moderately Agree
Over-all	4.04	Moderately Agree

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Memory Learning Strategies in English

The data shows the significant correlation between teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing (-4.42), discussing (1.80), delegating (1.40) and students’ Memory learning strategies. The significant correlation is supported by the higher computed t-values than the tabular t-values which *rejects* the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance.

This means that teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, and delegating affect students’ memory learning strategies. Memory strategies enable students to study on the vocabularies in such a way that they can not only deal with the unknown words and discover their meaning but also use them meaningfully in a context and have little chance to forget them.

Table 7. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Memory Learning Strategies

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Directing	-0.23	-4.42	-1.96	Reject
Discussing	0.10	1.80	-1.96	Reject
Delegating	0.08	1.40	-1.96	Reject

cv: -1.96 < t or t > 1.96

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Cognitive Learning Strategies in English

Disclosed in the results that there is the significant correlation between the teaching styles in terms of directing (7.66), discussing (10.05), delegating (9.95) and students’ cognitive learning strategies. The higher computed t-values than the tabular t-values *reject* the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, and delegating and students’ cognitive learning strategies.

The findings imply that teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, and delegating are important factors affecting students’ cognitive learning strategies.

Teacher’s explicit training on learners’ cognitive strategy use and their improvement in reading comprehension. The training provided by the teacher contributes to the FLL process, and learners’ awareness of the accurate use of the cognitive strategy increases. Teachers’ explicit instruction and assistance of learners’ strategy use during a particular activity are linked with the learners’ effective use of strategies (Khezrlou, 2012).

Table 8. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Cognitive Learning Strategies

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Directing	0.38	7.66	1.96	Reject
Discussing	0.48	10.05	1.96	Reject
Delegating	0.47	9.95	1.96	Reject

cv: -1.96 < t or t > 1.96

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Compensation Learning Strategies in English

As shown in the correlation between teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing (-20.05), discussing (-2.57), delegating (-3.33) and students’ compensation learning strategies is found significant at 0.05 level of significance, the *rejection* of the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between teachers’ teaching styles and students’ compensation learning strategies.

This means that students’ compensation learning strategies are affected by teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, and delegating

Table 10. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Compensation Learning Strategies

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Directing	-0.73	-20.05	-1.96	Reject
Discussing	-0.14	-2.57	-1.96	Reject
Delegating	-0.18	-3.33	-1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Metacognitive Learning Strategies in English

As revealed in the data, significant correlation exist between teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing (11.02), discussing (12.89), delegating (12.86) and students’ metacognitive learning strategies, hence the null hypothesis is *rejected* at 0.05 level of significance.

The results imply that students’ metacognitive learning strategies are affected by teachers’ teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, and delegating. The teaching of metacognitive skills is a valuable use of instructional time for a second language teacher. When learners reflect upon their learning strategies, they become better prepared to make conscious decisions about what they can do to improve their learning.

Table 9. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Metacognitive Learning Strategies

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Directing	0.51	11.02	1.96	Reject
Discussing	0.57	12.89	1.96	Reject
Delegating	0.57	12.86	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Affective Learning Strategies in English

The result reveals that teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing (-9.36), discussing (-5.82), delegating (-7.26) are significantly correlated to students’ affective learning strategies. The correlation yields higher computed t-values than the tabular t- values at 0.05 level of significance, hence the null hypothesis for this purpose is *rejected*.

The results imply that students’ affective learning strategies are dependent on teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, and delegating. Teachers can help generate positive feeling in class by giving students more responsibility, increasing the amount of natural communication, and teaching affective strategies.

Table 10. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Affective Learning Strategies

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Directing	-0.45	-9.36	1.96	Reject
Discussing	-0.30	-5.82	1.96	Reject
Delegating	-0.36	-7.26	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Social Learning Strategies in English

As gleaned from table 10f, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing (2.26), discussing (6.08), delegating (5.86) and students’ social learning strategies is *rejected*. The correlation yields higher computed t-values than the tabular values at 0.05 level of significance.

The findings imply that teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing and delegating are crucial to students’ social learning strategies. Social strategies are very important in learning a language because language is used in communication and communication occurs between people

Table 11. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Social Learning Strategies

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Directing	0.12	2.26	1.96	Reject
Discussing	0.31	6.08	1.96	Reject
Delegating	0.30	5.86	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Environmental Learning Styles in English

The study reveals the significant correlation between teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing (-21.81), discussing (-10.27), delegating (-12.58) and students’ learning styles as to environmental factors. The correlation obtained higher computed t-values than tabular values at 0.05 level of significance which *rejects* the null hypothesis.

The results connote that students’ learning styles as to environmental factors are dependent on teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, delegating.

Table 12. Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Environmental Learning Styles

Variable	Pearson r	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Directing	-0.76	-21.81	-1.96	Reject
Discussing	-0.48	-10.27	-1.96	Reject
Delegating	-0.56	-12.58	-1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Emotional Learning Styles in English

Disclosed in the data is the correlation between teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing (-15.06), discussing (-5.00), delegating (-9.56) and students’ learning styles as to emotional factors which yield higher computed t-values than tabular t-values. The correlation is deemed significant at 0.05 level which *rejected* the null hypothesis.

The findings connote that teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, delegating affect students’ learning styles as to emotional factors.

Table 13. Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Emotional Learning Styles

Variable	Pearson r	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Directing	-0.63	-15.06	-1.96	Reject
Discussing	-0.26	-5.00	-1.96	Reject
Delegating	-0.46	-9.56	-1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Sociological Learning Styles in English

The data reveals that the null hypothesis is *rejected* in the correlation between teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing (-6.39), discussing (-5.63), delegating (-11.13) and students’ sociological learning styles. The computed t-values exceed the tabular values at 0.05 level of significance.

The results imply that and students’ sociological learning styles are affected by teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, delegating.

Table 14. Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Sociological Learning Styles

Variable	Pearson r	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Directing	-0.33	-6.39	-1.96	Reject
Discussing	-0.29	-5.63	-1.96	Reject
Delegating	-0.51	-11.13	-1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Physiological Learning Styles in English

As shown from the results, teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing (2.63), discussing (6.45), delegating (6.23) and students’ physiological learning styles. The obtained higher computed t-values than the tabular t-values *reject* the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance.

The findings imply that teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, delegating are factors that affect students’ physiological learning styles.

Table 15. Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Physiological Learning Styles

Variable	Pearson r	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Directing	0.14	2.63	1.96	Reject
Discussing	0.33	6.45	1.96	Reject
Delegating	0.32	6.23	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Psychological Learning Styles in English

The data shows that the null hypothesis is *rejected* in the correlation between teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing (11.21), discussing (13.33), delegating (13.30) and students’ psychological learning styles. The significant correlation is supported by the computed values exceeding the tabular values at 0.05 level of significance.

The results mean that students’ psychological learning styles are affected by teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, delegating.

Table 16. Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Psychological Learning Styles

Variable	Pearson r	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Directing	0.52	11.21	1.96	Reject
Discussing	0.58	13.33	1.96	Reject
Delegating	0.58	13.30	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Academic Performance

The data reveals that teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing (217.57), discussing (217.53), delegating (217.57) are significantly correlated to students’ average academic performance in English.

The computed t-values exceed the tabular-t-values at 0.05 level of significance, hence the *rejection* of the null hypothesis.

The findings imply that teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, delegating affects students’ average academic performance in English. Many researchers (Giles et al., 2006; Razak, Ahmad, & Shad, 2007) point out that teaching style is vital for providing students with good learning experiences, while some (Akbari & Allvar, 2010) link it to students’ achievement outcomes.

Table 17. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ Average Academic Performance in English

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Directing	1.00	217.57	1.96	Reject
Discussing	1.00	217.53	1.96	Reject
Delegating	1.00	217.57	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Summary on the Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Style and Students’ learning strategies, learning styles and academic performance

The study presents the summary on the correlation between the teacher’s teaching style and students’ learning strategies, learning styles and academic performance.

The findings reveal that teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, delegating significantly correlate to students’ memory, cognitive, metacognitive, affective and social learning strategies. Likewise, teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, delegating have significant correlation to students’ environmental,

emotional, sociological, physiological, psychological learning styles and their average academic performance in English.

The findings indicate that students’ memory, cognitive, metacognitive, affective and social learning strategies; their environmental, emotional, sociological, physiological, psychological learning styles and their average academic performance in English are influenced by teachers’ teachers’ teaching styles in terms of directing, discussing, delegating.

Respondents’ assessment on the Significant Difference on Learning Styles of Students in Language Learning in Terms of Gender

The result shows the significant difference exists in the comparison of the students’ assessments on their environmental (-2.45), physiological learning styles (-2.529); psychological learning styles (-3.711) when they are grouped as to their gender., hence the stated null hypothesis is rejected because the computed t-values are greater than the tabular t- values at 0.05 level of significant.

The results indicate that the female students’ assessments on their environmental, physiological, and psychological styles in language learning significantly differed from their male counterpart.

The findings conform with Lee (2012) that the differences between male and female students on the types of reading strategies were significant, male students reported greater strategy use than their female counterparts regarding memory, cognitive, compensation strategies, while fewer males than females used strategies of meta-cognitive and social-affective while reading. In addition, males were more worried about unknown words compared to their counterparts while reading.

On the contrary, when students are grouped according to gender, no significant difference is noted in their assessments of their emotional (-0.500), sociological (-1.515) styles in language learning, hence the null hypothesis is *accepted*.

The results mean that male and female students have similar assessments on their emotional and sociological styles in language learning.

The results are parallel with the findings of Phakiti (2009) study, that there were no gender differences in either reading performance or use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies.

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Memory Learning Strategies

The result shows that in terms of teachers’ teaching methods and students’ learning strategies in terms of memory, the correlation is deemed significant. The computed t- values are all greater than the tabular values at 0.05 level of significance, the *rejection* of the null hypothesis.

The findings imply that teacher’s centered and student-centered teaching methods influence students’ memory learning strategies.

Table 18. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Memory Learning Strategies

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Teacher-Centered	0.77	22.44	1.96	Reject
Student-Centered	0.33	6.51	1.96	Reject

cv: -1.96 < t or t > 1.96

Correlation Between the Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Cognitive Learning Strategies

A revealed in the data, significant correlation exists between teacher’s teaching methods (26.40); student-centered teaching method (13.01) and students’ cognitive learning strategies. The correlation yields greater computed t- values than tabular t- values at 0.05 level of significance which *rejected* the null hypothesis.

The findings imply that teacher’s teaching methods play significant role on students’ memory learning strategies. Memory strategies are more focused on the memorization of words or word recall while the cognitive strategy are the mental strategy learners use to make sense of their learning.

Table 19. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Cognitive Learning Strategies

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Teacher-Centered	0.82	26.40	1.96	Reject
Student-Centered	0.57	13.01	1.96	Reject

cv: -1.96 < t or t > 1.96

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Compensation Learning Strategies

The computed t- values exceed the tabular t- values in the correlation between teacher’ teaching centered methods (21.48); student-centered teaching method (3.94) and students’ compensation learning strategies. Since the correlation is significant at 0.05 level, the null hypothesis for this purpose is *rejected*.

The findings imply that students’ compensation learning strategies are affected by teachers teaching methods. There is a need to train the learners in other compensation learning strategies to extend their existing repertoire of the strategies which would enable them to employ more of the strategies when learning English.

Table 20 Korin’s Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Compensation Learning Strategies

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Teacher-Centered	0.76	21.48	1.96	Reject
Student-Centered	0.21	3.94	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Metacognitive Learning Strategies

As shown in the results, teachers’ teaching centered methods (28.14); student-centered teaching method (15.52) are significantly correlated to students’ metacognitive learning strategies. The higher computed t-values than the tabular t- values affirm the significant correlation, hence the *rejection* of the null hypothesis.

The findings imply that teachers’ teaching methods are determinants of students’ metacognitive learning strategies. Metacognitive strategies go beyond the cognitive mechanism and give learners to coordinate their learning. This helps them to plan language learning in an efficient way.

Table 21. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Metacognitive Learning Strategies

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Teacher-Centered	0.83	28.14	1.96	Reject
Student-Centered	0.64	15.52	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Affective Learning Strategies

Revealed in the results the significant correlation between teachers’ teaching centered methods (23.00); student-centered teaching method (3.34) and students’ affective learning strategies. The greater computed t-values than the tabular t-values *reject* the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance which means that teaching centered methods are determinants of students’ affective learning strategies.

The results imply that teachers can help generate positive feeling in class by giving students more responsibility, increasing the amount of natural communication, and teaching affective strategies.

Table 22. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Affective Learning Strategies

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Teacher-Centered	0.78	23.00	1.96	Reject
Student-Centered	0.18	3.34	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between the Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Social Learning Strategies

The result shows that the null hypothesis is *rejected* at 0.05 level of significance in the correlation between teachers’ teacher centered teaching methods (24.96); student-centered teaching method (9.90) and students’ social learning strategies. The significant correlation is affirmed by the greater computed t- values than the tabular t-values at 0.05 level of significance. The findings imply that students’ social learning strategies are affected by their teachers’ teaching methods.

Table 22. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Social Learning Strategies

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Teacher-Centered	0.80	24.96	1.96	Reject
Student-Centered	0.47	9.90	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Environmental Learning Styles

This shows that significant correlation exists between teachers’ centered teaching methods (20.66) and students’ environmental learning styles, hence the *rejection* of the null hypothesis.

This means that students’ environmental learning styles are influenced by teachers’ teaching centered methods.

On the contrary, the null hypothesis is *accepted* in the correlation between teachers’ student-centered methods (0.96) and students’ environmental learning styles.

The findings imply that teachers’ student-centered methods are determinants of students’ environmental learning styles. Teachers should make students understand that learners can use social strategies to develop cultural understanding and become aware of thoughts and feelings of others.

Table 23. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Environmental Learning Styles

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Teacher-Centered	0.74	20.66	1.96	Reject
Student-Centered	0.05	0.96	1.96	Accept

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between the Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Emotional Learning Styles

The result reveals that teacher centered teaching methods (19.31); student-centered teaching method (4.47) are significantly correlated to the students’ emotional learning styles. The computed t- values exceed the tabular t- values at 0.05 level of significance, hence the *rejection* of the null hypothesis.

The findings imply that teachers’ teaching methods are determinants of students’ emotional learning styles.

Table 24. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Emotional Learning

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Teacher-Centered	0.72	19.31	1.96	Reject
Student-Centered	-0.23	4.47	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Sociological Learning Styles

Table 25 discloses that the correlation between teacher centered teaching methods (19.92); student-centered teaching methods (4.13) and students’ sociological learning styles is significant. The higher computed t- values than the tabular t- values *reject* the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance.

The findings imply that teachers’ teaching methods affect students’ sociological learning styles.

Table 25. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Sociological Learning Styles

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Teacher-Centered	0.73	19.92	1.96	Reject
Student-Centered	-0.22	4.13	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between the Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Physiological Learning Styles

As shown in the data, teacher centered teaching methods (25.53); student-centered teaching methods (10.30) are significantly correlated to the students’ physiological learning styles which *reject* the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance.

The findings imply that students’ physiological learning styles are influenced by teachers’ teaching methods.

Table 26. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Physiological Learning Styles

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Teacher-Centered	0.81	25.53	1.96	Reject
Student-Centered	0.49	10.30	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

Correlation Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Psychological Learning Styles

The data discloses that significant correlation exists between teacher centered teaching methods (30.02); student-centered teaching methods (16.28) and students’ psychological learning styles. The correlation yields greater computed t- values than tabular t- values which *reject* the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance.

The findings imply that teachers’ teaching methods are determinants of students’ psychological learning styles.

Table 27. Korin’s Correlation Coefficient r Showing Significant Relationship Between Teacher’s Teaching Methods and Students’ Psychological Learning Styles

Variable	Korin’s Correlation	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value (α = 0.05)	Decision
Teacher-Centered	0.85	30.02	1.96	Reject
Student-Centered	0.66	16.28	1.96	Reject

cv: $-1.96 < t \text{ or } t > 1.96$

CONCLUSIONS

1. Directing is evident and the dominant teaching style among the English teachers.
2. Delegating is evident and the dominant teaching style among their English teachers.
3. Both the teachers and the students consider student-centered method as the dominant teaching method often utilized by the teachers in teaching English.
4. Psychological style in language learning is the dominant learning style among junior high school students.
5. Teachers’ teaching styles significantly affect students’ learning strategies and their average academic performance in English
6. Teachers’ teaching methods significantly affect students’ learning styles and their average academic performance in English.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. More intensive classroom language interventions to enhance students’ learning styles and strategies.
2. A thorough review of their existing English program be done to improve students’ learning styles and strategies.
3. Regular monitoring and supervision should be done to assess and feedback all the interventions done to improve students’ academic performance in English.
4. Identify teaching styles by observing teachers’ teaching behavior, such as the ways of presenting information, organizing discussion, lesson planning, and ways of facilitating learning activities.
5. Require English teachers to integrate in their daily lesson log (DLL) specific activities or interventions that will further enhance their sociological, emotional learning styles and compensation strategies.
6. Require English teachers to come up with a written outline of activities that will improve students’ learning styles and strategies.
7. Use different techniques in various ways within a particular teaching style.
8. Design classroom activities/interventions to allow students to become aware of their learning strengths and weaknesses.
9. Employ self- directed learning to enhance students’ metacognitive learning strategies
10. Train the learners in other compensation learning strategies so as to extend existing repertoire of the strategies which would enable the employment of more strategies when learning English.
11. Assign students to share simple memorized passages and have them explain these to the class in order to enhance their memory learning strategies.
12. Enhance students’ memory learning strategies by training students along sorting words into creating mnemonic keywords, word analysis strategies, strategies for practicing words and strategies for deciding which words to learn.
13. Help students develop study skills compatible with their preferred learning style to have a positive effect on their academic performance.
14. Work on the factors involved in improving emotional and sociological learning styles (1) the desire to improve, (2) the willingness to try new techniques and (3) the motivation to practice.
15. Develop own initiative of learning new vocabulary each day through exposure to varied reading materials like periodicals, books and other printed materials to enhance the memory learning strategies.

REFERENCES

1. Feldesr, R. M. Brent, R. (2005). Understanding Student Differences. *Journal of Engineering Education*.
2. Illustre M. L. (2011). Philippines English: *Linguistic and Literary Perspectives*. Hong kong University Press.
3. Keefe, J. W. (2009). Learning Style: An Overview . VA: National Association of Secondary school Principals. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 17:649-667*.
4. Kirby, P. (2009). Cognitive Style, Learning style and Transfer *Skill Acquisition*, The National Center for Vocational Research, Ohio State University, Culumbos, Ohio.

- Lucas, M. and Corpuz B. (2007) *Facilitating Learning: a Metacognitive Process*. 779 Aurora Blvd., cor. Boston Street, Cubao, Quezon City, Metro Manila: Lorimar Publishing, Inc.
6. Manila: Lorimar Publishing, Inc.
 7. O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., (2005). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
 8. Ornos, P. S. (2011). *Facilitators of the Learning Process*. 50 M.R Flores Street Cor. Lorenzo St. Sto. Rosario Subd. Pateros, Metro Manila: Grand Water Publications.
 9. Price, G. (2007). *Diagnosing Learning styles: A Prescription for Avoiding Malpractice Suits*. Kappan. Indiana: Phi Delta Kappan.
 10. Reid, J. M. (2008). *Understanding Learning Style in the Second Language Classroom*. USA: Prentice Hall Regents.
 11. Jersey: Prentice Hall.
 12. Velasquez and Tan (2009) Determine the learning style of student in English

RESEARCH JOURNALS/REPORTS/PERIODICALS

1. Abante, M. A. et al. (2014). Learning Styles and Factors Affecting the Learning of General Engineering Students. Lyceum of the Philippines University, Batangas City. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, January 2014, Vol. 3, No. 1.
2. Andrad, L. (2005). *Secondary Schooling Alternatives (SSA) Secondary Education Development and Improvement Project Manual*, Bureau of Secondary Education.
3. Ayeni, A.J. (2011), "Teachers professional development and quality assurance in Nigerian Secondary Schools, *World Journal of Education*, 1(2):143-149.
4. Abraham, R. G. (2006). Strategies of Unsuccessful Language Learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 24 (2).
5. Anderson, N. J. (2005). Metacognitive Reading Strategies Increase L2 performance, *The Language Teacher*, Vol. 27.
6. Bernardo, Allan B. (2012). Olongapo Exchange Youths Give Virginia Counterparts Glowing Image of Philippines. *Filipino Reporter*. 2014, Vol. 42 Issue 17.
7. Carless, D. (2008). Students use of the mother tongue in the task-based classroom. *ELT Journal* vol.62/4, 331-338.
8. Cassidy P. B. (2004). Children's Learning Strategies in Language Immersion Classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol 83.
9. Chamot, A. U (2005). Language learning strategy instruction and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, (2005), pp. 112-130.
10. Chang, W.(2010)., "Interactive Teaching Approach in Year One University Physics in Taiwan: Implementation and Evaluation." *Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching* 3, (2010).
11. Claxton, C., and Ralston, Y. (2008). *Learning Styles: Their impact on Teaching and Administration*. AAHE-ERIC/ Higher Education Research Report No. 10 Washington, DC: American Association for the Study of Higher Education.
12. Damodharan V.S. & Rengarajan V. (2009), "Innovative Methods of teaching," National Research Council, Educational Journal Publication.
13. Dela Rosa, Elmer D.(2013). Are Two Achievement Goals Better than one? Filipino Students' Achievement Goals, Deep Learning Strategies and Affect. Vol.27.
14. Ehrman, M., Oxford, R., 2006. Adult Language Learning Styles and Strategies in an Intensive Training Setting. *Modern Language Journal* Vol. 74.
15. Ellis, R. (2009). Classroom Learning styles and their Effect on Second Language Acquisition: A Study of Two Learners. *System*, Vol. 17(2).
16. Estacio, M.J.M (2013). Bilingual readers' metacognitive strategies as predictors of reading comprehension. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 10,179-199.
17. Giles, J., Ryan, D.A. J., Belliveau, G., De Fritas, E., & Casey, R. (2006). Teaching style and learning in a quantitative classroom. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 7 (3), 213-225.
18. Green, J. and Oxford, R. (2005). A Closer look at Learning Strategies, L2 Proficiency, and Gender. *TESOL Quarterly* Vol.29(2)
19. Hashim, R., Sahil, S. (2005). Examining Learning' Language Learning Strategies. *RELJ Journal* Vol.25 (2).
20. Hesson, M. & Shad, S. (2007). " A student-centered learning model," *American Journal of Applied Science*, 628-636.
21. Hsiao, T and Oxford, R.L. (2002). Comparing Theories of Language Learning Strategies: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis. *The Modern Language Learning Journal*, 86: 368-383. Doi 10.1111/540-78.00155.
22. Riechmann-Hruska S. (2010) The learning style preferences of ESL student *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (1), 87-111.
23. Ikeda, M., Takeuchi, O. (2005). Can Strategy Instruction Help EFL Learners to Improve their Reading Ability? : An Empirical Study. *JACET Bulletin*, Vol. 37.
24. Iwai, Y. (2011). The effects of metacognitive reading strategies. Pedagogical implications for EFL/ESL Teachers. *The Reading Matrix*. 11(2), 150-157.

25. Jarvis, P. (2014). *Adult education and lifelong learning: Theory and practice*. London, England; Routledge.
26. Kron-Sperl, et. al (2008). The development and effectiveness of memory strategies in kindergarten and elementary school: Findings from the Wiirzburg and Gottingen longitudinal memory studies. *Cognitive Development*, 23, 79-104.
27. Lorenzo, A. and Lorenzo B. (2013). Learning Styles of Teacher Education Students: Basis Improving the Teaching-Learning Process. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 103, November 26, 2013, pp. 595-605.
28. Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use:revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal* vol. 90/3,320-337.
29. Na, Z. (2007). A study of high school students' English learning anxiety. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9(3), 22-34.
30. Nemati, A. (2009). Memory vocabulary learning strategies and long-term retention. *International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education* 1(2), 14-24.
31. O'Brien, C. (2005). Culture-Specific Perceptual-Learning-Style Preferences of Secondary Students of English as a Second Language.
32. Oxford, R.L. (2009). *Use of Language Learning Strategies: A Synthesis of Studies with Implications for Strategy Training*. System, Vol. 17(2).
33. Peacock, M. (2010). Match or mismatch? Learning styles and teaching styles in EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 1-20.
34. Phakiti, A. (2009). A closer lookm gender strategy and strategy use in L2 reading. *Language Learning*, vol. 53, 649-702.
35. Reid, J.M. (2007). The learning Style Preferences of ESL Students. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol.21.
36. Reis, S.M. et al. (2000). Compensation strategies used by high ability students with learning disabilities. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 44,123-134.
37. Slamecka, N. J., & Graf, P. (2008). The generation effect: Delineation of a phenomenon. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 4(6):592-604
38. Sozler, S. (2012). The effect of memory strategy training on vocabulary Development of Austrian secondary school students. Published by Elsevier Ltd. Open access under CC BY-NC-ND license. Doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.300
39. Taheri A. and Davoudi M. (2016). The Use of Compensation Strategies in the Iranian EFL Learners' Speaking and its Relationship with their ForeignLanguage Proficiency. *Journal of Education and practice*. Vol.7, Nov. 9, 2016. ISSN 2222-2888X (online).
40. Tam, K. (2013). A Study on Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) of University Students in Hong, The University of Hong kong, *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 11.2,1-42,2013.
41. Tar, I. (2007). Correlation of Language Learning Strategies Selection with Language Learning Experience and Anxiety. Department of Personality And Clinical Psychology Institute of Psychology, University of Debrecen.
42. Tebabal, A. & Kahssay, G. (2011), "The effects of students-centered approach in Improving students' graphical interpretation skills and conceptual understanding of kinematical motion, " *Lat. Am. J. Phy. Edu*, 5(2):374-381.
43. Tenedero, H. (2012) Center for Learning and Teaching Styles, Philippines and Mindful Ideas Asia-Pacific Education Researcher. De La Salle University Manila. Vol. 20 Issue 3.
44. Zakaria, E., Chin C.L. & Daud, Y. (2010) "The effect of cooperative learning on student mathematics achievements and attitude towards mathematics,*Journal of Social Sciences*, 6 (2): 272-275.
45. Zeeb,L.K.(2014)."Traditional versus contemporary goals and methods in accounting education: Bridging the gap with cooperatives learning," *Journal of Social Studies*, 70(5) 278-275.
46. Zhou, Y. (2010). English language learning strategy used by senior Chinese high school students. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 152-158.

THESES/DISSERTATIONS

1. Jhaish, M. A. (2010). The Relationship among Learning Styles, Language Learning Strategies, and the Academic Achievement among the English Major at Al-Aqsa University., the Islamic University, Deanery of Graduate Studies, College of Education, English Methods Department.
2. Paredes, E. (2010) *Language Learning Strategies Used by Colombians Adult English Language Learners: A Phenomenological Study*. FIU Electronic Thes and this Dissertation Paper 225. <http://digitalcommon.fiu.edu/225>.
3. Salem, G. R. (2010) *Instructors' and Students' antecedent and context: Their Influence on the English proficiency of college freshmen* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Saint Mary's University, Bayombong, Philippines.
4. Velasco, A. et al (2015). Emotional Elements on Learning style references of High and Low Performing Junior Marine Transportation Students University of Batangas, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary academic research*. Vol., No. 1 2015 ISSN 2309-4218.

WEBSITES/ONLINE DATABASE

1. Akbari, R., & Allvar, N. K. (2010). L2 Teacher characteristic as predictor of student academic achievement. *TESL-EJ*, 13 (4). Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/pdf/ej52//a2.pdf>
2. Anderson, N. (2002) The role of Metacognition in second language teaching and learning. Center for applied Linguistic. ERIC Clearing house on Languages and linguistics. ERIC Digest. www.CAL.org.ERICLL.
3. Ahmad, B. (2013) Compensation Learning Strategies Employed by Adult ESL learners of a University in Malaysia. *Social and Behavioral Science* Volume 90, October 10, 2013 pp. 78-87. Retrieved April 12, 2017 from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S187704281301940X?via%3Dhub>
4. Chermahini, A. (2013) Learning styles and academic performance of students in English as a second Language class in Iran. *Bulgarian Journal of Science and Education Policy BJSEP*, Volume 7, Number 2. Retrieved February 27, 2017 <http://bjsep.org/getfile.php?id=150>
5. Clinton, J. (2015) Learning style in the Japanese. Downloaded from: the following world website <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/langc/skills/learningstylejapanese.pdf>. Date accessed May 10, 2014
6. Cohen, A. (2017). "Assessing and Enhancing Language Learners' Strategies" Hebrew Higher Education Nu. 10. Retrieved April 13, 2017 from: <http://www.tc.umm.edu/~adcohen/index.html>
7. Department of Education (2012) K to 12 Primer Retrieved April 13, 2017 from <http://www.deped.gov.ph>
8. Dunn, R. and Dunn K. (1990). *Dunn and Dunn Learning Style Model*. Retrieved April 14, 2017 from <http://learningbledkids.com/learning-styles/dunn-dunn-learning-style-model>
9. Hismanoglu, M. (2000). Language Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching, *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. VI, No. 8, August 2000. Retrieved January 15, 2017 from <http://itesj.org>.
10. Khezrou, S. (2012). Cognitive Strategy Training: Improving Reading Comprehension in the Language Classroom. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)* 3 (4). Retrieved April 13, 2017 from http://shirazu.ac.ir/article_372_bd52befoad1oc9dbo6f864fd59a64286.pdf
11. Lee, M. (2012). A Study of the Selection of Reading Strategies among Genders by EFL College Students. *Procedia: Social Behavioral Sciences*. Published by Elsevier Ltd. Retrieved from doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.037
12. Ljungberg, A. (2011). Compensation Strategies in English as a Foreign Language. Retrieved April 13, 2017 from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:422453/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
13. Razak, N.A., Ahmad, F., & Shah, N.P (2007). Perceived and preferred teaching style (methods) of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) students. *e-BANGI: Jurnal Sains Sosial dan Kemanusiaan*, 2(2). Retrieved from <http://journalarticle.ukm.my/154>