Learning Styles and English Proficiency of Undergraduate EFL Students at One State Islamic University in Sumatera, Indonesia

Lenny Marzulina
lennymarzulina@gmail.com
State Islamic University of Raden Fatah, Palembang

Nova Lingga Pitaloka
novalinggapitaloka@gmail.com
State Islamic University of Raden Fatah, Palembang

Aren Dwi Yolanda
arenyolanda@gmail.com
An English Private Teacher at Palembang, South Sumatera

Abstract

This study investigated (1) the correlation between each learning style and English proficiency, and investigated (2) the influence of each learning style to English proficiency of undergraduate EFL students of one state Islamic University in Sumatera, Indonesia. The study was in the form of correlational research method. The population of the study was 537 active EFL students. By using purposive sampling technique, there were 82 students involved as participants. The data were gained by using two instruments: Barsch Learning Styles Questionnaire and TOEFL prediction test. The result showed that 1) 34.0% of students preferred in visual learning style, 43% of students preferred in Auditory learning style, and 23% of students preferred in Kinesthetic learning style. 2) the coefficient correlation between visual learning style preference and English proficiency with r-obtained was (0.430). It was higher than r-table (.2565), then Ha_1 was accepted and Ho_1 was rejected. It indicated that there was a significant correlation between visual learning styles and their English proficiency. 3) The coefficient correlation between Auditory learning style and English proficiency was (0.2565). It was lower than r-table (.2565), then Ho_2 was accepted and Ha_2 was rejected. 4) The coefficient correlation between Kinesthetic learning styles and English Proficiency was (-0.166). It was lower than r-table (.2565), then Ho_3 was accepted, and Ha_3 was rejected. It showed that there was no significant correlation between kinesthetic learning style and English proficiency of EFL students. Besides, there was also a significant influence of visual learning style on English proficiency with 18.5% contributions.

Keywords: EFL students, English proficiency, learning styles

Introduction

English plays an important role in our everyday life. It is known that English is an international language since it has been largely spoken among foreign language speakers. Algeo (2010) states it has become the most widespread languages in the world, used by more people for

more purposes than any other language on Earth. Moreover, Jackson and Stockwell argue English is used in every corner of the world as a medium to interact among people (as cited in Abrar, Mukminin, Habibi, Asyafi, Makmur, & Marzulina, 2018, p.129). In brief, the popularity of English makes English legal for every aspect in communication.

In relation to education, English language proficiency will affect students' learning ability, which may impact their academic success. In addition, Aina, Ogundele, and Olanipekun (2013) argue when students' proficiency in English language is high, it will definitely affect and improve the academic performance of such student. Nevertheless, where the proficiency in English is lacking in any academic setting, it will definitely lower the academic performance of such students. In brief, the accomplishment of learning process will be influenced by English proficiency.

The unsatisfying result of Indonesian people's proficiency can be affected by many factors; one of them is learning style. Oxford (2003) believes that learning styles is one of the main factors that help determine how well the students learn a second or foreign language. It can influence their achievement in language skills, speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Acording to Othman and Amiruddin (2010), learning styles are styles or individual learning techniques that act with its environment, to process, to interpret, and to obtain information, experiences or desirable skills, speaking, writing, reading, and listening. In addition, Brown (2007) states that the enormous task of learning a second language, one so deeply involves affective factors, a study of learning style brings important variables to the forefront.

In order to achieve the ultimate goal of student learning, it is important to use a combination of teaching methods and to make the classroom environment as stimulating and interactive as possible. Students have their own ways to learn. Some students are Visual learners, while others are Auditory or kinaesthetic learners. Visual learners learn visually by means of charts, graphs, and pictures. Auditory learners learn by listening to lectures and reading. According to Gilakjani (2012), Kinesthetic learners learn by doing. Students can prefer one, two, or three learning styles. Because of these different learning styles, it is important for teachers to incorporate their curriculum activities related to each of these learning styles so that all students are able to succeed in their classes. While we use all of our senses to take in information, we seem to have preferences in how we learn best. In order to help all students to learn, we need to teach to as many of these preferences as possible.

Based on our preliminary study, it was found that there were various problems found in English Education Study Program of one state Islamic university in Sumatera. First of all, based on my informal interview with undergraduate EFL students of one state Islamic university in Sumatera, it was found that some of them were not satisfied with their English proficiency proven by TOEFL scores. From the score of TOEFL test for the requirements of the Seminar on Research Proposal, it was found that some of the undergraduate EFL students of one state Islamic university in Sumatera got difficulties to get the score more than 450. They admitted that they learned in different ways but they did not know what learning styles they actually used to learn. Thus, an investigation on the link between their learning styles and English proficiency was used to conduct.

This study is similar to a study conducted by Gappy (2013) who found that there was no significant effect of gender, age and academic program on the learning style preferences of the students. Based on the result of the study, there was no significant correlation between the academic achievement and the learning style preferences of the students. Furthermore, Vaishnav (2013) examined a research whose objectives were to know the types of learning style prevalent among secondary school students. She found out that the three variables, Visual, Auditory and Kinesthetic, gave significant influence on academic achievement. The findings from the previous studies take an important role in designing this research.

Literature Review

Concept of learning styles

The term of style refers to consistent and rather enduring tendencies or preferences within an individual. According to Brown (2007), styles are those general characteristics of intellectual that differentiate an individual to the other. Therefore, styles are the things that make differentiate between one individual to the other. Supporting this statement Pritchard (2009) emphasizes that each individual will adopt an approach to learning with which they are most comfortable. It is helpful for learners if they are aware of their own particular learning preferences in order that they can use an appropriate learning style to suit the particular learning that is being undertaken and take opportunities to improve their potential for learning when faced with a learning activity that might steer them towards one of their 'weaker'– or at least one of their less favored – styles.

The above definitions asserted that learning styles have some characteristics; each learner has a preferred way of learning. Understanding this idea includes realizing that it is misleading to limit a person's learning style to only one certain type or category. Šabatová (2008) states that human beings naturally possess different learning styles, and are capable of learning in almost any styles. However, they adopt the one which they feel most comfortable with. According to Pritchard (2009), the terms "approach", "way" and "preference" have been used to refer to environmental, affective and physical conditions under which a student is likely to learn. In brief, every people have a particular learning style, but there is a possibility that someone is capable to have more than one learning styles, even all.

Kinds of learning styles

According to Gilakjani (2012), there are three main learning styles namely, Visual, Auditory, and Kinesthetic.

1. *Visual*

Brown (2007) states that visual learners tend to prefer reading and studying charts, drawings, and other graphic information. According to Tuan (2011), visual learners will be able to recall what they see and will prefer written instructions. These students are sight readers who enjoy reading silently. They prefer to process and learn information in visual forms such as pictures, charts, or other printed information, such as lists or paragraphs. They learn and remember best by seeing and visualizing information. Therefore, the visual learner will achieve the best achievement when they can maximize their eye skill. According to Wong (2010), there are additional characteristics of visual learners, first, students can easily recall information in the form of numbers, words, phrases, or sentences; second, they have strong visualization or visual memory skills and can look up (often up to the left) and "see" information; third, they make "movies in their minds" of information they are reading, the last they have strong visual-spatial skills that involve sizes, shapes, textures, angles, and dimensions.

2. *Auditory*

Auditory learners prefer listening to lectures and audiotapes. Al-Hebaishi (2012) said "Learner with an auditory style will prefer to use their hearing to learn" (p. 512). According to Rohliah (2015), they listen to a lecture about a certain topic rather than to read about it, talk about material with other or through "self-talk". They like sequence, repetition and summary, and when recalling memories tend to tilt their head and use level eye movements (Pritchard, 2009, p. 44). Wong (2010) added there are additional characteristics of auditory learners. These learners can accurately remember details of information heard in conversations or lectures, have strong language skills, well-developed vocabularies, and an appreciation of words, have strong

Edukasi Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran

P-ISSN : 2355 - 3699
E-ISSN : 2503 - 2518

uin
RADEN FATAH
PALEMBANG

oral communication skills and are articulate, have "finely tuned ears" and may find learning a foreign language relatively easy, hear tones, rhythms, and notes of music, and often excel in areas of music and have keen Auditory memories.

3. Kinesthetic

Kinesthetic learners will show a preference for demonstrations and physical activity involving bodily movement. They are the movers of the educational world. In this type, learners do best while touching and moving. They need to walk around or stand up while working. They enjoy physical activities, field trips, manipulating objects and hands-on experiences. According to Al-Hebaishi (2012), all kinesthetic learners need to interact with learning materials and resources. They tend to lose concentration if there is little or no external stimulation or movement. When listening to lectures they might want to take notes for the sake on the hand. When reading, they like scan the material first, and then focus on the details. In line with Pritchard (2009), they typically use color highlighters and takes notes by drawing pictures, diagrams, or doodling. According to Wong (2010), there are additional characteristics of kinesthetic learners. (1) They learn best by doing or manipulating physical objects and engaging in "hands on" learning; (2) they learn well through movement, such as working at large charts, role-playing, or dancing; (3) they learn well in activities that involve performing (athletes, actors, dancers); (4) they work well with their hands in areas such as repair work, sculpting, or art; (5) they are well coordinated, with a strong sense of timing and body movements, and (6) they are often wiggle, tap their feet, or move their legs when they sit. In addition, based on Fleming (2012), he believes that the kinesthetic learners should do the following activities; first, use real life examples, applications and case studies in your summary to help with abstract concepts second, redo lab experiments or projects, and the last utilize pictures and photographs that illustrate your idea.

The importance of learning styles

Learning style is important for many reasons. Gilakjani (2012) states that learning style has three vital ones. First of all, people's learning styles will vary because everyone is different from one another naturally. Secondly, it offers the opportunity to teach by using a wide range of methods in an effective way. Sticking to just one model unthinkingly will create a monotonous learning environment, so not everyone will enjoy the lesson. In other words, learning and teaching will be just words and not rooted in reality. Thirdly, people can manage many things in education and communication if they really recognize the groups they are called to. According to Coffield, Moseley, Hall, and Eccleston (2004), people may not know every detail; however, being aware of the students' learning styles, psychological qualities and motivational differences will be helpful to regulate the lessons appropriately and according to the conditions.

The advantage of identifying learning styles

According to Gilakjani (2012), it is important that individuals receive education in areas suitable for their learning styles. Students who are educated in an area having no relationship to their learning style may lack confidence, they could be less successful. As the result, they become frustrated. Knowledge of learning style also provides information to the students as to why they have learnt in a different way than others. It helps to control the process of learning. It is vital because one of the most important signals in learning is to learn to be autonomous, that is, for the individuals to take responsibility for their own learning. Because of this, they should know what learning style is. This has to be part of the learning process to enable the individual to obtain knowledge, which constantly shifts and changes, without any help from others.

English proficiency

Language proficiency is the language ability or ability in language use. Wong (2010) defines language proficiency as learners' communication of information, ideas and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of social studies. Proficiency refers to the degree of skill with which a person can use a language. Proficiency may be measure through the use of proficiency test that organised basically into listening, reading, writing and speaking skills

Proficiency goals include general competence, mastery of the four skills or mastery of specific language behaviours. In addition, Aydogan and Akbarov explain that the four basic skills are related to each other by two parameters: the mode of communication: oral or written and the direction of communication: receiving or producing the message (as cited in Saputra & Marzulina, 2015, p.5).

1. Listening Proficiency

One of receiving skill is listening. Patricia says listening is the process of listening and understanding what speaker said (as cited in Herlina, 2015, p.55). Also, Rost argues that developing proficiency in listening is a key of achieving proficiency in speaking. Not surprisingly, listening has a critical priority among the four skill areas for language students (as cited in Afriani, 2017, p.115). Having good mastery in listening skill is the fundamental for everybody to communicate in daily activity.

2. Reading Proficiency

Reading is receiving skill in English learning. The ability to read proficiently is a fundamental skill that affects the learning experiences and school performance of children and adolescents. According to Tadros (2014), reading proficiency requires that students be able to identify the words on the page accurately that they have enough knowledge and thinking ability to understand the words, sentences, and paragraph.

3. Writing Proficiency

Writing is the productive skill in the written mode. According to Pasand and Haghi, it is one the most important skills in learning a foreign language the nature of which has become clearer nowadays which involves the development of an idea, the capture of mental representations of knowledge, and of experience with subjects (as cited in Saputra & Marzulina, 2015). Habibi, Wachyuni & Husni 2017) added that the writer didn't only need to know the process of writing but also needed to apply these processes to the works. It would help the writer to organize idea logically.

4. Speaking Proficiency

The spoken productive language skill is called speaking. Richard and Renandya state that speaking is one of the central elements of communication and used for many different purposes: (1) it can be used as a casual conversation, for example may be to make social contact with people, to establish rapport, or to engage in the harmless chitchat that occupies much of time with friends; (2) it can be used to engage in discussion with someone like may be to seek or express opinions, to persuade someone about something or to clarify information (as cited in Herlina & Holandyah, 2016). According to Kalanzeda, Mahnegar, Hassannejad, and Bakhtiarvand, by speaking, people can convey information, ideas, and maintain social relationship in communicating with others (as cited in Gunawan, 2017). In brief, speaking proficiency is the ability to perform linguistic knowledge in actual communication. It is the ability to express idea, feeling, thought and need orally.

Methods

Research design

Correlational research was used in conducting this study. Creswell (2012) says that correlational designs provide an opportunity to predict scores and explain the relationship among variables. There is correlation coefficient, which is a numerical index that provides information about the strength and direction of the relationship between two variables. It provides information how variables are associated.

Research site and participants

The population of this study was all the active students of English Education Study Program of one State Islamic University in Sumatera. Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012) say that population is the larger group to which one hopes to apply the results. The distribution of population of the study could be seen below:

Table 1. Distribution of population

No	Semester	Number of Students
1	II	115
2	IV	134
3	VI	108
4	VIII	102
5	X	78
	Total	537

Note. English Education Study Program of one State Islamic University in South Sumatera

Purposive sampling method was used in this study. According to Creswell (2005), purposive samping is when the researchers select individuals and sites to learn and understand about the topic whether they are information rich. Purposive sampling was used because of some purposes to know the students' essay writing ability, a group of students who had already taken the essay writing courses from the population were considered as the sample. Nonetheless, most of the ninth semester and seventh semester students had already finished all of the lectures in the class and they were currently working with their thesis and teaching practice. It was quite difficult for us to collect the data from them. Also for the third semester students, they could not be as the sample because they were still learning essay writing course. Thus, we chose the fifth semester students as sample of this study. Not only because they had already taken essay writing course, but also because based on preliminary study, we found problems in the fifth semester students about their essay writing. Thus, the samples of this research were all of the active students in the fifth semester. The distribution of the sample was as follows.

Table 2. Distribution of sample

Class	Number of Students
A	28
B	30
C	25
D	29
Total	108

Note. English Education Study Program of one State Islamic University in South Sumatera.

Data collection and analysis

There were two kinds of instruments used to collect the data: questionnaire and the student's result of TOEFL test. Barsch Learning Style Inventory (BLSI) from Barsch (1996) was used as the instrument to identify the preferred learning style of students. BLSI is self-reporting instrument that provides the high school or college-level student with an indication of the relative strengths and weaknesses in learning through different sensory channels: Visual, Auditory, and Kinesthetic. It was a simple and convenient set of 24 Likert-scale questions which took approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. There were 24 statements each of which were assigned scores: five (5) points for often true, three (3) points for sometimes true and one (1) point for seldom preferred. Then, the student's English Proficiency was the student's competence in English language which was measured by using TOEFL prediction test. The data were collected from TOEFL test, in term of paper-based test. It consisted of 140 questions. There were two kinds of instruments used to collect the data, questionnaire of learning styles and student's result of TOEFL test divided into 3 sections, first section was listening consisting 50 questions, second section was structure consisting 40 questions, and the last was reading section consisting 50 questions, and the time allocation is about 2 hours.

Validiy and Reliability

Before the instruments were given to the sample, the test must be valid. Fraenkel et al. (2012) state that validity refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness, correctness, and usefulness of the inferences a researcher makes. The two variables of this study used content validity to valid the instrument. Instrument test can be designed by the researcher or they can take based on some ready-made index including the fact of these have been validated and tested for reliability. Barsch Learning Styles Inventory was adopted in this study. The 24 items were piloted with one hundred Iranian EFL fist year undergraduate students majoring in English Language. The result of the pilot study indicated that the questionnaire enjoyed acceptable validity, with Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy being 0.71. For test, TOEFL prediction test was used. TOEFL test is international instrument commonly used to measure the ability of English speakers or learners of English by institution like senior high school or university. Richards and Schmidt emphasize that "TOEFL test was considered valid if it measured students' language proficiency. In learning language, students' proficiency is regarded as the degree of skill with which a person can use a language, such as how well a person can read, write, speak, or understand language" (as cited in Liskinasih, 2016, p. 137).

Next, reliability refers to the consistency of scores or answers from one administration of an instrument to another, and from one set of items to another (Fraenkel et al., 2012). Further, to get the reliability of the questionnaire, internal consistency was used and analyzed by using Alpha Cronbach in SPSS bersion 23. Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012) state that to decide is the questionnaire was reliable, the coefficient should be at least 0.70, preferably higher. Further reliability analysis from Mutua (2015) indicated scale reliabilities were found to be 0.862. Since the coefficient should be at least 0.7, the questionnaire was reliable. In addition, according to Richards and Schmidt, "TOEFL test was considered reliable if it measured students' language proficiency. In learning language, students' proficiency is regarded as the degree of skill with which a person can use a language, such as how well a person can read, write, speak, or understand language" (as cited in Liskinasih, 2016, p. 137).

Instrument analysis

The instrument of learning styles questionnaire and TOEFL test were analyzed in order to gain the data of the study. The questionnaire consisted of 24 items based on four sources of learning styles and the time to answer the questionnaire was 10 minutes. This questionnaire used Likert-type scale and the response option was a value of 5 points for *often true,* 3 points for

Edukasi Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran

P-ISSN : 2355 - 3699
E-ISSN : 2503 - 2518

uin
RADEN FATAH
PALEMBANG

sometimes true, and 1 point for *seldom preferred.* Then, the style which had the best score was decided as the student's actual learning style. Then, the students' types of learning styles were classified into description statistic and data frequency. Then, the scores results were classified. The TOEFL test was scored on a scale of 217 to 677 point. Score of TOEFL prediction test was used as the data of students English Proficiency. Then, the students' types of learning styles were classified into description statistic and data frequency.

Findings

The result of students' learning styles

The total active students in the fifth semester of English Education Study Program were 108 students. However, 82 students participated in this study; the other students were not available to be participants when we were conducting this study. Learning style questionnaire by Barsch Learning Style Inventory (BLSI) from Barsch (1996) was used to investigate the participants' learning style. The learning style questionnaire was rated by using Likert scale. There were 24 statements each of which has assigned scores: five (5) points for often true, three (3) points for sometimes true and one (1) point for seldom preferred.

The descriptive statistical analysis of learning style questionnaire for the participants was shown in Table 3. The maximum score was 98, and the minimum score was 64. The mean scores for the participants were 81.46 and the standard deviation was 7.297. The data was shown in following table.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of learning style

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Learning_Style	82	64	98	81.46	7.297
Valid N (listwise)	82				

The result of the questionnaire revealed that the majority of students were 35 out of 82 (43%) had Auditory preference followed by Visual style as much as 28 out of 82 participants (34%). Moreover, there were 19 participants (23%) whose learning style was Kinesthetic. The details were as follows.

Table 4. Percentage of learning styles

Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Visual	28	43%
Auditory	35	34%
Kinesthetic	19	23%
Total	**82**	**100%**

The result of students' English proficiency

The descriptive statistic analysis of English proficiency for the participants was shown in the table 5. The maximum score was 333, and the lowest score was 517. The mean score indicated that the level of English proficiency of participants was 413.29, and the standard deviation was 41.754. The data was shown as follows.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics of English proficiency

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
English_Proficiency	82	333	517	413.29	41.754
Valid N (listwise)	82				

It revealed that from the English proficiency test, the five categories of English proficiency were all obtained by the students with different number: "Pre-elementary" as the least obtained category and "Post-advance" as the most obtained category. The distribution was presented in the following table:

Table 6. Score Distribution of TOEFL test

Categories of TOEFL score	Score Interval	Number of Students	Percent (%)
Post Advance	550-677	0	0
Advance	500-549	4	5
Pre-Advance	450-499	14	17
Intermediate	400-449	31	38
Elementary	350-399	28	34
Pre-Elementary	217-349	5	6
Total		82	100

The result showed that there were 5% students who had advance rank of TOEFL score. 17% had pre-advance rank, 38% students had intermediate rank of TOEFL test, 34% had elementary rank, and 6% had pre-elementary and post advance TOEFL score.

Statistical analyses

The result of normality test

The data are interpreted normal if $p > .05$. If $p < .05$, which means the data are not normal. To find out whether the data distribution is normal or not, Kolmogrov-smirnov was used to see the normality. The results of normality test showed that the data from each variable were normal and appropriate for data analysis with coefficients .188 for learning styles and .200 for English proficiency. The result of data normality test could be seen in the table below.

Table 7. Normality test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test			
		Learning_Style	English_Proficiency
N		82	82
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	81.59	413.29
	Std. Deviation	7.355	41.754
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.092	.076
	Positive	.061	.076
	Negative	-,092	-,059
Test Statistic		.087	,076
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.188c	,200c

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

The result of linearity test

For linearity test, deviation of linearity was obtained. If it is more than .05, the two variables are linear. Based on the data, the result showed that the deviation from linearity between learning styles and English proficiency (sig) was .489 or higher than .05, which the result could be assumed that the data were linear. The result of data linearity test could be seen in this table.

Table 8. Linearity test

			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
English Proficiency * Learning Styles	Between Groups	(Combined)	42085.108	15	2805.674	1.868	.043
		Linearity	21598.103	1	21598.103	14.380	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	20487.005	14	1463.358	.974	.489
	Within Groups		99129.868	66	1501.968		
	Total		141214.976	81			

ANOVA Table

The correlation between each learning style and English proficiency

This section answered the first research problem by analyzing the result of descriptive statistics for the learning styles questionnaire and TOEFL test. The result of Pearson Product Moment in this research could be seen in table below:

Table 9. Correlation between visual and english proficiency

		Visual_LS	English_Proficiency
Visual_LS	Pearson Correlation	1	.430[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	82	82
English_Proficiency	Pearson Correlation	.430[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	82	82

[**]. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Based on Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficients, the result indicated that the pattern of correlation between Visual learning style and English proficiency was positive. The correlation coefficients or the *r*-obtained (.430) was higher than *r*-table (.2565). Then the level of probability *(p)* significance (sig. 2-tailed) was .000. It meant that *p* (.000) was lower than .05. Thus, there was a significant correlation between the students' Visual learning style and English proficiency.

Table 10. Correlation between auditory and English proficiency

Correlations		Visual_LS	English_Proficiency
Auditory_LS	Pearson Correlation	1	.275
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.012
	N	82	82
English_Proficiency	Pearson Correlation	.275	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	
	N	82	82

Based on Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficients, the result indicated that the pattern of correlation between Auditory learning style and English proficiency was negative. The correlation coefficients or the *r*-obtained (.275) was higher than *r*-table (.2565). Then the level of probability *(p)* significance (sig. 2-tailed) was .012. It meant that *p* (.012) was higher than .05. Thus, there was no significant correlation between the students' Auditory learning style and English proficiency.

Table 11. Correlation between Kinesthetic and English Proficiency

Correlations		Kinesthetic _LS	English_Proficiency
Kinesthetic_LS	Pearson Correlation	1	-.166
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.137
	N	82	82
English_Proficiency	Pearson Correlation	-.166	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.137	
	N	82	82

Based on Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficients, the result indicated that the pattern of correlation between Kinesthetic learning style and English proficiency was negative. The correlation coefficients or the *r*-obtained (-.166) was lower than *r*-table (.2565). Then the level of probability *(p)* significance (sig. 2-tailed) was .137. It showed that *p* (.137) was higher than .05. Thus, there was no significant correlation between the students' Kinesthetic learning style and English proficiency.

Influence of students' Visual learning style and English proficiency

This section answered the second research problem by analyzing the result of descriptive statistics for the learning style questionnaire and TOEFL test. In addition, since there was a significant correlation between the visual learning style questionnaire and TOEFL test, it could be inferred that students' visual learning style had significant influence on their English proficiency. In addition, since there was no significant correlation between Auditory and Kinesthetic learning style to English proficiency, it would not get future analysis. Next, regression analysis was still be used to find out if students' visual learning style influenced their English proficiency. The result could be seen in the table below:

Table 12. The Regression Analysis of Students' Visual Learning Style and English Proficiency

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	289.023	29.503		9.797	.000
	Visual_LS	4.430	1.041	.430	4.255	.000

a. Dependent Variable: English_Proficiency

The result indicated that the students' visual learning style influenced English proficiency significantly with t_{value} (4.255) was higher than t_{table} (1.993) with sig. Value (.000) was lower than probability (.05). Therefore, there was significant influence between visual learning styles towards English proficiency of the undergraduate EFL students at one State Islamic University in Sumatera.

Table 13. Model Summary

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.430[a]	.185	.174	37.939

a. Predictors: (Constant), Visual_LS

In addition, to know the contribution of visual learning style on English proficiency, R-Square was obtained. The result of the analysis revealed that the R Square (R^2) was .185. It indicated that students' learning style gave significant effect in the level of 18.5% toward English proficiency.

Discussion

Based on learning styles questionnaire, it was found that the most dominant learning style of students was auditory style. In addition, in terms of English proficiency, most of the students were categorized as intermediate level. The findings showed that there was a significant correlation between visual learning style and English proficiency (*r*-obtained .430). It was also found that visual learning style was considered having contribution of 18.5% to students' English proficiency and it is influenced by 81.5% of other factors that cannot be explained.

In addition, there was no significant correlation between auditory learning styles and English proficiency (*r*-obtained .275) and there was no significant correlation between kinesthetic learning styles and English proficiency (*r*-obtained -.166). It is supported by Reid (1987) who said that higher levels of English proficiency prefer to visual mode. Students will feel comfortable learning visually. In other words, students with higher English proficiency is more interested in learning using their sight or use this style most of learning. Visual learners learn by several way for example by reading book, see graph, chart, or by using LCD projector, etc. Furthermore, insignificant correlation between the students' auditory also kinesthetic learning styles and English proficiency denied the theories which believed that learning styles is the independent variable that has big influence in predicting students' proficiency (Oxford, 2003; Dunn & Dunn, 2000; & Keefe, 1979). The result of this present study was in line with the study done by Nadzifah (2013) which found that there was correlation between visual learning style preferences and English proficiency, there was no significant correlation between auditory learning style

preferences and English proficiency and there was no significant correlation between kinesthetic learning style preferences and English proficiency of students at English Educational Program of STAIN Tulung Agung. Furthermore, Suwarni (2014) also found that the most dominant learning style of the nursing students of Muhammadiyah University Palembang was Auditory style. It was also in line with the study conducted by Naqeeb and Awad (2011) who stated that the dominant learning style as perceived by Arab American University EFL students was auditory. Furthermore, Kara (2009) also revealed that Auditory and Visual were the most prominent learning styles among the students of Anadolu University.

In short, the total contribution of students' learning styles and English proficiency showed that only Visual learning styles was significant correlation and influence. The findings of this study may have some pedagogical implications for teacher or lecturer, students, and next researcher. Finally, this study was successful in investigating the link and the influence between learning styles and English proficiency of Undergraduate EFL Students at one State Islamic University in Sumatera.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the findings and interpretations of the study, there are some conclusions could be drawn:

1. The correlation between each learning style and students' English proficiency.
   a. There was a significant correlation between students' Visual learning styles and their English proficiency r-table (.430). The finding showed that be alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected.
   b. There was no significant correlation between the students' Auditory learning styles and English proficiency r-table (.012). The finding showed that null hypothesis (H_0) was accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was rejected.
   c. There was no significant correlation between the students' Kinesthetic learning styles and English proficiency r-table (-.166). The finding showed that null hypothesis (H_0) was accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was rejected.

2. Based on the findings, it indicated that there was significant influence (18.5%) of students' visual learning styles on their English proficiency. It could be implied that students' visual learning styles gave a dominant effect in English proficiency of undergraduate EFL students at one State Islamic University in Sumatera.

Seeing all the explanations and the conclusions above, we intended to give some suggestions related to English teaching learning as well as the future studies. Firstly, the students should raise the awareness regarding their learning styles and English proficiency might make them not only more prepared for learning but also more analytic about their learning styles and the strategies they make use. Students need to understand their learning style to improve their speed and quality of learning. match the students' learning style and teaching techniques in order to improve the students' learning quality and get avoid students' demotivation, whereas a mismatch tends to have a dire outcome. Second, for English lecturers, we hope English lecturers would like to observe and understand the students learning style in order to match to their teaching style. The last, it is hoped that this study will contribute or will be valuable to other researchers in conducting further research of the similar topic in more detail.

References

Abrar, M., Mukminin, A., Habibi, A., Asyafi, F., Makmur., & Marzulina, L. (2018). If our English isn't a language, what is it? Indonesian EFL student teachers' challenges speaking English. *The Qualitative Report 23*(1), 129-145.

Afriani, E, P. (2017). The relationship between learning style and listening comprehension achievement of twelfth grade students of SMA Pusri Palembang. *Edukasi Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran,4*(1), 111-124

Aina, J. K., Ogundele, A. G., & Olanipekun, S, S. (2013). Students' proficiency in English language relationship with academic performance in science and technical education. *American Journal of Educational Research, 1*(9), DOI: 10.12691/education-1-9-2

Algeo, J. (2010). *The origins and development of the English language* (6th ed.). Australia: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Al-Hebaishi, M. S. (2012). Investigating the relationship between learning styles, strategies and the academic performance of Saudi English majors. *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education, 1*(8), 510-520.

Barsch, J. R. (1996). *Barsch learning style Inventory*. Novato, CA: Academic Therapy Publication.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education.

Coffield, F., Moseley, D., Hall, E., & Ecclestone, K. (2004). *Learning styles and pedagogy in post-16 learning. A systematic and critical review.* London, England: Learning and Skills Research Centre.

Creswell, J.W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. (2000). *Teaching students through their individual learning styles: A practical approach.* Reston, VA: Reston Publishing.

Fleming, N. D. (2012). *Teaching and learning styles: VARK strategies.* Christchurch, New Zealand: Author.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gappy, L. L. (2013). Relationship between learning style preferences and academic performance of students. *International of Educational Research and Technology, 4*(2), 70-76.

Gilakjani, A. P. (2012). Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic learning styles and their impact on English language teaching. *Journal of Studies in Education, 2*(1), 104-113. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jse.v2il.1007.

Gunawan. J. (2017). The correlation between students' self-esteem and speaking achievement of undergraduate EFL students of English education study program of Islamic state university of Raden Fatah Palembang. *Edukasi Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran,4*(1), 1-10

Habibi, A., Wachyuni, S., & Husni, N. (2017). Students' perception on writing problems: A survey at one Islamic University in Jambi. *Ta'dib: Journal of Islamic Education,2*(1), 96-108

Herlina, L. (2015). Teaching listening comprehension through TQLR (tune in, question, listen, review) strategy to the twelfth-grade students of SMA Negeri 2 Tebing Tinggi. *Edukasi Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran, 2*(3), 53-62.

Herlina, & Holandyah, M. (2016). Teaching speaking skill by using guided conversation technique through pair taping to the seventh grade students of SMP PTI Palembang. *Edukasi Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran,3*(1), 107-119

Kara, S. (2009). Learning styles and teaching styles: A case study in foreign language classroom. *Journal of Arts and Sciences, 1*(20), 77– 82.

Keefe, J. (1979). *Learning Styles: An overview.* Reston, VA: Prometrus Nemesis.

Liskinasih, A. (2016). The validity evidence of TOEFL test as placement test. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa dan Sastra*.3(2), 173-180

Mutua, M. N. (2015). *A correlation study between learning styles and academic achievement among secondary school students in Kenya* (Master's thesis). Nairobi, Kenya: University of Nairobi.

Nadzifah, A. (2013). *A study on correlation between students' perceptual learning style preferences and English proficiency at english education program of STAIN Tulungagung* (Undergraduate's theisis). STAIN Tulungagung, Tulungagung, Indonesia.

Naqeeb, H., & Awad, A. (2011). Learning styles as perceived by learners of English as a foreign language in the English language center of the Arab American University. *An - Najah Univ. J. Res. (Humanities), 25*(8), 2232-2256.

Othman, N., & Amiruddin, M. H. (2010). Different Perspectives of Learning Styles from VARK Model. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *7*, 652–660.

Oxford, R. L. (2003). *Language learning styles and strategies: An overview.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Pritchard, A. (2009). *Ways of learning: Learning theories and learning style in the classroom* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge Taylor and Prances group.

Reid, J. M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly, 2*(1)*,* 226-228

Rohliah, L. (2015). *The correlation among foreign language anxity, learning styles, language learning attitudes, and English poficiency of the economic faculty students of Muhammadiyah University Palembang* (Master's thesis). Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia.

Šabatová. (2008). *Learning styles in ELT* (Master's thesis). Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic.

Saputra, H., & Marzulina, L. (2015). Teaching writing by using process genre approach to the eighth-grade students of SMP negeri 22 Palembang. *Edukasi Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran, 2*(1), 1-12

Suwarni, E. (2014). *The correlation among the sixth semester nursing science study program students' learning styles. Learning attitudes, and reading achievement of Muhammadiyah health school Palembang* (Master's thesis). Universitas Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia.

Tadros, L. C. (2014). Definition and approaches measuring reading proficiency.*CEELO Fast FACT, 5*(2), 1-7.

Tuan, L. T. (2011). EFL learners' learning styles and their attributes. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 2*(2), 299-320.

Vaishnav, R. S. (2013). Leangrning styles and academic achievement of secondary school student *Voice of Research, 1*(4), 1-4.

Wong, L. (2010). *Essential study skills* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.