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Abstract

Present study endeavors to explore the 10th grade secondary schools English teachers’ teaching styles and learning styles of their students and examine the potential relationship between teaching learning style match with student’s academic achievement as shown by their last secondary school board’s results. A sample of forty two schools was selected from the population of Punjab province government schools. All the English class students and their class teachers were the respondent of this study. Relevant information was collected through teaching and learning styles inventories from teachers and their students and English subject result was obtained through their relevant schools. The study employed Grasha’s inventory (1996) in diverse learning styles categories related to students and investigate teaching styles related to teachers. Grasha’s inventory was employed on five sub categories of the scale. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics techniques. The results demonstrate that students’ learning styles and their achievement in English course, have statistically significance difference among them and statistically significance effect was not found, between students’ learning styles and teachers’ teaching styles on students English achievements.
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**Introduction**

English is widely spoken global language. It is a global language in all areas of the pure sciences, social sciences, arts, trade, business, commerce and diplomacy. There is no exception from this language, where after the Urdu; it is a main language in all areas of our life. Almost 80% of all types of correspondence in Pakistan are carried out in English (Mueen, 1992), there is no doubt that it is an official language of Pakistan. Being an official language, there is a great need to promote and foster this language as a practical tool and means of communication in education. In this world non-English speaking countries like Pakistan, it is ignored to learn and teach English and due importance is not given to this language, there will be huge decline in the socio-economic and education, and science and technology, which is the determinants of growth and development of any country. Moreover, without the English language, we will be unable to express and present our nation on the global forum of all nations. It is the language of ‘United Nations and International Court of Justice’. Thus, we cannot communicate effectively without command on English Language (Mathews, 1989).

The current situation about the English language in our education institution is not up to the expectations. There is shortage of competent and qualified instructors and language trainers in our schools. Majority of our school students find it difficult to translate their views and ideas in English, which ultimately shows a huge drop out in English subject course. Speaking and writing of English is a challenging and most difficult task for our students. Several reasons may be put forwarded for the state of deterioration and under rated performance in this language. One dilemma of empathic could have been advocated for the pervasiveness of poor performance in English language. A probable reason for this state of misery could be the existence of unit of mismatch concerning teachers’ teaching styles and learners’ learning styles. In this study focused on match or incompatibility between learning styles and teaching styles.

**Review of Literature**

There is a long standing debate among the educators on the existence of relationship between teaching-learning styles match and its effect on the performance of the students. Very much literature has been published but this debate seems to be never ending. A number of research studies existed in which researchers have examined the effects of teaching-learning styles match on student’s academic performance (Aripin, 2008; Collison, 2000; Felder, 2002; Uzuntiryaki, 2003). All these studies pointed out those students’ learning style preferences have considerable effect on their academic
achievements/performances to varying extents. Likewise, in the area of learning styles, some studies pointed out that individual attitude of the students regarding their area of study was affected by their learning style preferences (Mutlu, 2006), and their academic performance can be enhanced by aligning the students’ preferred learning styles and their learning environment. On the opposite, a mismatch or non-alignment of students’ preferred learning styles and their learning environment could reduce the academic achievements of the students (Klavas, 1994; Dunn, 1995 & Andrews, 1990). Moreover, a better understanding of the course and a better positive attitude among the students towards their course, match exists flanked by students preferred erudition styles and their instructors teaching styles (Felder, 1993).

Literature is surveyed the effect of teaching learning style match on the academic achievements of the students in their course work. Some studies claimed that a competition among pupils’ learning styles and instructing styles produce a positive effect on students’ academic achievement (McDonald, 1996; Felder et al., 2002; Felder, 1988; Goodwin, 1995; Ester, 1994). Quite a number of researches supported the view when learning and teaching styles, match motivation and achievement of the student significantly improved (Stitt-Gohdes, 2003). Felder and Spurlin (2005) argued that when the teaching styles of the instructors’ do not match with their learners’ styles, the state of mismatch exist between teaching styles which ultimately result in that the students may become inattentive and bored, perform poorly in their tests, become depressed in relation to their studies, course contents and academic curriculum, even there is a feeling among the students to switch over other courses or even leave the school. (Naimie, 2010).

On the other side, some research studies indicated that no significant relationship exist between matching of teaching-learning styles and pupils achievements as evident from last examination grades or course grades. Aragon (2001), Desmedt and Valcke (2003), Stahl (1999), and Tucker (1998), argued that students’ learning styles have no effect on their academic performance.

In summary, educators are divided in their research findings. Some researchers believed no relationship exist between teaching-learning styles match and academic performance of the students. Oppositely, some researchers claimed, if learning and teaching styles matched, students get superior exam scores than those whom style do not match. This study further investigates the effects of teaching-learning style match and achievement of the students as pointed out by their final examination marks.
Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the research study were to:

1. Identify the teaching styles of Secondary School English teachers.
2. Identify the learning styles of Secondary School English students.
3. Establish whether teacher’s teaching styles match with student’s learning styles.
4. Find relationship between teaching-learning style match and students’ achievement.

Methodology

Survey research design is the instrument adopted and applied for this study. In this research, investigator anticipated to investigate a sample of approximately participant students of 42 schools and their English language teachers of province of Punjab and evaluating data collected from 42 schools for particular, content area of English subject and students’ score in English subject.

The theoretical population of this study contains the whole Government Secondary school English teachers and their students of grade X of Punjab Province. The sample of this study, teachers and their students in the province of Punjab were selected by using multi-stage probability sampling technique. There are nine administrative Divisions in Punjab. Four schools (from urban & rural 2 male schools each one and two female school) excluding Central Model School, Pilot and Comprehensive secondary Schools were selected randomly from each division using simple balloting method. Two central Model Schools (one male & one female), two Pilot Secondary Schools (one male & one female) and one male & one female Comprehensive Schools were randomly selected from the entire schools, each category in Punjab province. In this way 42 schools were selected from the province of Punjab. All the teachers teaching English to Class X and their students of the selected schools were included in this study.

The study was aimed to classify the Grade X English class students’ learning styles and their English instructors’ instructing styles and to explore the relationship of match or mismatch of instructing styles with the scores of English subject. To measure X grade students’ learning style, Grasha-Riechmann Student Learning Styles Scale (GRLSS), was used in this study. This instrument consists of 60 items with a 5 point Likert scale (strongly disagree=SD.1 to strongly agree=SA.5) this scale, six different types of learning styles can be identified (“competitive, collaborative, avoidant, participant, dependent and independent”). To measure the teaching styles of the English class teachers, Grasha-Riechmann Teaching Style Inventory (GRTSI)
was used in this study. Grasha (1996) developed this inventory which include 40 items it has also same scale (strongly disagree=SD.1 to strongly agree=SA.5). This teaching style inventory measure the teaching styles on five subcategories of teaching styles such as “expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator and delegator”.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Research Question. 1 In order to identify the teaching styles of the instructors, first value of mean scores on the five subcategories of the teaching style inventory were calculated. Then the mean value scores of each subcategory were compared. Grasha, (1996) projected diverse measures and scales ranges.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Styles</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Authority</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Model</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegator</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the comparison of mean scores mentioned in the above table, the sample teachers of the schools were found as Expert, Personal Model, Facilitator and Delegator.

Research Question. 2 To identify the students’ learning styles, first mean scores values of the students on six subcategories of learning styles inventory were computed. Then the values of these mean scores were compared with Grasha (1996) projected diverse measures and scales ranges. The result is shown below:-
Table 2

Students’ Mean Scores on Grasha-Riechmann Learning Style Scale (N 2942)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Styles</th>
<th>Student’s Mean Scores</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data given in above table, Collaborative and Competitive learning styles were found.

Research Question 3. In order to investigate the match between the teaching styles of the teachers and learning styles of their students, the dominant teaching and learning styles of all the participating teachers and students were first identified by the researcher. Then, to determine the frequencies of match and mismatch, each student’s dominant learning styles were linked to all dominant teaching styles of his/her teacher. Table below presents the data for the total frequencies of teaching and learning styles, match and mismatch in all the schools that were participated in this study.

Table 3

Total number of matches/mismatches cases of teaching and learning styles that existed in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>Frequency of style match</th>
<th>Frequency of style mismatch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2942</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>3160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in the above table shows that in most of the schools under study, the frequency of teaching and learning styles match is relatively lower than the frequency of mismatches. This observation describes the fact that there was a vast difference of total match/mismatch frequencies determined for all these schools. The above table further demonstrates that for all secondary schools under this study, there exists 29.5% matching and 70.5% mismatching cases of teaching-learning styles. It is established from the above data that the majority of the school teacher’s teaching styles do not match with their students’ preferred learning styles. Furthermore, it seems that many students do not have the experience of favorable learning environments to cater their individual learning needs.
**Research Question 4.** According to Grasha (1996), an individual does not have exclusively one learning style, but rather a combination of learning styles. Therefore, Grasha (1996) developed learning clusters using the six categories of his learning style scale. Grasha, (1996) proposed certain learning styles groups that consist of various grouping of teaching styles. These groups of learning styles are:

- Dependent-Avoidant-Participant-Competitive (**Cluster 1**)
- Participant-Dependent-Collaborative (**Cluster 2**)
- Collaborative-Participant-Independent (**Cluster 3**)
- Independent-Collaborative-Participant (**Cluster 4**)

Grasha, (1996) suggests that the clusters of learning styles are associated with the clusters of teaching styles. The groups which have high mean scores were clustered by the researcher according to the categories as stated by Grasha (1996). Students’ cluster wise learning styles distribution is shown in the table below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Combination of Learning Styles</th>
<th>Students (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Dependent - avoidant-participant-competitive</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Participant - dependent-collaborative</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Collaborative - participant-independent</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>Independent - collaborative-participant</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in the above table demonstrate that 23.5% students’ learning styles were identified as participant/dependent/collaborative (**Group 1**). 41.2% of the students learning styles were identified as participant/dependent/collaborative (**Group 2**). 16.6% students learning styles were identified as collaborative-participant-independent (**Group 3**). 18.7% students learning styles were identified as independent/collaborative/participant (**Group 4**) learners. From the above table, it is concluded that a majority of students (64.7%) had more dependent style of learning while remaining (35.3%) students had independent style of learning.

To study whether matching between teachers’ teaching style and their students’ learning styles had an effect on the level of achievements of students in English subject; the researcher introduced a new variable by grouping students according to a match between their learning styles corresponding to their teacher’s teaching styles.
Table 5
Student’s means and standard deviation scores for English subject in relation to their preferred learning styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Combination of learning styles</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>Group Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Dependent - avoidant-participant-competitive</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>53.94</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Participant - dependent-collaborative</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>58.32</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Collaborative - participant-independent</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>62.17</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>Independent - collaborative-participant</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>64.81</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
Mean and SD scores for Students’ English Subject – Match Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Style Clusters</th>
<th>Learning style Clusters</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>Group Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>52.28</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>56.92</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>60.20</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>64.94</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>799</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the above table demonstrate that the students whom learning styles match with their teacher’s teaching styles had a mean score of their English achievements 58.58 % and a standard deviation of 9.22.

Table 7
Mean and SD scores for Students’ English Subject – Mismatch Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Style Clusters</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>Group Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>51.59</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>55.75</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>57.89</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>62.64</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2143</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.96</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.79</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results from the above table describe that the students whom learning styles mismatch with their teacher’s teaching styles had a mean score of their English achievements 56.97% and a standard deviation of 7.79.

In order to explore the possible relationship between teaching learning styles match and student’s achievement in English subject, a two way analysis of variance was performed between [(4 learning clusters) x (2 match/mismatch)] four learning clusters as shown in table 48 and two teaching learning styles match/mismatch variables. The results of this analysis are given hereunder in table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Style (A)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65712.734</td>
<td>21904.246</td>
<td>153.743</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.846</td>
<td>50.846</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (AxB)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>175.628</td>
<td>55.078</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>66712.564</td>
<td>22.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2942</td>
<td>12984575.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the above table show that statistically there was no considerable relational effect between students’ learning style groups and matching between teaching and learning styles. However, statistically a significant mean difference was found among the various learning styles of the students with respect to their achievements in English subject.

The relationship strength between learning styles and English achievement was assessed by eta squared (η²) was found to be strong. The f ratio of 1.231 was not significant at .05 levels. Students learning styles accounted for 32.9% of variance in student’s English achievement levels. The results from above table demonstrated that statistically no significant effect was found between teaching-learning styles match on students’ achievements.
Summary

The present study was a descriptive study based on a survey research. The study aimed to identify learners’ styles of learning English at 10th grade and teaching styles of 10th grade English class teachers and to find out whether students’ learning styles, the difference between teachers’ teaching styles and their students’ learning styles. The further aimed to investigate whether any match exist between teachers’ teaching styles and their students’ learning styles and most important to examine possible relationship between teaching-learning style match and students’ achievement in English subject. The study was conducted in the government schools of the province of Punjab.

Statistical analysis of the relationships between degree of match scores and students’ academic achievement yielded low correlations in the English subject area. The relationship strength between learning styles and English achievement was assessed by eta squared (θ²) was found to be strong. The f ratio of 1.231 was not significant at .05 levels. Students learning styles accounted for 32.9% of variance in student’s English achievement levels. The evidence from the statistical results demonstrated that no significance impact of matching teaching-learning styles on students’ achievements was found.

Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to investigate whether teaching styles of 10th grade English teachers match with the learning styles of their students and the effect of teaching-learning style match on the academic achievements of the students. The results showed that there was a statistically significant difference among students with different learning styles in terms of English achievements. Students with learning styles of independent/collaborative/participant had higher achievements score then the students from the other three groups. This result supported the findings of other studies in the literature indicating that students’ learning styles had a significant influence on their achievements (Mathews, 1996; Collison, 2000; Synder, 2000; Cano-Garcia & Hewitt-Hughes, 2000; Letele, 2013).

When the English course means scores of students in four learning style groups were examined, an increase was found in student’s mean scores belonging from learning style groups 1 and learning style group 2 to learning styles groups 3 and learning style group 4. Group 1 and group 2 exhibited dependent styles, whereas groups 3 and group 4 had independent styles. This means students having independent learning styles showed high achievement than the students who had dependent learning styles. Independent learning style students appeared to be more
confident as regard to their learning abilities. They like to learn course material that
was important to them. They prefer to study alone on a project or their classroom
assignments. They consider their teacher as a facilitator and expect him to help them
in their learning when needed.

Generally, it is believed that matching teachers’ teaching styles with their
students’ learning styles have significant positive impact on the student’s academic
performance and achievements. Some research studies point out that higher
achievement is observed when learning styles and teaching styles are matched
Nevertheless, the findings emanating from the present study demonstrated that
matching of teaching styles of the instructors with the learning styles of their students
have no significant effect on the academic performance of the students. These finding
may be surfaced due to the fact reasons that different instructors have adopted
different instruction methods; variation in the learning styles of the learners, and their
familiarization to the various and distinct learning environments and distinctive
teaching methods and approaches employed by their instructors.

The finding supports the results of other studies (Wilson, 2011; Rozalina,
2013; Sabeh, 2011; Dincol, 2011, Uzuntiryaki, 2007) which produced the evidences
that teaching-learning style match do not have a considerable impact on the academic
success of the students. There are a number of studies in the past literature which
support and confirm the results of the present study. Study conducted by Uzuntiryaki
and his associates shared the similar findings. Their study found that matching the
teaching styles of the teachers with their students’ learning styles did not produced a
significant effect on the academic achievements of the students (Uzuntiryaki, 2007).
A Study conducted by Tucker (1998), who used the Canfield teaching and learning
style inventories for the measurement of instructors teaching styles and their students’
learning styles, concluded that matching instructors’ teaching styles with their
students’ learning styles did not showed considerable effect on the students’ academic
achievements. The matching teaching-learning styles of department of Turkish Folk
literature’s teachers and their students’ depicted no significant increase in the
academic success of the students. The one possible reason for these findings may be
the fact that reason behind these finding are a great variation in the learning styles of
the students. They further hold that by the passage of time, students learning styles
may be changed depending upon the student’s age, their course subject and their
learning environments.
Conclusion

The theory established in the past literature by the researchers that teaching-learning style match can enhance student academic success as measured by their exam scores and course grades and course grades (Van Vuren, 1992; Zippert, 1985; Matthews, 1995; Raines, 1976; Carthey, 1993; Miglietti, 1994, Minotti, 2005; Dasari, 2006; Romanelli et al., 2009; Kovacic, 2008; Demirel, 2004; Peacock, 2001; Tseng et al., 2008; Lovelace, 2005; Honigsfeld & Schiering, 2004; Collinson, 2000; Felder & Brent, 2005) may not be valid in all situations. The research findings of this study demonstrated that there was no significant relationship found between teaching-learning style match and student academic achievement for this specific group of participants. In this study, no significant differences were found in exam scores between students whom learning style matched with their teachers’ style and those who did not. The findings found in the past literature that there exist no significant relationship between teaching-learning style match and students’ academic achievements (Aragon, 2001; Desmedt & Valcke, 2003; Stahl, 1999; Tucker, 1998; Wilson, 2011; Rozalina, 2013; Sabeh, 2011; Uzuntiryaki, 2007;) was found to be true in this study. In this study, no significant differences were found in exam scores between students whom learning style matched with their teachers’ style and those who did not.

The results produced appreciated information regarding practicable relationships between the degree of match about preference students’ learning styles in fourth grade and teaching styles, and effect of both on students’ academic achievement. Analysis of data showed that the teaching styles of the sample teachers of this present study were found as “Expert, Personal Model, Facilitator and Delegator” and Collaborative and Competitive learning styles were found. The relationship strength between learning styles and English achievement was assessed by eta squared ($\eta^2$) was found to be strong. The $f$ ratio of 1.231 was not significant at .05 levels. Students learning styles accounted for 32.9% of variance in student’s English achievement levels. The evidence from the statistical results demonstrated that no significant effect exited between matching teaching-learning styles and students’ achievements. Nevertheless, outcomes of this study offer vital facts concerning the field of education and have valued consequences for educationalists.
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