

How to Cite:

Zakaria, S. K., Vijararatnam, P. A., Aziz, A. A., & Salleh, S. (2022). Preference for learning styles among UPSI students during learning Titas Course. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S5), 11721–11737. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS5.12129>

Preference for learning styles among UPSI students during learning Titas Course

Siti Kausar Zakaria

Email: sitikausar.zakaria@newinti.edu.my

Phawani A. Vijararatnam

Email: phawani@newinti.edu.my

Azureen Abd. Aziz

Email: azureen@newinti.edu.my

Sakinah Salleh

Email: sakinah.salleh@fsk.upsi.edu.my

Abstract---Learning styles are unconscious, stable characteristics that influence how learners perceive and respond to their learning environment. The purpose of this study is to investigate the learning styles of UPSI students while studying Titas and to examine the differences in learning styles between male and female students. The participants in this study were 311 students randomly selected from 513 students. Honey and Mumford's (1986) learning styles questionnaires were given to each student after obtaining informed consent. Data were collected using questionnaires and analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics, such as frequencies and means, were used to explain the learning style scores and gender of the respondents. An independent T-test was used to compare the differences between genders. The result shows that theoretical style (mean = 3.83) was rated the highest by the students. This was followed by the pragmatic style (mean=3.81) and the reflective style (mean=3.79). Students rated the activist style as moderate (mean=3.46). The independent T-test showed that there was no significant difference between genders. However, the mean score of pragmatic male students is higher than female students (m=3.85, f=3.74), the mean score of theoretical female students is higher than male students (f=3.87, m=3.85), the mean score of reflective female students is higher than male students (f=3.81, m=3.72), and the mean score of activist male students is higher than female students (m=3.50, f=3.44). The study found that students exhibited a theorist learning style. Students should prefer pragmatic and activist learning styles the most when learning Tamadun Islam dan Tamadun Asia

Tenggara (TITAS), especially female students. Learning in higher education should embrace a variety of learning styles and be adapted to the nature of the course content, while instructors need to use a variety of assessment and instruction methods that are appropriate to both student priorities and the nature of the course.

Keywords---Learning style, Tamadun Islam and Tamadun Asia Tenggara (TITAS) course, higher education learning, patriotisme, nasionalisme, universal value.

Introduction

The TITAS course aims to develop a person's potential by making him knowledgeable, skillful, highly talented, virtuous and patriotic. Moreover, this course aims to make students and their communities think more about the need to contribute to the community and the country, especially by fostering the patriotic and nationalistic spirit to build a Malaysian nation and contribute to global prosperity (Proforma Kursus Titas UPSI 2018).

The course is a compulsory subject offered in all public and private universities in Malaysia. Titas is namely called Kursus Islamic Civilization and Asian Civilization. The purpose of introducing this course is to promote understanding and unity among students and their communities. In addition, the objectives of this course can promote a strong sense of belonging to the country and tolerance among the different races of Malaysia (Nazri Muslim & Mnmansur 2015).

Based on the course structure designed by the university, the course aims to discuss the introduction of civilizational knowledge, Islamic civilization, the role of Islam in Malay civilization, and in the shape of Malaysian civilization. This course also focuses on Indian and Chinese civilization. The current challenges facing Islamic and Asian civilization will also be discussed to educate students on the current issues involved (Proforma Kursus Titas UPSI 2018).

In learning this course, students must be introduced to an appropriate learning style necessary to achieve the purpose of this course. Honey Mumford's learning style, which includes theoretical, reflective, pragmatic, and activist elements, is an excellent choice for combination when learning this course. The most important thing is that students give preference to the pragmatic and activist learning styles because the goal of this course is to prepare students who are realistic, dynamic, active, and can apply new ideas in community life.

Pragmatic and activist learning styles should be practised as students complete their assignments and even as they interact with their fellow students and the community around them. The most obvious example is student life at the university, where students must complete assignments with friends of different races, ethnicities, and religions and interact with the university community, which comes from diverse backgrounds. On exams and quizzes, students applied the theoretical and reflective style they had previously learned in class. These

types of exams required them to remember, understand, analyse, and synthesise course material.

In today's world, people with a wide range of skills such as problem solving, critical thinking, and creativity are in high demand. Therefore, learning styles play an important role, especially for problem solving skills in learning (Ghaziwakili, et.al 2014). The purpose of this study was to determine the learning styles of students during TITAS course.

According to Honey and Mumford (1986), learning is the process by which a student can demonstrate something new in the form of understanding, awareness, or skill. The term "learning style" refers to how something is learned based on the learner's preferences. It is possible to not only take advantage of a person's learning style, but also to maximise one's potential by identifying the person's learning style (Honey and Mumford 1986).

According to Grasha (1996), a student's learning style is his or her own style and it has a significant impact on how he or she learns and how much he or she can apply what he or she has learned. Learning style models include David Kolb's (1984) model, Grasha-Riechman's (1996) model, the VAK (learning by doing) model developed by Neil Flemming in 1987 (Flemming 2011), and Honey and Mumford's model. In this study, the learning style based on Honey and Mumford's (1986) model was chosen to assist the researcher in answering the research question.

Problem of the Study

The country of Malaysia is ethnically, culturally and religiously diverse. Therefore, citizens need to understand this diversity by recognising the culture, religion, language, and customs of their race or ethnic traditions. Understanding other ethnic cultures can help reduce interracial tensions and sensitivities. The purpose of the Titas course is not only to test, but more importantly to apply in daily life.

Although different races live in their own communities, each citizen must understand the concept of diversity through diversity by recognising racial or ethnic traditions, culture, religion, language, and customs. Understanding other ethnic cultures can help reduce interracial tensions and sensitivities. So the purpose of the Titas course is not only to test, but the most important thing is that learning this course can help students apply the learning outcomes.

The main objective of this course, introduced by the Ministry of Higher Education, is to promote racial harmony and patriotism and nationalism among Malaysians. In this case, the Titas course teaches students to identify universal values or values that can be shared by people of different races. The more universal or shared values are lived by students, the greater the understanding between races and the more interethnic conflict can be avoided. As a result, a pragmatic approach is needed so they can find more realistic solutions that can be implemented. Students should expand their learning styles to include pragmatic and activist learning styles.

The instructor's assignments and coursework can influence students' learning styles (Gray and Diloreto 2016). The TITAS course benefits greatly from hands-on coursework and fieldwork because students will focus on theoretical and reflective styles when they focus on quizzes and exam questions. The main goal of this course is to determine how well students can apply noble values to bridge the racial divide and what actions need to be taken to reduce racial conflict. The application of theoretical and reflective styles will make it difficult to achieve the learning outcomes of this course.

According to a study conducted by Majdi and Azlina (2017) at one of the country's Polytechnic Colleges found that both male and female students (88 or 33 percent) prefer to use reflective learning styles. It was similar to what Syed Jamal Abdul Nasir (2015) discovered, in which both IPTA and IPTS students showed a similar pattern of learning styles. The reflector learning style was found to be the most popular among male and female students, as well as students of various ethnic backgrounds, while the activist style was the least popular.

Studies shown that females are thinkers over doers, prefer diverging and assimilating learning styles, whereas males prefer converging and accommodating learning styles (doers than thinkers). Boys are motivated by the object or material to be learned, while girls are motivated by the desire to impress adults (Olagbaju 2014). Whatever either male or female ought to be active in learning this subject. They must be pragmatic and active to achieve the goals of learning Titas to become a nation capable of adapting professionally to different moral values and cultural norms.

However, the students will also be required to take the exam and quizzes, as stated in the learning course specification. So, the theoretical and reflective style also needed and helped them to get a good grade. Theoretical style that allows students to adapt observations and integrate them into complex but logically sound theories. Students can think through problems in a vertical, logical, step-by-step manner. As a result, they find it easy to answer questions that require them to analyze, synthesize, and establish basic assumptions, principles, and theories. The reflective style is a philosophical style that allows students to think philosophically. It allows them to gather data to reach definite conclusion.

Both styles require students to have a thorough and deep understanding of the material in order to answer the exam questions and quizzes. The final exams and quizzes account for half of the overall Titas course grade (50%), while the coursework accounts for the other half. For the other half, students must complete videos, written assignments, reflections, presentations, and eLearning assignments via the Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) platform (50%). (Proforma Kursus Titas UPSI 2018). The coursework requires students to use all the learning styles presented by Honey and Mumford (1986).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the learning styles of students during the Titas course and to determine the differences between the learning styles of male and female students.

Research Question

1. What learning styles do students employ while studying Titas?
2. What is the different learning styles between male and female students?

Hypothesis

This study determined four null hypotheses.

H0 1 Hypothesis: There is no significance difference of Theorist style across gender

H0 2 Hypothesis: There is no significance difference of Pragmatist style across gender

H0 3 Hypothesis: There is no significance difference of Activist style across gender

H0 4 Hypothesis: There is no significance difference of Reflective style across gender

Literature Review

Previous research that involved Malaysian students, has yielded mixed results. To address this issue, the researchers wanted to see learning styles profile and if there were any differences in learning style preferences in average (mean) between male and female in learning Titas course. Study by Majdi and Azlina (2017) among students at Polytechnic Sultan Sirajuddin found that both male and female students preferred to use reflective learning styles. It means that there are no differences in learning preferences between men and women. Most studies suggest that lecturers should improve their teaching strategy while taking into account the students' preferred teaching style like studies by Phavadee 2020; Ridwan et. al 2019; Yusmarwati 2014). It would result to the creation of new curriculum designs, but students must be encouraged to learn, explore, and apply new information in novel ways.

Capita Carol (2014) conducted research on Kolb's learning styles (theorist, pragmatist, activist, and reflective) among first-year university students at the University of Bucharest in Romania. The reflector and theorist components were found to be the most popular among students, while the activist component was the least popular. While gender does not seem to be a discriminating factor.

Muhammad Andi et al. (2020) investigate students' learning styles and discover a better way of teaching that meets the needs of undergraduate finance students in the Department of Management, Universitas Negeri Medan. According to the findings, 50.8 percent of students are reflectors, 29.4 percent are pragmatists, 17.5 percent are theorists, and only 2.4 percent are activists. This research suggests that the theory of learning style could be applied to other areas of academia, such as how a learning style develops in small and medium businesses.

Mohd Said et al. (2019) study learning styles among generation 'Y' Healthcare undergraduates from various Healthcare programs, International Islamic University Malaysia found that the reflector learning style was most preferred by

the Malaysian healthcare undergraduates. The preferred learning was activist, followed by theorist and the least preferred style was the pragmatist style.

According to Yadav, Karla, and Naeem (2020), the most common styles used by students pursuing a bachelor's degree in Medical Laboratory at a tertiary-level hospital were activist and reflector. There was no distinction between male and female students. The styles were found to be likely to aid in the adoption of appropriate teaching methods and assessment strategies and resulting in improved learning and laboratory efficiency.

Martin, et.al (2021) in their study among 636 students at the University of Huelva (UHU), Cadiz (UCS) AND Pablo de Olavide of Seville (UPO) showed a significant preference for the reflector style while activist, theorist and pragmatist being less preferred. Study suggested that it's critical to pay attention to how students' learning styles evolve as they progress through higher education courses to facilitate a more optimal and long-term teaching-learning process.

Study that found significance difference across gender can be seen from study by Mwangi & Muchiri (2021) among Kenya Medical Training College. Study showed there was a significant association between the gender of the participants and the learning styles. The preferred style by students was reflector style. Based on the findings of this study, students with various learning styles should try different methods to educate themselves, which is beneficial to both lecturers and students. Students are encouraged to experiment with various learning styles.

Honey and Mumford's Learning Styles Theory (1983, 1992)

Honey and Mumford (1986) developed a learning theory that was based on David Kolb's experiential learning model (1984). Learning style, according to this theory, is a learning style that a student prefers or dislikes. However, he believes that a person's learning style cannot be concretely practised. This is because students can choose any learning style that is appropriate for a wide range of learning situations. They advocate for each student to be able to practise one or more of the four learning styles that are appropriate for the learning tasks or activities. There are four major learning styles discussed: activist, reflective, theoretical, and pragmatic. According to Honey and Mumford, a student's learning style is closely related to their attitude.

a) Activists

Activists prefer 'hands-on' learning over other modes of instruction like reading and listening. These people have a preference for learning, which manifests itself in activities such as group learning and an interest in things that can be touched, his strength is that he is open-minded and optimistic. Activists enjoy taking risks and will consider the consequences later, easy dissatisfied with the rules (consolidation), would you like to put something to the test, adaptable, able to communicate effectively and easy to participate in activities even when not ready or prepared something. Activist is an active person with a high level of curiosity who is eager to complete his work. They are, however, highly motivated, diligent, and solve problems on their own initiative. Extracurricular activities are more

likely to be pursued by this group. Class discussions, brainstorming, puzzles, role play, and competitions are all favourites.

b) Reflector

Reflectors are students who are extremely conscientious. They prefer to observe and perceive things holistically, for example, by integrating them with various perceptions and past experiences. The disadvantage of this person is that he is relatively slow in coming up with ideas and organising decisions. They are typically cautious and methodical in their thinking, prefer to plan ahead of time and use useful information and experience, dislike working in a hurry, very methodical and detailed in one's approach in completing a task, slow in making decisions and thoughts, good listener, always puts his own feelings aside, prefers to be in the background or avoids debate, prefers to observe and think deeply about problems from multiple perspectives, and low priority.

Students who are reflective prefer to think before acting. For them, this is a more rational and logical attitude. These students have strong critical thinking skills as well as the ability to be creative as a result of their attitude. They can also reflect on themselves by carefully observing, researching, interpreting, and evaluating information before making a decision. They are more systematic in organising learning activities, disciplined, and have a more in-depth and organised learning thinking strategy. They also have a proclivity to relate the topic of the lesson to their own experiences and surroundings. Models, statistics, and stories are among the most popular activities.

c) Theorist

Theoretical students are those who can integrate and relate each observation made, as well as question and find the root cause of any relevant issues. They are a conscientious student who keeps their mind and work well-organized. They are not tolerant of things that are not clear and obvious in their authenticity. Theoretical students dislike subjectivity and instinctivity and prefer to be logical, rational, and objective.

Students who learn theoretically strive for perfection and use theoretical principles to draw conclusions from problems, such as observing and performing tasks in a logical order. That is why they are said to be less creative because they prefer to use their left brain to find the cause, law, and principle of something rather than their right brain. However, they are more disciplined, formal, and objective in their decision-making, as well as more rational in many ways. Popular activities include case studies, problem solving, and discussions.

d) Pragmatist

Pragmatists, on the other hand, will not generate ideas or theories until their validity has been proven. They are idea executors who are confident in developing and implementing new ideas. Pragmatists are relatively poor at solving problems in a scientific order, such as analysis and synthesis. They are the type of people who can't stand useless things. They are very realistic, grounded in reality, eager to put what they have learned into practice, focus on specific tasks and techniques, find it difficult to agree with theory, and always discard ideas that aren't applicable.

Students who learn in a pragmatic manner think more realistically and practically. This student is determined and self-disciplined. Theoretical concepts are said to irritate them, but they prefer to apply them in real-world situations. If they discover a new thing, theory, or law, they will be aware of it for the rest of their lives. When they're learning, they like to make comparisons between what they've learned and other things. Concrete learning materials, as well as activities such as coaching, interviews, and pair discussions, are ideal for this type of student (Honey & Mumford 1986).

According to Honey and Mumford, most people exhibit characteristics of all four learning styles, with one or more of them predominating. A mature student is one who can employ all learning styles as needed. Honey and Mumford's (1986) model of learning styles was chosen because it includes four learning styles that can be practised by students from various disciplines. It is ineffective to rely on a single learning style to learn different subjects because, according to Honey and Mumford, a specific learning style should be used in learning situations that require it.

Based on David Kolb's learning theory, Peter Honey and Alan Mumford developed this learning style model in 1986. According to Honey and Mumford, a learning style is a learning approach that an individual chooses or prefers to maximise learning. Each student should be aware of their own learning style and make full use of it. Honey and Mumford's 'Learning Styles Questionnaires,' a questionnaire developed by Honey and Mumford, can help an individual identify his or her learning style.

According to Honey and Mumford, choosing a learning style that fits a person's personality makes learning easier, more effective, and enjoyable. To be an effective learner, however, they must also develop the ability to use a variety of learning styles. As a result, they will be more open and adaptable to a wide range of formal and informal learning situations, whether on a regular or when necessary. The Honey and Mumford (1986) learning style model will be used in this study to assess and identify students' learning styles while learning Titas This model is used in this study because it appears to support experiential learning, which includes both formal and informal learning. This learning style model emphasises the importance of prior or subsequent experience, interaction, and interpersonal relationships in learning, as well as the importance of covering aspects of thinking, career, and life skills.

Based on Kolb's (1984) learning theory, this learning style model is thought to be appropriate for measuring learning styles among students in higher education because it emphasises lifelong learning and learning through unlimited formal learning experience. Tertiary students are frequently associated with careers and learning styles that are better suited to their needs and circumstances. This learning style model, in particular, supports the philosophy that learning should be practised in accordance with one's needs and desires, rather than solely on one's preferred style.

Methodology

This research is a survey of UPSI students who attended the Titas course. The questionnaire was completed by 311 samples. The samples were selected randomly. The study population included 500 UPSI students who attended the Titas course. According to Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) table for determining sample size, a sample of 31 individuals out of 500 individuals in the population means that the confidence interval is 5.6. The size of this confidence interval is small, and the probability of sampling error is only 5.6 percent. Therefore, the researcher believes that the total sample of 311 people is large enough to generalize about the characteristics of the population.

The instrument for this study is a questionnaire consisting of two parts: part A (2 questions) about respondents' demographic data and part B (28 questions) about learning style. Part B contains a closed-ended or multiple-choice questionnaire with five-point Likert-rated questions: strongly agree (SA) with 5, agree (A) with 4, neutral (N) with 3, disagree (D) with 2, and disagree at all (SD) with 1. This questionnaire addressed learning styles in four domains adopted from Honey and Mumford's (1996) learning style instrument, which originally contained 40 items but was reduced to 28. The 80-item instrument is better suited for career research than the 40-item instrument, which is better suited for learning and teaching.

The language used is also easy to understand and focuses on behaviors and information processing methods. In addition, this instrument can help students learn more about the different types of learning styles they have (Honey and Mumford 1984). Goldstien and Bokoros (1992) said that this questionnaire can classify the learning styles of college-level students.

In terms of reliability, Honey and Mumford's (1984) learning style instrument has been found to be very reliable for each construct. Previous research such as that of Anni, Azlina, Herliana, and Jamaliah (2001) found that the overall reliability of the item was 0.89, indicating high reliability. Aziz et al. (2011) found that the value of the coefficient of reliability for all items in this questionnaire is high and is 0.906.

The results of this study show that Honey and Mumford's learning style instruments are suitable for use in local cultural and social contexts. Honey and Mumford's learning style questionnaire was originally written in English. Therefore, the researcher undertakes the translation process with the help of two experts who are fluent in both English and Malay. The first linguist was asked to translate the instrument from English to Malay, and the second expert was asked to translate the instrument from Malay back to English. The description of each construct is explained in Table 1.

Table 1 Explanation of each Learning Style Constructs

Constructs	Explanation	Items
C (1) Teorist (t) t1, t2 t3, t4 t5 t6, t7	a) Capable of distinguishing between arguments based on assumptions. b) Logic, rationality, and objectivity are emphasised. c) Inductive and deductive. d) Be cautious and disciplined.	t5
C (2) Pragmatist (p) p1 p3 p4 p5 p6, p7	a) Dislike for things that are irrelevant. b) Dislike theorising. c) Ideas that cannot be implemented should be rejected. d) Practical and realistic. e) Putting a well-known concept into practise.	p2, p4
C (3) Activist (a) a1, a2 a3 a4 a5, a6 a7	a) Likes to take chances. b) Less at ease with the rules. c) Optimist and flexibel. d) Extremely active and disliking of ideas. e) Dislikes methodical work and detailed work.	
C (4) Reflector (r) r1 r2 r3 r4	a) Take extreme caution. b) Work methodically. d) A little sluggish in making decisions. e) A good listener who does not ignore others feelings. f) Likes to be in the background or to avoid	

- the conversation.
- r5 g) Low-profile and relatively quiet.
- r6 h) Enjoyed the ideas and thoughts.
- r7

Source: Honey dan Mumford (1992); Coffield et al (2004); and S.Penger dan M. Tekacic (2009).

This study employs an internal consistency measure to determine internal reliability, which refers to the degree of agreement between each item or the degree to which the item can measure the same variable. A pilot study was conducted on 40 people from a voluntarily selected study population to conduct. The obtained data were analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha reliability test to obtain internal consistency measures. The obtained alpha value is for Reflective is .715, Theorist .916, Pragmatist .865, and Activist .858. This indicates that this value is acceptable. Inter-item correlation also was used to get r value.

This test was used to determine which items should be kept or discarded. Items with a common value of less than 0.3 should be removed and changed. According to the test results, the theoretical construct has a r value of .429 to.813, the Pragmatic construct has a r value of .489 to.893, the Activist construct has a r value of .403 to.718 and the Reflective construct has a r value of .413 to.718. It meant that no items were going to be deleted.

Findings of this study were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The frequency, mean, and standard deviation were used in descriptive analysis to determine the gender of respondents and learning styles score. Mean comparison of students' learning styles was calculated based on their responses to the learning styles items.

Analysis of Finding

The demographic of the respondents in this study by gender are described detail in the following table 2. According to gender, there are 97 male students and 210 female students.

Table 2 Respondents' Demographic

Male	Gender	
	Male	Female
	97	210

Normality Test

The samples of this study were 311 people who were more than 30, so there was no need to test for normality test of Kolmogorov-Smirnov.

Learning Styles

Student learning styles are classified into four types, theoretical, pragmatic, activist, and reflective. To determine the learning style, a descriptive analysis involving mean and standard deviation was performed, as shown in Table 3 by gender and Table 4 by general.

Table 3 Distribution of mean and standard deviation of student learning style by gender

Gender		Theorist	Pragmatist	Activist	Reflective
M	Mean	3.7467	3.8442	3.5002	3.7231
	N	97	97	97	97
	Std. Deviation	.59637	.55915	.51783	.57581
F	Mean	3.8728	3.7364	3.4422	3.8129
	N	210	210	210	210
	Std. Deviation	.52275	.46886	.49764	.56324

Table 3 shows the distribution of mean and standard deviation for students' learning style (Theorist, Pragmatic, Activist and Reflective) by gender. It shows the mean of Theorist style of male students (Mean = 3.75, SP = .596) was lower than that of female students (Mean = 3.87, SP = .522), while the mean of pragmatic style of male (Mean = 3.84, SP = .559) recorded a higher mean than female students (Mean = 3.73, SP = .468). Activist style of male students (Mean = 3.50, SP = .517) recorded higher than female students (Mean = 3.44 SD = .497). Reflective style of male students (Mean = 3.72 SD = .575) recorded lower than female students (Mean = 3.81, SD = .563).

Table 4 Distribution of mean and standard deviation of student learning style in general

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Theorist	311	1.57	5.00	3.8342	.54874
Pragmatist	311	1.57	5.00	3.8075	.49875
Activist	311	1.86	4.71	3.4555	.50375
Reflective	311	1.00	5.00	3.7850	.56772
Valid N (listwise)	311				

Table 4 shows the distribution of mean and standard deviation for students learning styles during learning Titas course. It shows the mean of Theorist style is 3.83, SD = .548, Pragmatist style is 3.80, SD = .498, Activist style is 3.46, SD = .503 and mean for Reflective style is 3.79, SD = .568. It is recorded that Theorist style was higher mean compared with other styles. It is followed by Pragmatist style as second higher and Reflective as third higher. The lowest mean compared to other styles means is Activist style. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare learning styles (Theorist, Pragmatist, Activist and Reflective) of male and female. The result shows at the Table 5 and Table 6.

Table 5

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
T	M	97	3.7467	.59637	.06055
	F	210	3.8728	.52275	.03607
P	M	97	3.8442	.55915	.05677
	F	210	3.7364	.46886	.03235
A	M	97	3.5002	.51783	.05258
	F	210	3.4422	.49764	.03434
R	M	97	3.7231	.57581	.05846
	F	210	3.8129	.56324	.03887

Table 6 The Independent Samples t Test Result of Two Independent Groups

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variance s		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
T	Equal variances assumed	.137	.711	-1.878	305	.061	-.12610	.06715	-.25824	.00603
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.789	166.593	.075	-.12610	.07048	-.26526	.01305
P	Equal variances assumed	2.363	.125	-1.760	305	.079	-.10784	.06126	-.22840	.01271

	Equal variances not assumed			- 1.65 0	160.69 8	.101	- .10784	.06534	- .23689	.02120
A	Equal variances assumed	.04 4	.83 3	.938	305	.349	.05807	.06188	- .06370	.17984
	Equal variances not assumed			.925	180.30 3	.356	.05807	.06280	- .06585	.18198
R	Equal variances assumed	.40 0	.52 7	- 1.29 0	305	.198	- .08980	.06964	- .22683	.04722
	Equal variances not assumed			- 1.27 9	183.17 5	.202	- .08980	.07021	- .22832	.04871

There was no significance difference in the scores of Theorist style of male students ($M = 3.75$, $SD = .596$) and Theorist female students ($M = 3.87$, $SD = .522$) conditions, $t(305) = -1.878$, $p = 0.061$. This result suggest that gender does not influence Theorist style. There was no significance difference in the scores of Pragmatist style of male students ($M = 3.74$, $SD = .559$) and Pragmatist style of female students ($M = 3.84$, $SD = .469$) conditions, $t(305) = -1.760$, $p = 0.079$. This result suggest that gender does not influence on Pragmatist style. There was no significance difference in the scores of Activist style of male students ($M = 3.50$, $SD = .518$) and Activist style of female students ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .498$) conditions, $t(305) = .938$, $p = 0.349$. This result suggest that gender does not influence on Activist style. There was no significance difference in the scores of Reflective style of male students ($M = 3.72$, $SD = .576$) and Reflective style of female students ($M = 3.81$, $SD = .563$) conditions, $t(305) = -1.290$, $p = 0.198$. This result suggest that gender does not influence on Reflective style.

Discussion

It is found that generally students who learn Titas course prefer to engage in theorist style in which they learn by understanding the theory behind the actions. They mainly used the style during learning Titas Meaning that, they enjoy following models and learning facts to help them participate more in the learning process. The second preferred style was pragmatist. Pragmatist demonstrated that students understand how to apply what they've learned in the real world. They try to do experiments with theories, ideas, and techniques while learning Titas, and they also reflect about how what they've done relates to reality.

Students preferred the reflective style the third most. This shows that students can learn Titas by observing and reflecting on their surroundings. They'll try to observe from the sidelines, collect data, and draw conclusions based on what they see. The least preferred style was activist, indicating that students disliked learning by doing and were not able to put what they were learning into practice. They were the people with the least open minds and biases. They were extremely

uncommon when it came to brainstorming, discussion, and problem-solving activities.

When learning Titas, UPSI students prefer theorist style. It demonstrates that there are no parallels with previous research findings among higher education students. It means that learning styles are used differently depending on the situation, type of assessment, syllabus, study topics, and disciplines. Lecturers' instructional strategies and approaches may have a significant impact on students' learning styles.

In term of gender, male students preferred pragmatic and activist learning styles, while female students preferred theoretical and reflective learning styles. Detail test show that there was no significance different of styles across gender. This is coinciding with previous findings by Majdi and Azlina (2017), Capito Carol (2014) and Yadav, Karla, and Naeem (2020); Even though the findings show no different learning styles between men and female, but the average (mean) shown that must be debated. In fact, students must be able to apply values and ethics in societal life while learning Titas such as tolerance, understanding, cooperation, patriotism, love, sympathy, empathy, and tolerance.

Students and educators must understand that learning styles are not always fixed but can change over time and develop through experience. Students with better understanding of learning styles can adapt to different situations. Educators and lecturers can use the same application to properly adapt their teaching methods. According to this study findings, more research is needed to help educators understand complex learning processes particularly in courses that require students to apply values and being a dynamic and realistic person in dealing with current issues.

Conclusion

Learning at the Institute of Higher Education necessitates a variety of learning styles that are appropriate for the course being studied. Students should be able to use a specific learning style to meet the course requirements rather than prioritizing their preferred style alone. Practicing all learning styles is the best step because it adheres to David Kolb's (1984) ideal learning cycle process (1984). Students will go through an experiential learning experience by practicing the four styles as supposed by Honey and Mumford (1986), which include concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. Learning Titas requires a pragmatic and activist approach, with the goal of the course being to produce patriotic students who can respect diverse cultural people and situations they encounter in their daily lives. The best way to learn is to use all learning styles by the end of the cycle. This is because learning at university is not solely to obtain a high CGPA alone, but also to develop career skills. Career skills cannot be developed solely by theoretical and reflective styles without the use of other styles.

References

- Capita Carol (2014). Learning styles in higher education: A case study in history learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science* 180 Journal, 256-261.
- Coffield FJ, Moseley DV, Hall E and Ecclestone K (2004). Should we be using learning styles? What research has to say to practice. London: Learning and Skills Research Centre/University of Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Fleming, N. (2011). Teaching and learning styles: VARK Strategies. Christchurch: N.D. Fleming. p. 128.
- Gani, A. A., Ibrahim, N., & Khaerudin, .-. (2018). Multimedia use and learning styles on learning achievement in social studies. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(2), 187-193. <https://doi.org/10.29332/ijssh.v2n2.163>
- Ghaziwakili, Z., Nia, R.N., Panahi, F., Karimi, M., Gholsorkhi, H & Ahmadi, Z. (2014). The role of critical thinking and learning styles of university students in their academic performance. *Journal of Advance Med Educ Prof*, 2(3), 95-102.
- Goldstein, M.C. & Bokoros, M.A. (1992). Tilting at Windmills: Comparing the Learning Style Inventory and the Learning Style Questionnaire. *Educational and Measurement Journal*. Honey, P., & Mumford, A (1986). *Manual of Learning Styles*. Ed. 2. London: p. Honey.
- Grasha, A.F. (1996). Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles. San Bernadino: AlliancePublishers.
- Gray, J.A & Dilerota, N. (2016). The effect of students' engagement, student satisfaction, and perceived learning in online learning environments. *NCPEA International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 11(1).
- Honey & A. Mumford (1992). The Manual of Learning Styles. Maidenhead: Peter Honey Publications.
- Honey, & A. Mumford (1992). The Manual of Learning Styles. Maidenhead: Peter Honey. in the Kenya Medical Training College. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science (IJRIAS)*, 4(3), 2454-6194
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kolb, D.A. (1981). Learning styles and disciplinary differences, in: A.W. Chickering (Ed.) *The Modern American College* (San Francisco, LA: Jossey-Bass, 232-255.
- Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W., (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*.
- Majdi & Azlina (2017). Learning styles preferences between gender and majors programme among Politeknik Tuanku Syed Sirajuddin Student. *Advanced Journal of Technical and Vocational Students*, 1(4), 04 – 07.
- Majdi & Azlina (2017). Learning Styles Preferences between Gender and Majors of Program among Politeknik Tuanku Syed Sirajuddin Student. *Advanced Journal of Technical and Vocational Education*, 1(4), 04-08.
- Martin, P.A., Diaz, R.C., Alcon, C.G., Urbano, R.L, & Garcia, C.M (2021). Variability of Higher Education Students' Learning Styles Depending on Gender, Course, Degree, and Institutional Context. *Journal of Education as Sustainability Development*, 13(4), 1659.
- Mohd Said, Mohd Adli, Azlina, Siti Zuhaidah, Khazidah & Shefaly (2019). Learning styles of Malaysian generation 'Y' healthcare undergraduates, The

- Second International Nursing Congress (INSC 2018) of Faculty Nursing, Universitas Indonesia.
- Muhammad Andi, Syahrizal & Humaisar (2020). Identification students' learning style through Honey and Mumford theory in disruptive era. Proceedings of the 1st Unimed International Conference on Economics Education and Social Science (UNICEES 2018), 191-195.
- Mwangi, M.C.R. & Muchiri, W.A. (2019). Learning Style Preferences of Physiotherapy Students
- Nazri Muslim & Mmansor (2015). Evaluation of effectiveness of teaching compulsory course in public institutions of higher education Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science 56 Journal*, 227-236.
- Olagbaju, O.O. (2014). The Interplay between Gender and Learning Styles: Implications for
- Penger, M. Tekavcic (2009). Testing Dunn & Dunn's and Honey & Mumford's learning style theories: the case of the Slovenian higher education system Management, 14 (2), 1-20.
- Phavadee, S. (2020). The way of teaching toward different students' learning styles/teaching that takes into account different learning styles. *Opus at Educatio*, 7(2).
- Ridwan, L (2019). Teaching styles of the teachers and learning style of the students. *Journal of Physics, Conference Series*.
- Second Language Teaching. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science: G Linguistics & Education*, 14 (2).
- Syed Jamal Abdul Nasir (2015). Learning Styles of Malaysian's Universities Students. https://www.academia.edu/11798938/Learning_Styles_Of_Malaysian_Universities_Students.
- Suryasa, I. W., Rodríguez-Gámez, M., & Koldoris, T. (2022). Post-pandemic health and its sustainability: Educational situation. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(1), i-v. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6n1.5949>
- Sugito, S., Agung, A. A. G., Yudana, I. M., & Ariawan, I. P. W. (2022). Digital testing application in knowing the effect of servant leadership and work motivation on teacher performance. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(2), 682–698. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6n2.7583>
- Tepper, B., Tetrault, L., Braun, C., & Romero, J. (1993). Discriminant and convergent validity of the problem-solving style questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 437- 444.
- Yadav, S.K., Karla, R. & Naeem, R. (2020). Honey Mumford's learning styles of medical laboratory students: An observational study with implication for laboratory efficiency. *Journal of Archives of Medicine and Health Science*, 8(1), 107.
- Yusmarwati, Rohayu & Halizah (2014). What Students Need, and What Teacher Did: the Impact of Teacher's Teaching Approaches to the Development of Students' Generic Competences. *Social and Behavioral Science Journal*. 204, 36-44.