

The Use of Animation Movie on WhatsApp Group to Improve Students' Narrative Writing Skills

Reza Intan Pandini¹

Ngasbun Egar²

Th. Cicik Sophia Budiman³

¹ Corresponding Author, English Education Department, Universitas PGRI Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia; rezaintan17@gmail.com

² English Education Department, Universitas PGRI Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

³ English Education Department, Universitas PGRI Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

Received: December 8, 2021

Accepted: January 13, 2022

Published: January 31, 2022

Abstract

This study aims to look into students' preferences for learning English through Rote Memorization and Meaningful Learning. This study criticism concerns students' learning strategies and how university students learn English. The students' learning techniques involve selecting between rote memory and meaningful learning to increase their English language proficiency. This study collects data on how important both theories are for students to integrate new experiences, events, and facts into their existing knowledge system. That is a descriptive quantitative study using a survey technique. In this study, devices such as questionnaires employee to collect data. This study's subjects were all students from several campuses. The clustered random sampling strategy use to choose the research subjects. Techniques such as collecting data, displaying data, and making conclusions are used to analyze the data. Based on the research for students use meaningful learning has obtained Question 6 (39,4 percent); Question 1 (35,6 percent); Question 5 (35,6 percent); Question 3 (31,7 percent); Question 2 (29,8 percent); Question 7 (28,8 percent); and Question 4 (28,8 percent) (26,9 percent). This suggests that the majority of students adopt meaningful learning as their English learning technique. Based on the research for students who use rote memorization obtained Question 10 (44,2 percent), Question 8 (32,7 percent), Question 11 (30,8 percent), and Question 9 (44,2 percent) were chosen by students who decided Rote Memorization (27,9 percent). That data suggests that most kids are learning English by rote memorization.

Keywords: English, Meaningful, Memorization, Students' Preference.

To cite this article: Pandidi, R.I., Egar, N. & Budiman, C.S. (2022). The use of animation movie on WhatsApp group to improve students' narrative writing skills. *SALEE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education*, 3(1), 72-85. <https://doi.org/10.35961/salee.v3i1.349>

DOI: 10.35961/salee.v3i1.349

1. Introduction

Our primary means of communication is language. That is a way for us to share our views and beliefs with anyone else. The globe is home to a variety of languages. Each country has its national language and the many regional languages well-spoken understandable by its citizens; millions speak some languages of individuals while others are spoken by just a few thousand. Because English is the world's most widely spoken language, its significance in a globalized society cannot emphasize. English is one of the world's most commonly spoken languages. People all around the globe choose to learn English as a second language because it is essential (Ilyosovna, 2020). English is taught as a second language in many nations, and children begin learning English early. English, as an international language, is one of the foreign languages studied at schools, colleges, and other institutions of higher learning. Students learn English in a variety of ways throughout their education.

In a learning style, a student's learning style is a consistent manner of responding to and utilizing inputs. "A mix of cognitive, emotional, and physiological variables that serve as generally consistent markers of how the learner sees, interacts with, and responds to the learning environment," says Wayne (2004). According to Stewart and Felicetti (1992), learning styles are "educational settings under which pupils are most likely to learn." As a result, learning styles focus more on how students want to study than what they learn. There are various meanings of the word learning style based on the learning style model. Zajacova (2013) defines learning styles as how individuals generally approach different learning activities. According to Sarasin (2006), learning styles are more than a few tendencies. Learning style is an individual's inclination or propensity to comprehend and process information in a certain way or a mix of patterns. Learning styles are complicated methods in which and situations in which learners most efficiently and effectively understand, process, store, and recall what they are attempting to learn, James and Gardner (2011) write in their definition of learning styles.

The notion of "learning styles" is the subject of a lot of educational research. The ability to characterize students' learning styles, according to several writers, can enhance the educational experience. Teachers can adjust their teaching approach to better suit the learning type of a particular student or class in this way. Frank (2009) argued that misalignment of learning and teaching styles encourages and challenges pupils to broaden their academic skills. Offering courses with a range of teaching methods may be a best practice. The standardized learning methods, a variety of scales provide. This scale, which employs a range of learning style descriptions, has been criticized for predicting personality traits. As classrooms grow and variety, learning styles may become a more crucial pedagogical notion. This study will go through various learning types of instruments and their possible applications and drawbacks. The use of learning style theory in numerous fields, particularly English Education, is also explored. Based on the preceding description, learning styles may be defined as the purposeful synthesis of multiple forms of information about informal language contexts and modifying current knowledge, behavior, skills, values, or preferences.

Researchers are interested in students' learning styles, how university students learn English, and which type of English they use. The student's learning styles include choosing a particular technique to improve their English language abilities between rote memorization and meaningful learning. This research aims to get information and data about how important

both theories are for students to integrate new experiences, occurrences, and facts into their existing knowledge system. Sharp (2004, as referenced in Razawi & Muslim, 2011) remarked that several aspects impact a language learner's success in learning a language, particularly a second language, including language learning styles. According to Dalyono (2010), a person's success or failure in learning is determined by two aspects: internal factors (which originate within the learner) such as health, intelligence and talent, interests and motivation, and learning methods or styles. Family, school, community, and environment are external influences that influence learning. It means that there are numerous advantages to knowing and understanding learning styles. Academic success means maximizing students' learning potential, achieving victory at all five levels of education, understanding how to learn best and getting better grades on exams and tests, overcoming limitations in class, reducing student frustration and stress, and developing efficient and effective learning strategies.

According to Ausubel (Dahar, 1988: 134), there are two sorts of learning: (1) rote memorization and (2) meaningful learning. Meaningful learning is a type of learning in which new information links to the structure of understanding that the learner already has. Students who are learning to memorize are attempting to accept and master the material presented by the teacher or reading without understanding. While rote memorization is a type of learning in which students who try to get and learn the content offered by the teacher or read without knowledge are practicing rote memorization. Ausubel pays close attention to pupils in school, emphasizing the importance of meaning in language development (meaningful verbal learning). When seen together, significance is defined as a combination of oral information, concept, laws, and principles. As a result, learning solely by rote achievement is not regarded as necessary. According to Ausubel, students do not have to find everything on their own for their learning process to generate anything valuable. Both theories emphasize how important it is for students to integrate new experiences, occurrences, and facts into their existing knowledge system. These theories also emphasize the importance of assimilating new experiences into concepts or understanding students already have.

The researchers use the theory from Ausubel as our research foundation. Using this theory aims to prove the theory's truth with some research that we will do. With this theory, we will know what style the students in university will do as their learning style and which type they prefer to use. Sari (2017) also performed research on meaningful learning. According to the findings, applying significant learning theory to mathematics subjects could boost students' math achievement and communication by 75%. That demonstrates how meaningful learning may help students improve their math and communication skills. That is also the reason the researchers use the theory from Ausubel. We want to know the impact of Rote Memorization and Meaningful learning on English students' achievements.

According to Groove and Stacey (2012) in *A continuum of learning: from rote memorization to meaningful learning in organic chemistry*. In the research literature, Ausubel and Novak's Assimilation Theory define two extremes in chemical education: meaningful learning and memorization. However, such distinct learning categories are unlikely to exist. To be more specific, the ends of the learning spectrum are memorization and meaningful learning. This paper presents a qualitative study of students' experiences in the spiral organic chemistry curriculum, focusing on the different learning continuum locations between meaningful learning and memory. The results of this study highlight the necessity of using a range of theoretical frameworks while doing research. Perry's scheme of intellectual and

ethical growth served as an analytical tool in our earlier paper outlining the findings of this study (Grove and Bretz, 2010), allowing us to define students' problems in studying organic chemistry. The same data evaluate using two distinct theoretical frameworks, Ausubel's Theory of Assimilation and Novak's Theory of Assimilation, to create a series of orthogonal but complementary conclusions that link the continuum between meaningful learning and memory.

Based on Ahemed (2017), their study looks into undergraduate and graduate students' preferences for various learning techniques and the influence of the surface learning approach (memorization learning) on their academic performance. This study demonstrates that deep learning is a good approach and that academic success is firmly reliant on it. Both high achievers and poor achievers prefer deep learning techniques; thus, teachers should encourage deep learning strategies in their lectures to increase students' academic performance at all levels. Furthermore, the in-depth method is not just for male students; it is also a frequent tactic for female students, refuting the stereotype that women are rote learners. Despite all of the scientific data supporting the benefits of deep learning techniques, children may require a surface learning strategy in some situations. Surface learning does not need material memorization, but it can aid deep subject comprehension. This research demonstrates how students at the tertiary level like to learn. According to the last part, teachers should encourage deep learning in their pedagogy to fulfill the requirements of students and society from elementary to tertiary levels. Teachers should recognize student learning types and instill deep learning methods through appropriate training sessions. Students should be encouraged to use their cognitive powers more to enhance deep learning abilities. Future studies in other areas should be conducted to see if the learning techniques differ.

Sari (2017) conducted meaningful learning research after reviewing numerous prior studies. Applying significant learning theory to mathematical topics, according to the research, may increase students' math achievement and communication by 75%. Stacey and Groove's (2012) study focused on a qualitative examination of students' experiences in the spiral organic chemistry curriculum, emphasizing the different locations on the learning continuum between meaningful learning and memory. According to Ahemed (2017), an investigation explored undergraduate and graduate students' preferences for various learning strategies and the impact of the surface learning strategy (memorization learning) on their academic achievement.

The researcher's research will be different from the three articles above. This research will focus on all students in all study programs to leverage student preferences in applying the idea of rote memorization and meaningful learning for students' performance and communication in English learning. This research objection concerns students' learning methods and how university students learn English. The students' learning strategies include deciding between rote memorization and meaningful learning to improve their English language ability. This study aims to gather data on how crucial both theories are for students to integrate new experiences, occurrences, and facts into their existing knowledge system.

2. Method

This research focused on why students choose specific English learning techniques when studying English. The researcher utilized a questionnaire to gather information. The

researcher uses quantitative approaches to examine the data supporting this investigation. Research techniques, respondents, data collecting methods, and data analysis methods are all covered in this chapter.

2.1. Research Techniques

The research method refers to how the technique is implemented and how the research conducts. The researchers use quantitative research, and the results will be presented quantitatively. Quantitative research, according to Creswell (2009), uses statistical data and objective metrics to analyze and characterize a phenomenon. Quantitative research, according to Niglas (2000), is concerned with quantifying issues by generating numerical data that may then translate into usable statistics. Quantitative research is a type of study that uses quantifiable data to create facts and find patterns. Quantitative research aids the researcher in presenting the study findings as numerical data in a percentage table that may use to inform the research conclusions.

2.2. Respondents

Students in university took part in this research. According to Arikunto (2006: 112), if the total number of participants is less than 100, it is preferable to sample all of them, and the study is referred to as a population study. Alternatively, if the number of subjects is more significant than 100, the researchers can take a sample of 10-25 percent or more.

In this study, researchers gathered data from roughly 10% of the population. The respondents are all students in university, either English students or non-English students studying English for general purposes. The researchers utilized convenience sampling to choose respondents for this study.

Convenience sampling, sometimes known as sampling by chance, is non-probability sampling. This approach identifies people of the target demographic who are easily accessible and available at a specific moment (Etikan, Musa, Alkassim, 2016:2). Before delivering questionnaires, the researcher needs to enquire about the respondents' availability at a given time or their desire to participate in this study.

2.3. Data Collecting Methods

Instruments are used to collect data in research and are an essential element of any study. According to Sugiyono (2011), the research instrument measures natural and social phenomena. Data collecting techniques must use by measuring equipment to gather data. The data collection strategy used in this research is a questionnaire.

In this study, the assessment instrument is a platform for students to acquire research questions in visual media comprising questions in the Google Form application. Multiple choice questions submit into the Google Form as part of this evaluation tool. "A questionnaire is a research tool that comprises a series of questions or statements to gather data or information that the respondent must answer freely according to his viewpoint," writes Zainal Arifin (2011).

The type of questionnaire used in this study is a closed questionnaire, also known as a structured questionnaire. It is a questionnaire with several options for replies. The questionnaire instrument in this study employs an attitude measure based on a Likert scale of 1 to 5, with alternative response options including Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral

(3), Disagree (2), and Strongly Disagree (1). According to Sugiono (2012:134), the Likert scale assesses a person's or a group's attitudes, views, and perceptions of social phenomena.

2.4. Data Analysis Methods

Closed questions are ideal for conducting surveys and distributing questionnaires on subjects to research student preferences. Researchers use surveys and questionnaires to obtain data about phenomena or occurrences swiftly. Researchers utilized closed questions in this investigation. According to Fraley (2001), closed-ended questions are surveys with predetermined responses. Closed surveys often include only two options (for example, 'yes or no,' 'true or false'). Multiple options, such as ordinal data (e.g., 'strongly agree /agree /neutral /disagree /strongly disagree.') are sometimes available. In this study, researchers use Multiple options, including (5) Strongly Agree, (4) Agree, (3) Neutral, (2) Disagree, (1) and Strongly Disagree.

The author examined the data in three stages. There were item scores, frequency distribution, and central tendency. The researchers used the following procedures to explore the data:

- a. The writer gathered the essential data (item scores/responses).
- b. The writer organized the acquired scores into a frequency of score distribution table.
- c. The author computed the mean, median, and mode.
- d. The author determined the deviation score.
- e. The writer interpreted the findings of the analysis.
- f. The author provided a conclusion.

Estimating the proportion of students who prefer English learning styles, the answers to the student questionnaire are computed using Microsoft Excel and SPSS to format the data. The researcher descriptively provides the facts.

3. Finding and Discussion

3.1. Finding

The research findings on student preferences in learning English were obtained through the use of a questionnaire as a data collecting method. The information displayed includes the response, central tendency, and standard deviation.

3.1.1. The Students' Preference on Meaningful Learning Strategies

The table frequency distributor, the chart frequency distribution, the measurement of central tendency (mean, median, mode), and the measurement deviation standard all show the data presentation of the item score of the students' preferences. The sample was 104 students for the questionnaire.

For analyzing the Finding and Discussion of the questionnaire, the researchers displayed the data as follow:

Table 1. The finding of the questionnaire “Meaningful Learning”

		X.1	X.2	X.3	X.4	X.5	X.6	X.7
N	Valid	104	104	104	104	104	104	104
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.13	3.27	3.02	3.18	2.97	3.59	3.42
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	4	3	5	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Sum		325	340	314	331	309	373	356

As can be seen from the table 1, the response towards students' preference in learning English using theory meaningful learning at university students as follow:

Table 2. Presentation, students' preference, Question 1, meaningful learning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	9	8.7	8.7	8.7
	Disagree	23	22.1	22.1	30.8
	Neutral	37	35.6	35.6	66.3
	Agree	16	15.4	15.4	81.7
	Strongly Agree	19	18.3	18.3	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Question number one show a question related to Meaningful Learning. There were 9 students (8,7 %) voted strongly disagree, 23 students (22,1 %) voted disagree, 37 students (35,6 %) voted neutral, 16 students (15,4 %) voted agree, and 19 students (18,3 %) voted strongly agree. The total number of disagreement is 32 students (30.8 %), agreement is 35 students (33,7 %).

Table 3. Presentation, students' preference, Question 2, meaningful learning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	9	8.7	8.7	8.7
	Disagree	20	19.2	19.2	27.9
	Neutral	31	29.8	29.8	57.7
	Agree	22	21.2	21.2	78.8
	Strongly Agree	22	21.2	21.2	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Question two shows a question related to Meaningful Learning. There were 9 students (8,7 %) voted strongly disagree, 20 students (19,2 %) voted disagree, 31 students (29,8 %) voted neutral, 22 students (21,2 %) voted agree, and 22 students (21,2 %) voted strongly agree. The total number of disagreement is 29 students (27,9 %), agreement is 44 students (42,4 %).

Table 4. Presentation, students' preference, Question 3, meaningful learning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	8	7.7	7.7	7.7
	Disagree	27	26.0	26.0	33.7
	Neutral	33	31.7	31.7	65.4
	Agree	27	26.0	26.0	91.3
	Strongly Agree	9	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Question number three shows a question related to Meaningful Learning. There were 8 students (7,7 %) voted strongly disagree, 27 students (26 %) voted disagree, 33 students (31,7 %) voted neutral, 27 students (26 %) voted agree, and 9 students (8,7 %) voted strongly agree. The total number of disagreement is 35 students (33,7 %), agreement is 36 students (34,7 %).

Table 5. Presentation, students' preference, Question 4, meaningful learning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	13	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Disagree	19	18.3	18.3	30.8
	Neutral	26	25.0	25.0	55.8
	Agree	28	26.9	26.9	82.7
	Strongly Agree	18	17.3	17.3	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Question number four, shows a question related to Meaningful Learning. There were 13 students (12,5 %) voted strongly disagree, 19 students (18,3 %) voted disagree, 26 students (25 %) voted neutral, 28 students (26,9 %) voted agree, and 18 students (17,3 %) voted strongly agree. The total number of disagreement is 32 students (30.8 %), agreement is 35 students (33,7 %).

Table 6. Presentation, students' preference, Question 5, meaningful learning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	7	6.7	6.7	6.7
	Disagree	31	29.8	29.8	36.5
	Neutral	37	35.6	35.6	72.1
	Agree	16	15.4	15.4	87.5
	Strongly Agree	13	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Question number five shows a question related to Meaningful Learning. There were 7 students (6,7 %) voted strongly disagree, 31 students (29,8 %) voted disagree, 37 students

(35,6 %) voted neutral, 16 students (15,4 %) voted agree, and 13 students (12,5 %) voted strongly agree. The total number of disagreement is 38 students (36.5 %), agreement is 29 students (27.9 %).

Table 7. Presentation, students' preference, Question 6, meaningful learning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	14	13.5	13.5	13.5
	Disagree	11	10.6	10.6	24.0
	Neutral	20	19.2	19.2	43.3
	Agree	18	17.3	17.3	60.6
	Strongly Agree	41	39.4	39.4	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Question number six shows a question related to Meaningful Learning. There were 14 students (13,5 %) voted strongly disagree, 11 students (10,6 %) voted disagree, 20 students (19,2 %) voted neutral, 18 students (17,3 %) voted agree, and 41 students (39,4 %) voted strongly agree. The total number of disagreement is 25 students (24.1 %), agreement is 59 students (56,7 %).

Table 8. Presentation, students' preference, Question 7, meaningful learning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	13	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Disagree	14	13.5	13.5	26.0
	Neutral	20	19.2	19.2	45.2
	Agree	30	28.8	28.8	74.0
	Strongly Agree	27	26.0	26.0	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Question number seven shows a question related to Meaningful Learning. There were 13 students (12,5 %) voted strongly disagree, 14 students (13,5 %) voted disagree, 20 students (19,2 %) voted neutral, 30 students (28,8 %) voted agree, and 27 students (26 %) voted strongly agree. The total number of disagreement is 37 students (26 %), agreement is 57 students (54,8 %).

3.1.2. The Students' Preference on Rote Memorization Strategies

The table frequency distributor, the chart frequency distribution, the measurement of central tendency (mean, median, mode), and the measurement deviation standard all show the data presentation of the item score of the students' preferences. The sample was 104 students for the questionnaire.

For analyzing the Finding and Discussion of the questionnaire, the researchers displayed the data as follow:

Table 9. The finding of the questionnaire “Rote Memorization”

		TOTAL X	Y.1	Y.2	Y.3	Y.4	TOTAL Y
N	Valid	104	104	104	104	104	104
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		22.58	3.24	2.95	3.74	3.41	13.35
Median		23.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	14.00
Mode		25	4	3	5	3	16
Minimum		7	1	1	1	1	6
Maximum		35	5	5	5	5	20
Sum		2348	337	307	389	355	1388

As can be seen from the table 9, the response towards students' preference in learning English using theory rote memorization at university students as follow:

Table 10. Presentation, students' preference, Question 1, rote memorization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	17	16.3	16.3	16.3
	Disagree	19	18.3	18.3	34.6
	Neutral	12	11.5	11.5	46.2
	Agree	34	32.7	32.7	78.8
	Strongly Agree	22	21.2	21.2	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Question number one shows a question related to Rote Memorization. There were 17 students (16,3 %) voted strongly disagree, 19 students (18,3 %) voted disagree, 12 students (11,5 %) voted neutral, 34 students (32,7 %) voted agree, and 22 students (21,2 %) voted strongly agree. The total number of disagreement is 36 students (34,6 %), agreement is 56 students (53,9%).

Table 11. Presentation, students' preference, Question 2, rote memorization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	15	14.4	14.4	14.4
	Disagree	23	22.1	22.1	36.5
	Neutral	29	27.9	27.9	64.4
	Agree	26	25.0	25.0	89.4
	Strongly Agree	11	10.6	10.6	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Question number two shows a question related to Rote Memorization. There were 15 students (14,4 %) voted strongly disagree, 23 students (22,1 %) voted disagree, 29 students (27,9 %) voted neutral, 26 students (25 %) voted agree, and 11 students (10,6 %) voted strongly agree. The total number of disagreement is 38 students (36,5 %), agreement is 35 students (35,6 %).

Table 12. Presentation, students' preference, Question 3, rote memorization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	12	11.5	11.5	11.5
	Disagree	11	10.6	10.6	22.1
	Neutral	15	14.4	14.4	36.5
	Agree	20	19.2	19.2	55.8
	Strongly Agree	46	44.2	44.2	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Question number three shows a question related to Rote Memorization. There were 12 students (11,5 %) voted strongly disagree, 11 students (10,6 %) voted disagree, 15 students (14,4 %) voted neutral, 20 students (19,2 %) voted agree, and 46 students (44,2 %) voted strongly agree. The total number of disagreement is 23 students (22,1 %), agreement is 66 students (63,4 %).

Table 13. Presentation, students' preference, Question 4, rote memorization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	5	4.8	4.8	4.8
	Disagree	20	19.2	19.2	24.0
	Neutral	32	30.8	30.8	54.8
	Agree	21	20.2	20.2	75.0
	Strongly Agree	26	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Question number four shows a question related to Rote Memorization. There were 5 students (4,8 %) voted strongly disagree, 20 students (19,2 %) voted disagree, 30 students (30,8 %) voted neutral, 21 students (20,2 %) voted agree, and 26 students (25 %) voted strongly agree. The total number of disagreement is 25 students (24 %), agreement is 47 students (45,2 %).

3.2. Discussion

Based on the data, the researcher explained that utilizing a questionnaire, students' preferences in studying English were for all students at several universities.

Question 1, stated that "I will read my book if my teacher asks me to." Based on the data above, it could see that 35,6% or 37 of 104 students are neutral that they will read the book if their teacher asks them.

Question 2, stated that "I prefer to understand the material than memorize it." Based on the data above, it could be seen that 29,8% or 31 of 104 students neutral that they prefer to understand than memorize the material.

Question 3, stated that "I prepare for the final test by studying and understanding the material every day." Based on the data above, it could see that 31,7% or 33 of 104 students are neutral. They are prepared for the final test by studying and understanding the material every day.

Question 4, stated that "Observation and research assignments are more interesting to me." Based on the data above, it could see that 26,0% or 28 of 104 students agree with that statement. The students have liked observation and research assignments because it was more interesting.

Question 5, stated that "Memorizing is a difficult thing to do." Based on the data above, it can see that 35,6% or 37 of 104 students are neutral with the statement. Some students feel that sometimes it is difficult for them to learn to use memorizing.

Question 6, stated that "In my opinion, understanding is more important than a score." Based on the data above, it can see that 39,4% or 41 of 104 students strongly agree with this statement. Students things that are understanding the material is more important than the score.

Question 7, stated that "I prefer to summarize by noting the important points of the material than just underlining it." Based on the data above, it can see that 28,8% or 30 of 104 students agree with the statement. Most of the students prefer summarizing the critical point of the material than just underlining it from the book or other source.

Question 8, stated that "I usually do "SKS" or *Sistem Kebut Semalam* before my test." Based on the data above, it can see that 32,7% or 34 of 104 students agree with the statement. Most of the students are usually do SKS before the test.

Question 9, stated that "I often memorize material by making it a song" Based on the data above, it can see that 27,9% or 29 of 104 students are neutral with the statement. Some students here often use the method of memorizing the material by making a song.

Question 10, stated that "Students will succeed in understanding the material if the teacher uses the right way of teaching." Based on the data above, it can be seen 44,2% or 46 of 104 students strongly agree with the statement when the teacher uses the right way when they teach, so the students will succeed in understanding the material.

Question 11, stated that "It's better to take the important point of a book than to understand all of its contents." Based on the data above, it can see that 30,8% or 32 of 104 students are neutral with the statement. Some students choose to take some critical points instead of reading all the material.

At the end of this research, the result obtained, Question 6 (39,4 percent); Question 1 (35,6 percent); Question 5 (35,6 percent); Question 3 (31,7 percent); Question 2 (29,8 percent); Question 7 (28,8 percent); and Question 4 (28,8 percent) (26,9 percent). So, based on the statistics, it can be determined that Question 6, which said, "In my opinion, understanding is more important than a score," was the most often selected by students since they all agreed with the statement. In fact, for most pupils, comprehension is essential than grades. That suggests that most students adopt meaningful learning as their English learning technique.

Then, Question 10 (44,2 percent), Question 8 (32,7 percent), Question 11 (30,8 percent), and Question 9 (44,2 percent) were chosen by students who decided Rote Memorization (27,9 percent) Based on the data shown above. It is possible to deduce that Question 10, which said "Students will succeed in understanding the material when the teacher uses the right way of teaching," received the most significant score from students. When teachers educate their pupils correctly, their students learn the content better. That suggests that the majority of kids are learning English by rote memorization.

4. Conclusion

This study aims to learn about students' preferences for studying English. This study aims to find out what English learning techniques students prefer. Several inferences may draw from the study's findings. As a consequence, students' preferences for vocabulary memorization procedures were revealed depending on the most significant number of possibilities to the fewest number of options among them in the following order:

1. For the students who choose Meaningful Learning:

Question 6 (39,4%); Question 1 (35,6%); Question 5 (35,6%); Question 3 (31,7%); Question 2 (29,8%); Question 7 (28,8%); and Question 4 (26,9%).

So based on the data, it can conclude that Question 6 stated that "In my opinion, understanding is more important than a score." Students chose this mainly because they all agree with the statement. Actually, for most students, understanding is more important than the score. That means that most students use meaningful learning to learn English.

2. For students who choose Rote Memorization:

Question 10 (44,2%); Question 8 (32,7%); Question 11 (30,8%) ;and Question 9 (27,9%)

Based on the data above, it can conclude that Question 10 stated, "Students will succeed in understanding the material if the teacher uses the right way of teaching." They have the highest score chosen by students. When the teacher is teaching correctly to their students, their students will understand the material more. That means that most students use rote memorization learning as their strategy in learning English.

References

- Agra, G., Formiga, N. S., Oliveira, P. S. D., Costa, M. M. L., Fernandes, M. D. G. M., & Nóbrega, M. M. L. D. (2019). Analysis of the concept of Meaningful Learning in the light of Ausubel's Theory. *Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem*, 72, 248-255.
- Ahmed, A., & Ahmad, N. (2017). Comparative Analysis of Rote Learning on High and Low Achievers in Graduate and Undergraduate Programs. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 4(1), 111. <https://doi.org/10.22555/joeed.v4i1.982>
- Diyanah, N. O. (2015, June 13). Teori Belajar Ausubel. *dunialimu Nailah*. <https://dunailmunailah.wordpress.com/2015/06/13/teori-belajar-ausubel/>
- Grove, N. P., & Lowery Bretz, S. (2012). A continuum of learning: from rote memorization to meaningful learning in organic chemistry. *Chem. Educ. Res. Pract.*, 13(3), 201–208. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c1rp90069b>
- Ilyosovna, N. (2020). The Importance of the English language. *International Journal On Orange Technologies (IJOT)*, 02(01). <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/333378-the-importance-of-english-language-2c7b6d03.pdf>

- Ivie, S. D. (1998). Ausubel's Learning Theory: An Approach to Teaching Higher Order Thinking Skills. *The High School Journal*, 82(1), 35–42. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40364708>
- Learning Styles. (n.d.). [Http://Knowledgejump.Com/](http://Knowledgejump.Com/). Retrieved September 30, 2021, from <http://www.nwlink.com/%7Edonclark/hrd/styles.html>
- Parulekar, M., Mekoth, N., Ramesh, C., & Parulekar, A. (2016). http://dspace.chitkara.edu.in/jspui/bitstream/1/766/1/01_JPTRM_Meena%20Parulekar.pdf. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Technology, Research, and Management*, 4(2), 103–127. <https://doi.org/10.15415/jptrm.2016.42007>
- Pujiastuti, E., G.G., & Haryana, G. (2014). The Influence of Learning Styles and Learning Motivation on Result Student Learning in Subjects of Financial Accounting Class Xi Accounting in SMK Muhammadiyah 2 Pekanbaru. *Media Neliti*. Published. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/201489-pengaruh-gaya-belajar-dan-motivasi-belaj.pdf><https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/201489-pengaruh-gaya-belajar-dan-motivasi-belaj.pdf>
- Ratna, E. (2019). Exploring Students' Preference of English Learning Styles (A Survey an Non-English Language Education Department Students of FTK UIN Ar-Raniry). Faculty of Education And Teacher Training Ar-Raniry State Islamic University. Published. <https://repository.ar-raniry.ac.id/id/eprint/6904/2/skripsi%20Gabung.pdf>
- Romanelli, F. (2009). Learning Styles: A Review of Theory, Application, and Best Practices. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*. Published. <https://doi.org/10.5688/aj730109>
- S. (2017, March 23). Rote Learning vs. Meaningful Learning. Oxford Learning. <https://www.oxfordlearning.com/difference-rote-learning-meaningful-learning/>
- Sari, Fitri Ratna. —Program Studi Pendidikan Matematika Fakultas Keguruan Dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Muhammadiyah Purworejo 2017,|| 2017, 200.
- U. (2021, September 30). Teori Belajar Ausubel. Blogspot. http://physickasyik.blogspot.com/2012/11/teori-belajar-ausubel_28.html
- Why educational research matters to you: Rote vs meaningful learning. (2018, December 7). Chem13 News Magazine. <https://uwaterloo.ca/chem13-news-magazine/november-2014/recommended/why-educational-research-matters-you-rote-vs-meaningful>