July 10, 2013

Melinda A. Hollis  
Executive Editor  
*Current Issues in Education*  
Arizona State University

Dear Ms. Hollis:

This letter is intended to respond to the editor and reviewer comments cited in your e-mail message to us dated June 1, 2013. The comments related to the revised manuscript entitled “On the Effect of Learning Style on Scholastic Achievement” by R. Bhatti and W. Bart.

1. The first concern was the following: **“**Explain how this study adds to the existing body of research on the influence cognitive learning styles has on academic achievement. Since there are several studies that have investigated this relationship between learning style and achievement, how does this study differ? Is this study unique in that it studies the relationship between learning styles, as defined by Kolb, and academic achievement?”

Our response is that much of the research on Kolb’s learning styles has focused on the assessment of individual learning styles. Because of the possible effect of learning styles on student achievement, there is a definite need for research to address the relationship between Kolb’s learning styles and academic achievement. This study provides empirical evidence that there is a significant interaction between Kolb’s learning style and grade point average (GPA) among undergraduate students. Therefore, the study provides a significant contribution to the existing literature on learning styles.

1. A second concern is the following: “It would be easier to read if the means, standard errors, and 95% confidence intervals for the four learning styles (on page 8) were presented in a table.” Our response is that we have added a table. Table 1 contains those descriptive statistics.
2. Another concern was the following: “P.9 states: ‘Thus, Assimilators could not perform better even in the subject of their choice.’ There is not substantial evidence to support this statement that students are prevented from performing better in their subject of choice due to their learning style. This sentence should be reworded or removed.”

In response, we removed this sentence.

In summary, we contend that we have dutifully addressed all of the concerns of the reviewers of our first revised manuscript through a program of changes, modifications, and additions resulting in the attached second revised manuscript. We also contend that the second revised manuscript is a clearer, stronger, and better manuscript than the first revision. Reviewer comments and our responses to them have contributed substantially to the second revised manuscript. We are grateful for the fine editor and reviewer comments provided us regarding our first revised manuscript.

Please examine this letter containing our responses to editor and reviewer comments and the second revised manuscript as you and your editorial colleagues consider the second revised manuscript for publication in your fine academic journal *Current Issues in Education*. Please contact us if you and your editorial colleagues have any questions or seek any additional information.

Otherwise, we look forward to seeing our article published in your fine academic journal, *Current Issues in Education*. If possible, please send each of us a copy of the published article or a copy of the journal issue of the manuscript after it is published. Thank you in advance for your consideration of this message.

Sincerely,

Rahmatullah Bhatti, Ph.D.

Research Scholar

Department of Education

National University of Modern Language

Islamabad

William Bart, Ph.D.   
Professor

Educational Psychology  
University of Minnesota