



## Correlation Between Lecturers' Communication Style and English Students' Motivation in Thesis Writing

(A Correlation Study at Semester VIII of the Department of English Language Education at Universitas Hasyim Asy'ari)

Putri Tiara Zahrotul Mukaromah<sup>1</sup>, Sayid Ma'rifatulloh<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Universitas Hasyim Asy'ari Tebuireng Jombang, Indonesia

[putri.tiara.z.m@gmail.com](mailto:putri.tiara.z.m@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>, [sayidmarifatulloh@unhasy.ac.id](mailto:sayidmarifatulloh@unhasy.ac.id)<sup>2</sup>

\*Korespondensi penulis: [sayidmarifatulloh@unhasy.ac.id](mailto:sayidmarifatulloh@unhasy.ac.id)

**Abstract.** This study aims to investigate students' perceptions of lecturers' communication styles and to examine the correlation between lecturers' communication style and students' motivation in thesis writing. This research employed a quantitative approach with a correlational design involving students of the Department of English Language Education at Hasyim Asy'ari University who were in the process of completing their thesis. Data were collected through a questionnaire measuring two variables, namely lecturers' communication style and students' motivation, and were analyzed using descriptive statistics and Pearson product-moment correlation with the help of SPSS. The findings revealed that students generally have positive perceptions of lecturers' communication styles during thesis supervision, as indicated by the high mean score of the communication variable. Furthermore, the results of the correlation analysis showed a very strong and significant positive relationship between lecturers' communication style and students' motivation in thesis writing, indicating that better communication from lecturers is associated with higher levels of student motivation. These findings emphasize the importance of effective, clear, and supportive communication in enhancing students' motivation and facilitating the thesis completion process. Therefore, lecturers are encouraged to adopt communicative and collaborative approaches to create a more engaging and motivating academic environment. This study contributes to the existing literature by providing empirical evidence in the context of thesis supervision, which has received limited attention in previous research.

**Keywords:** Correlation Study; Higher Education; Lecturers Communication Style; Students' Motivation; Thesis Writing.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Higher education plays a crucial role in developing human resources, not only by equipping individuals with knowledge and professional skills but also by fostering critical thinking, ethics, and innovation. These aspects are essential in addressing global challenges and enhancing a nation's competitiveness (Rasyid et al., 2024). In this context, lecturers hold a significant responsibility in shaping students' academic experiences, particularly through their roles as educators and mentors (Ariga, 2025).

One important aspect of this role is communication. Communication is a fundamental process of exchanging information, ideas, and feelings that underpins social interaction and learning activities (Yolanda et al., 2024). In educational contexts, communication is not merely the transfer of information but also a process that shapes understanding, attitudes, and behavior. Effective communication between lecturers and students can create a conducive learning environment, strengthen interpersonal relationships, and enhance students' motivation

(Sakdiah et al., 2025).

From a theoretical perspective, lecturers' communication style refers to the consistent patterns of verbal and non-verbal behavior used by lecturers in delivering messages and interacting with students (Afzal et al., 2021). Communication styles can be categorized into several types, such as communicative, authoritative, and collaborative. A communicative and collaborative style emphasizes openness, interaction, and mutual understanding, while an authoritative style tends to be more directive and one-way. Previous studies indicate that a collaborative communication style can increase student participation and create a more dynamic learning environment (Rahman, 2023). Therefore, the selection of an appropriate communication style is crucial in supporting effective learning processes.

In addition, learning motivation is defined as the internal and external drive that encourages students to engage in learning activities and achieve academic goals (Nuraeni et al., 2025). Motivation plays a key role in determining students' persistence, effort, and academic success. Students with high motivation tend to show greater engagement, consistency, and resilience in completing academic tasks (Handayani, 2024). In contrast, low motivation may lead to procrastination, decreased performance, and delayed completion of academic responsibilities.

The importance of both communication style and motivation becomes more evident in the context of thesis writing. Thesis writing is a complex academic task that requires high levels of persistence, self-discipline, and independent learning (Rohma et al., 2025). It represents a critical stage in students' academic journey, as it reflects their ability to apply theoretical knowledge to solve real-world problems (Megawati & Damayanti, 2022). In this process, the interaction between students and their academic advisors becomes more intensive and personalized compared to regular classroom learning.

Effective communication characterized by clarity, empathy, and constructive feedback can significantly influence students' motivation during thesis writing (Adara et al., 2023). Lecturers who provide clear guidance, timely feedback, and emotional support are more likely to foster students' confidence and persistence (Kinasih & Pradikto, 2025). Conversely, ineffective communication, such as unclear instructions or lack of responsiveness, may lead to confusion, frustration, and decreased motivation (Wang & Pan, 2022). This principle is also aligned with the value of supportive guidance as emphasized in the prophetic tradition: "Facilitate things and do not make them difficult, give glad tidings and do not make people run away" (Narrated by Bukhari No. 69 and Muslim No. 1734), which highlights the importance

of a supportive and encouraging approach in mentoring.

Empirically, previcommunious studies have demonstrated a significant relationship between lecturers' communication styles and students' motivation in general learning contexts (Amalia et al., 2024; Hamdan & Attika, 2024). These studies consistently show that effective and supportive communication contributes positively to students' motivation and learning outcomes. However, most existing studies focus on classroom settings rather than the specific context of thesis supervision, which involves more complex and sustained interactions (Koerniansyah & Tanjung, 2025).

Despite the importance of this issue, there is still limited research that specifically examines the relationship between lecturers' communication styles and students' motivation in thesis writing, particularly among English language education students. This indicates a clear research gap that needs to be addressed. In addition, many students still experience difficulties in completing their thesis on time, often due to low motivation and ineffective communication with their supervisors (Wibowo et al., 2024).

Based on this background, the problems of this study can be formulated as follows: (1) how do students of the Department of English Language Education perceive lecturers' communication styles in improving their motivation during thesis supervision? and (2) is there a significant correlation between lecturers' communication style and students' motivation in completing their theses?

Therefore, this study aims to (1) identify students' perceptions of lecturers' communication styles in improving their motivation during thesis supervision and (2) analyze the significance of the correlation between lecturers' communication style and students' motivation in completing their thesis, particularly among students of the Department of English Language Education at Hasyim Asy'ari University.

## **2. RESEARCH METHOD**

This study employed a quantitative research design using a correlational approach to examine the relationship between lecturers' communication styles and students' motivation in thesis writing. A correlational design is used to determine the degree of relationship between variables without manipulating them (Putri et al., 2025).

The target population of this research comprised students of the English Language Education Department at Hasyim Asy'ari University who were currently engaged in thesis writing. Given the limited number of participants, a total sampling approach was employed,

whereby all individuals within the population were selected as the research sample (Arikunto, 2013). Therefore, the total number of respondents in this study was 18 students.

According to Creswell, as cited in Hardianti & Murtafi (2022) Data were collected using a structured questionnaire designed to measure two main variables: lecturers' communication style and students' motivation in thesis writing. The questionnaire was developed based on relevant theoretical indicators, including aspects such as clarity, empathy, feedback, and interaction for communication style, as well as persistence, interest, and goal orientation for motivation. The instrument used a Likert scale to capture respondents' perceptions, which is commonly used to measure attitudes and perceptions.

Prior to data collection, the research instrument was evaluated to establish its validity and reliability. The validity assessment aimed to determine whether the questionnaire items appropriately reflected the intended variables, whereas the reliability test was conducted to examine the consistency of the instrument (Janna & Herianto, 2021).

The data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Descriptive analysis was used to describe the level of lecturers' communication styles and students' motivation. Meanwhile, inferential analysis was conducted using the Pearson Product-Moment correlation to examine the relationship between the two variables. The level of significance was set at 0.05 (Janna & Herianto, 2021).

### **3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

#### **Result**

##### ***Descriptive Statistics***

The descriptive statistics show that the total number of respondents in this study was 18 students. The variable of lecturers' communication style obtained a mean score of 41.06 with a standard deviation of 7.392, a minimum score of 28, and a maximum score of 50. Meanwhile, the students' motivation variable had a mean score of 40.78 with a standard deviation of 7.750, a minimum score of 25, and a maximum score of 50.

These results indicate that both lecturers' communication style and students' motivation are generally at a relatively high level.

**Descriptive Statistics**

|                     | N  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|---------------------|----|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| Communication Style | 18 | 28      | 50      | 41.06 | 7.392          |
| Motivation          | 18 | 25      | 50      | 40.78 | 7.750          |
| Valid N (listwise)  | 18 |         |         |       |                |

**Picture 1.** Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Research Variables.

**Instrument Testing**

**a. Validity Test**

The validity test results indicate that all questionnaire items for both variables are valid. All items in the lecturers' communication style variable and students' motivation variable have significance values below 0.05, indicating that each item is capable of measuring the intended constructs accurately (Janna & Herianto, 2021).

X: Communication Style

**Correlations**

|                     | X1                  | X2                  | X3                  | X4                  | X5                  | X6                  | X7                  | X8                  | X9                  | X10                 | Communication Style |                    |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| X1                  | Pearson Correlation | 1                   | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .889 <sup>**</sup> |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                     | .022                | .000                | .007                | .000                | .022                | .000                | .007                | .022                | .003                | .000               |
| N                   |                     | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                 |
| X2                  | Pearson Correlation | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1                   | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | .614 <sup>**</sup>  | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | .614 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .829 <sup>**</sup> |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .022                |                     | .022                | .007                | .022                | .000                | .022                | .007                | .000                | .003                | .000               |
| N                   |                     | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                 |
| X3                  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1                   | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .889 <sup>**</sup> |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                | .022                |                     | .007                | .000                | .022                | .000                | .007                | .022                | .003                | .000               |
| N                   |                     | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                 |
| X4                  | Pearson Correlation | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | .614 <sup>**</sup>  | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | 1                   | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | .614 <sup>**</sup>  | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .614 <sup>**</sup>  | .740 <sup>**</sup>  | .829 <sup>**</sup> |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .007                | .007                | .007                |                     | .007                | .007                | .007                | .000                | .007                | .003                | .000               |
| N                   |                     | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                 |
| X5                  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | 1                   | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .889 <sup>**</sup> |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                | .022                | .000                | .007                |                     | .022                | .000                | .007                | .022                | .003                | .000               |
| N                   |                     | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                 |
| X6                  | Pearson Correlation | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | .614 <sup>**</sup>  | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1                   | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | .614 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .829 <sup>**</sup> |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .022                | .000                | .022                | .007                | .022                |                     | .022                | .007                | .000                | .003                | .000               |
| N                   |                     | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                 |
| X7                  | Pearson Correlation | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1                   | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .889 <sup>**</sup> |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                | .022                | .000                | .007                | .000                | .022                |                     | .007                | .022                | .003                | .000               |
| N                   |                     | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                 |
| X8                  | Pearson Correlation | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | .614 <sup>**</sup>  | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .614 <sup>**</sup>  | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | .616 <sup>**</sup>  | 1                   | .614 <sup>**</sup>  | .740 <sup>**</sup>  | .829 <sup>**</sup> |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .007                | .007                | .007                | .000                | .007                | .007                | .007                |                     | .007                | .003                | .000               |
| N                   |                     | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                 |
| X9                  | Pearson Correlation | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | .614 <sup>**</sup>  | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .537 <sup>**</sup>  | .614 <sup>**</sup>  | 1                   | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .829 <sup>**</sup> |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .022                | .000                | .022                | .007                | .022                | .000                | .022                | .007                |                     | .003                | .000               |
| N                   |                     | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                 |
| X10                 | Pearson Correlation | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .740 <sup>**</sup>  | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | .740 <sup>**</sup>  | .666 <sup>**</sup>  | 1                   | .839 <sup>**</sup> |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .003                | .003                | .003                | .000                | .003                | .003                | .003                | .000                | .003                |                     | .000               |
| N                   |                     | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                 |
| Communication Style | Pearson Correlation | .889 <sup>**</sup>  | .829 <sup>**</sup>  | .889 <sup>**</sup>  | .829 <sup>**</sup>  | .889 <sup>**</sup>  | .829 <sup>**</sup>  | .889 <sup>**</sup>  | .829 <sup>**</sup>  | .889 <sup>**</sup>  | .829 <sup>**</sup>  | 1                  |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                | .000                | .000                | .000                | .000                | .000                | .000                | .000                | .000                | .000                |                    |
| N                   |                     | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                  | 18                 |

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).  
\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Picture 2.** Results of Validity Testing for Lecturers' Communication Style Items.

Y: Motivation

|            |                     | Correlations |         |         |        |         |        |        |         |         |         |            |
|------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|------------|
|            |                     | Y1           | Y2      | Y3      | Y4     | Y5      | Y6     | Y7     | Y8      | Y9      | Y10     | Motivation |
| Y1         | Pearson Correlation | 1            | .537*   | 1.000** | .616*  | .537*   | .736** | .737*  | .537*   | .537*   | 1.000** | .836**     |
|            | Sig. (2-tailed)     |              | .022    | .000    | .001   | .022    | .000   | .000   | .022    | .022    | .000    | .000       |
|            | N                   | 18           | 18      | 18      | 18     | 18      | 18     | 18     | 18      | 18      | 18      | 18         |
| Y2         | Pearson Correlation | .537*        | 1       | .537*   | .616*  | 1.000** | .761** | .698*  | 1.000** | 1.000** | .537*   | .889**     |
|            | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .022         |         | .022    | .001   | .000    | .000   | .003   | .000    | .000    | .022    | .000       |
|            | N                   | 18           | 18      | 18      | 18     | 18      | 18     | 18     | 18      | 18      | 18      | 18         |
| Y3         | Pearson Correlation | 1.000**      | .537*   | 1       | .616*  | .537*   | .748** | .737*  | .537*   | .537*   | 1.000** | .836**     |
|            | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .022    |         | .001   | .022    | .000   | .000   | .022    | .022    | .000    | .000       |
|            | N                   | 18           | 18      | 18      | 18     | 18      | 18     | 18     | 18      | 18      | 18      | 18         |
| Y4         | Pearson Correlation | .616*        | .614**  | .616**  | 1      | .614**  | .721** | .686*  | .614**  | .614**  | .616**  | .776**     |
|            | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .007         | .007    | .007    |        | .007    | .001   | .003   | .007    | .007    | .007    | .000       |
|            | N                   | 18           | 18      | 18      | 18     | 18      | 18     | 18     | 18      | 18      | 18      | 18         |
| Y5         | Pearson Correlation | .537*        | 1.000** | .537*   | .614*  | 1       | .761** | .698*  | 1.000** | 1.000** | .537*   | .889**     |
|            | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .022         | .000    | .022    | .001   |         | .000   | .003   | .000    | .000    | .022    | .000       |
|            | N                   | 18           | 18      | 18      | 18     | 18      | 18     | 18     | 18      | 18      | 18      | 18         |
| Y6         | Pearson Correlation | .748**       | .761**  | .748**  | .721** | .761**  | 1      | .813** | .761**  | .761**  | .748**  | .922**     |
|            | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .000    | .000    | .001   | .000    |        | .000   | .000    | .000    | .000    | .000       |
|            | N                   | 18           | 18      | 18      | 18     | 18      | 18     | 18     | 18      | 18      | 18      | 18         |
| Y7         | Pearson Correlation | .737*        | .606*   | .737*   | .606*  | .606*   | .823** | 1      | .666*   | .666*   | .737*   | .856**     |
|            | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .003    | .000    | .003   | .003    | .000   |        | .003    | .003    | .000    | .000       |
|            | N                   | 18           | 18      | 18      | 18     | 18      | 18     | 18     | 18      | 18      | 18      | 18         |
| Y8         | Pearson Correlation | .537*        | 1.000** | .537*   | .614*  | 1.000** | .761** | .698*  | 1       | 1.000** | .537*   | .889**     |
|            | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .022         | .000    | .022    | .001   | .000    | .000   | .003   |         | .000    | .022    | .000       |
|            | N                   | 18           | 18      | 18      | 18     | 18      | 18     | 18     | 18      | 18      | 18      | 18         |
| Y9         | Pearson Correlation | .537*        | 1.000** | .537*   | .614*  | 1.000** | .761** | .698*  | 1.000** | 1       | .537*   | .889**     |
|            | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .022         | .000    | .022    | .001   | .000    | .000   | .003   | .000    |         | .022    | .000       |
|            | N                   | 18           | 18      | 18      | 18     | 18      | 18     | 18     | 18      | 18      | 18      | 18         |
| Y10        | Pearson Correlation | 1.000**      | .537*   | 1.000** | .616*  | .537*   | .748** | .737*  | .537*   | .537*   | 1       | .836**     |
|            | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .022    | .000    | .001   | .022    | .000   | .000   | .022    | .022    |         | .000       |
|            | N                   | 18           | 18      | 18      | 18     | 18      | 18     | 18     | 18      | 18      | 18      | 18         |
| Motivation | Pearson Correlation | .836**       | .889**  | .836**  | .776** | .889**  | .922** | .856** | .889**  | .889**  | .836**  | 1          |
|            | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .000    | .000    | .000   | .000    | .000   | .000   | .000    | .000    | .000    |            |
|            | N                   | 18           | 18      | 18      | 18     | 18      | 18     | 18     | 18      | 18      | 18      | 18         |

Picture 3. Results of Validity Testing for Students' Motivation Items.

**b. Reliability Test**

The reliability test results show that the instrument used in this study is highly reliable. The lecturers' communication style variable obtained a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.957, while the students' motivation variable obtained a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.961. Since both values exceed the threshold of 0.70, the instruments are considered reliable and consistent for data collection (Janna & Herianto, 2021).

X= Communication Style

Y: Motivation

| Reliability Statistics |            |
|------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha       | N of Items |
| .957                   | 10         |

| Reliability Statistics |            |
|------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha       | N of Items |
| .961                   | 10         |

Picture 4 and 5. Reliability Analysis of Research Instruments Using Cronbach's Alpha.

**c. Normality Test**

The normality test in this study was performed using the Shapiro-Wilk method, considering that the number of respondents was below 50. The findings indicate that the significance value for the lecturers' communication style variable is 0.070, while the students' motivation variable shows a significance value of 0.109.

As both values exceed the threshold of 0.05, the data can be regarded as normally distributed. Accordingly, the normality assumption is fulfilled, and the data are appropriate for further analysis through parametric statistical procedures. (Hardianti & Murtafi, 2022).

|                     | Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup> |    |      | Shapiro-Wilk |    |      |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|----|------|--------------|----|------|
|                     | Statistic                       | df | Sig. | Statistic    | df | Sig. |
| Communication Style | .210                            | 18 | .034 | .905         | 18 | .070 |
| Motivation          | .207                            | 18 | .040 | .916         | 18 | .109 |

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

**Picture 6.** Results of Normality Test Based on Shapiro–Wilk Method.

### **Correlation Analysis**

The Pearson Product Moment correlation analysis was employed to investigate the association between lecturers' communication style and students' motivation in thesis writing. The results reveal a correlation coefficient of 0.983 with a significance value of 0.000.

As the significance value is below 0.05, this indicates the presence of a statistically significant relationship between the two variables. Moreover, the coefficient value of 0.983 reflects a very strong positive correlation.

This means that better lecturers' communication style is associated with higher students' motivation in thesis writing. Conversely, a lower level of communication style may lead to decreased student motivation.

|                     |                     | Communication Style | Motivation |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Communication Style | Pearson Correlation | 1                   | .983**     |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                     | .000       |
|                     | N                   | 18                  | 18         |
| Motivation          | Pearson Correlation | .983**              | 1          |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                |            |
|                     | N                   | 18                  | 18         |

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

**Picture 7.** Correlation Analysis Between Lecturers' Communication Style and Students' Motivation.

### **Discussion**

#### ***Students' Perceptions of Lecturers' Communication Style in Thesis Supervision***

The findings of this study indicate that students generally perceive lecturers' communication style in thesis supervision as positive. This is reflected in the relatively high mean score of the communication style variable ( $M = 41.06$ ), which suggests that lecturers tend to apply effective communication in guiding students during the thesis process.

This result is in line with the theoretical perspective stated in the introduction, which emphasizes that communication is not only a process of delivering information but also a

means of shaping students' understanding, attitudes, and behavior (Yolanda et al., 2024). In the context of higher education, effective communication between lecturers and students can create a supportive and conducive learning environment, thereby enhancing students' motivation (Sakdiah et al., 2025).

Furthermore, the findings support the concept of lecturers' communication styles, particularly the importance of a communicative and collaborative approach. As explained by Rahman (2023), a collaborative communication style promotes openness, interaction, and mutual understanding. In thesis supervision, this approach enables students to feel more comfortable in expressing their difficulties, asking questions, and engaging actively in the learning process.

In addition, the presence of clarity, empathy, and constructive feedback from lecturers plays a crucial role in shaping positive student perceptions. These aspects help reduce confusion and anxiety during thesis writing, which is often considered a challenging academic task. This finding also aligns with the value of supportive guidance as emphasized in the prophetic tradition, which encourages educators to facilitate and motivate rather than create difficulties.

### ***The Correlation between Lecturers' Communication Style and Students' Motivation***

The results of the correlation analysis reveal that there is a very strong and significant positive relationship between lecturers' communication style and students' motivation in thesis writing ( $r = 0.983$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). This indicates that improvements in lecturers' communication style are closely associated with increases in students' motivation.

This finding supports the theory of learning motivation, which states that motivation is influenced not only by internal factors but also by external factors such as the learning environment and the role of educators (Handayani, 2024). In this case, lecturers' communication style acts as an external factor that can either enhance or hinder students' motivation.

Moreover, the findings are consistent with previous studies conducted by Amalia et al. (2024) and Hamdan & Attika (2024), which found that effective communication has a positive and significant effect on students' motivation and learning outcomes. However, this study extends previous research by focusing specifically on the context of thesis supervision, where interaction between lecturers and students is more intensive and individualized.

The very strong correlation found in this study indicates that communication style plays a critical role in maintaining students' persistence and engagement during thesis writing. Lecturers who provide clear instructions, timely feedback, and emotional support can

significantly increase students' confidence and motivation. Conversely, ineffective communication may lead to decreased motivation, delays in thesis completion, and lower academic performance.

Overall, these findings highlight the importance of improving lecturers' communication competence as a strategic effort to enhance students' motivation and ensure the successful completion of their thesis.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study aims to examine students' perceptions of lecturers' communication styles and to analyze the correlation between lecturers' communication style and students' motivation in thesis writing. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that lecturers' communication style plays a significant role in shaping students' academic experiences, particularly during the thesis supervision process. Effective communication not only facilitates the delivery of information but also contributes to creating a supportive and engaging academic environment that encourages students to remain active and committed to their academic responsibilities.

The results reveal that students generally have positive perceptions of lecturers' communication styles in thesis supervision. This is indicated by the relatively high mean score of the communication style variable, suggesting that lecturers tend to demonstrate clear, empathetic, and interactive communication when guiding students. Such communication practices help students feel more comfortable, confident, and motivated to express their ideas and overcome challenges during the thesis writing process. Therefore, positive communication from lecturers becomes an essential factor in supporting students' academic progress.

Furthermore, this study confirms that there is a very strong and significant positive correlation between lecturers' communication style and students' motivation in thesis writing. The high correlation coefficient indicates that improvements in communication style are closely associated with increased levels of student motivation. This finding emphasizes that lecturers' communication style is not merely a complementary aspect of supervision but a crucial determinant of students' persistence, engagement, and success in completing their thesis.

In addition, the findings highlight the importance of adopting a communicative and collaborative approach in thesis supervision. Lecturers who provide clear instructions, constructive feedback, and emotional support are more likely to foster students' motivation and confidence. Conversely, ineffective communication may lead to confusion, decreased motivation, and delays in thesis completion. Therefore, enhancing lecturers' communication

competence should be considered a strategic effort to improve the quality of higher education and student outcomes.

Finally, this study contributes to the existing literature by providing empirical evidence on the relationship between lecturers' communication styles and students' motivation in the specific context of thesis writing, which has received relatively limited attention in previous studies. However, this study is limited by its small sample size and focus on a single department. Future research is recommended to involve a larger sample and explore additional variables that may influence students' motivation. Despite these limitations, this study offers valuable insights for lecturers, institutions, and future researchers in understanding the importance of effective communication in supporting students' academic success.

## DAFTAR REFERENSI

- Adara, R. A., Nur, J., & Al, P. (2023). Investigating the correlation between teachers' instructional communication and students' motivation. *Informasi*, 53(2), 229–244. <https://doi.org/10.21831/informasi.v53i2.62164>
- Afzal, D., Arif, S., Rasul, I., & Chaudhry, M. (2021). Effect of teacher's communication styles on students' engagement. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 18(8), 5593–5604.
- Amalia, R., Sari, D., & Putra, A. (2024). The effect of lecturers' communication style on students' learning motivation in higher education. *Journal of Educational Research and Development*, 8(1), 45–56.
- Ariga, B. (2025). Peran mahasiswa KKN dalam meningkatkan minat belajar pendidikan agama Islam di MDTA Yayasan Al-Muttaqin. *Akhlak: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam dan Filsafat*, 2(4), 101–111. <https://doi.org/10.61132/akhlak.v2i4.1323>
- Arikunto, S. (2013). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik*. Rineka Cipta.
- Hamdan, M., & Attika, N. (2024). Interpersonal communication and student motivation: Evidence from higher education context. *International Journal of Instruction*, 17(2), 233–248.
- Handayani, S. (2024). Students' motivation in thesis writing: Factors influencing academic writing performance. *Journal of Language and Education*, 10(1), 78–89. <https://doi.org/10.20885/jee.v8i1.23672>
- Hardianti, B. M., & Murtafi, B. B. (2022). *Approval sheet attitude and motivation of English education students toward English: A survey study*.
- Janna, N. M., & Herianto, H. (2021). *Konsep uji validitas dan reliabilitas dengan menggunakan SPSS*. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/v9j52>

- Kinasih, A. S., & Pradikto, S. (2025). Pengaruh teman sebaya dan keterampilan mengajar dosen terhadap motivasi belajar mahasiswa Pendidikan Ekonomi angkatan 2021–2022 Universitas PGRI Wiranegara. *Jurnal Bima: Pusat Publikasi Ilmu Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 3(1), 280–289. <https://doi.org/10.61132/bima.v3i1.1570>
- Koerniansyah, D. T. I., & Tanjung, E. F. (2025). Implementasi pembelajaran tahfidz interaktif dalam meningkatkan motivasi dan karakter siswa di SDIT Az-Zahra Islamic School. *Akhlak: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam dan Filsafat*, 2(4), 122–133. <https://doi.org/10.61132/akhlak.v2i4.1329>
- Megawati, F., & Damayanti, R. (2022). The process of thesis writing and its challenges among university students. *Journal of Academic Writing Studies*, 5(2), 101–115.
- Nuraeni, Y., Indahyani, D., Agustin, I., Nurhidayah, S., & Rizkyta, S. (2025). Peran lingkungan keluarga terhadap motivasi belajar siswa sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Sadewa: Publikasi Ilmu Pendidikan, Pembelajaran dan Ilmu Sosial*, 3(1), 379–387. <https://doi.org/10.61132/sadewa.v3i1.1582>
- Putri, L., Rezani, M. R., & Hermina, D. (2025). Correlational research design. *JURMIE*, 2, 306–317. <https://doi.org/10.71282/jurmie.v2i6.456>
- Rahman, A. (2023). The impact of collaborative communication style on student engagement in classroom interaction. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 15(3), 120–132.
- Rasyid, M., Hidayat, T., & Lestari, P. (2024). The role of higher education in developing human resources and national competitiveness. *Journal of Higher Education Studies*, 9(1), 12–25.
- Rohma, M. N., Ramadila, N., & Afrizal, M. (2025). Analisis penyuntingan aspek kebahasaan dalam skripsi Diyah Ayu Cahyaningrum. *Jurnal Arjuna: Publikasi Ilmu Pendidikan, Bahasa dan Matematika*, 3(4), 184–190. <https://doi.org/10.61132/arjuna.v3i4.2224>
- Sakdiah, N., Fitriani, L., & Wahyuni, S. (2025). Effective communication in education: Enhancing student motivation and engagement. *Journal of Educational Communication*, 7(1), 33–47.
- Wang, J., & Pan, L. (2022). Role of resistance to innovation, lack of intercultural communication, and student interest on the student demotivation results towards the English education system. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.922402>
- Wibowo, M. P., Jannah, R., Pradita, S., & Syahril, A. (2024). Komunikasi interpersonal sebagai kunci kesuksesan dalam proses belajar mengajar. *Jurnal Nakula: Pusat Ilmu Pendidikan, Bahasa dan Ilmu Sosial*, 3(1), 182–190. <https://doi.org/10.61132/nakula.v3i1.1494>
- Yolanda, D., Pratama, R., & Siregar, E. (2024). Communication as a fundamental aspect in human interaction and learning process. *Journal of Social and Educational Studies*, 6(2), 55–66.