Original Research

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Accommodations of Learners' Different Learning Styles in ELT Context: Two Colleges of Teachers' Education in Oromia, Ethiopia.

Aliye Geleta*[1], Zeleke Teshome[2], Mekuria Zewdie[3]

[1]Research Scholar, Institute of Languages Study and Journalism, Wollega University, Nekemte, Ethiopia
[2]Institute of Languages Study and Journalism, Ethiopian Civil Cervices University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
[3]Institute of Languages Study and Journalism, Wollega University Nekemte, Ethiopia

Abstract	Article Information
Educators of English as a foreign language (EFL) at Dembi Dollo and Mettu Colleges of Teachers' Education in Oromia, Ethiopia, were the subjects of this study, which aimed to examine how well they understood and accommodated their students' diverse learning styles. The study's primary goal was to document the current state of affairs regarding the ways in which EFL instructors accommodate students' learning styles, hence a descriptive survey approach was chosen to accomplish this aim. Using a rigorous sample technique, a total of 60 participants were selected, including EFL teachers and third-year EFL students from the English language department. Also, in order to see how the teachers really taught English, classroom inspections were carried out. The data collected from the two sources were triangulated using this technique. Lastly, the study's results showed that EFL teachers at CTEs did a poor job of adjusting their lessons to accommodate their students' various learning styles. To rephrase, when instructing their students in English, EFL instructors at the aforementioned CTE institutions are failing to take into account their students' individual learning styles. Teachers may have failed to accommodate their students because they did not take the time to understand how students learn best.	 *Corresponding Author: Aliye Geleta E-mail: aliye.geleta@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

Research on methods for teaching languages other than one's native tongue has evolved alongside the evolution of the educational system. At the same time, ideas of how to effectively accomplish the desired outcomes of educational endeavors began to be considered (Oxford, 1990). Various theoretical models of language achievement and the need for learner autonomy in language acquisition have led to the (re)emergence of language teaching-learning styles and strategies (Oxford, 1990; Dorji, 2017; Jie & Xiaoqing, 2006; Sreenidhi & Helena, 2017).

Slowly but surely, the long-ignored facets of language instruction began to shift and eventually became front and centre. According to Sreenidhi and Helena (2017) and Brown (2007), this was mostly accomplished

with the use of CLT, which is grounded in the constructivist theory of language learning. The proponents of this approach argue that education should not be something that students are forced to do but rather something that they actively pursue with the guidance of their instructors. The premise is that problems associated with learners need to be reevaluated in order for teaching and learning processes to be effective.

Teachers are rightfully seen as providing pupils with the inputs they need, according to constructivism. To achieve this goal, educators must be aware of the wide range of student learning styles so that they may adapt their lesson plans and assignment designs to meet the needs of all students. Therefore, constructivist theory is a legitimate starting point for research into instructional techniques that takes into account both the significant contributions of instructors and the individual and collective efforts of students to build knowledge.

Looking at constructivism through the prism of the Differentiated Instruction (DI) model of classroom practice could further make it applicable to the current study (Tomlinson & Imbeau, 2011). As a more recent and pertinent theory to direct the many assumptions in this study, the constructivist differentiated education paradigm—which has its origins in the Theory of Multiple Intelligences (MI)—was utilized. This is due to the fact that differentiated instruction, which is a component of MI Theory, allows educators to cater to students with varying preferences in how they absorb information. It is the premise of the theory that a subject instructor should use a variety of pedagogical

strategies to ensure that all student groups are adequately catered to and profit from the course material. Since the theory's primary focus is on acknowledging the various learning styles and intelligences of students, its appropriate implementation by classroom teachers is crucial to the theory's actualization.

According to Tomlinson and Imbeau (2011) and Zebari, Allo, and Mohammedzadeh (2018), the main idea behind differentiated instruction is that students' unique learning styles can be accommodated in order to accomplish the overall academic goals. These academics argue that educational goals, both broad and detailed, are designed to benefit all students, not just those whose learning styles coincide with the instructor's. Though this theory acknowledges that perfect matching is unrealistic, it posits that teachers can still effectively address diverse student needs through lesson planning and pedagogical variation based on an understanding of students' individual learning styles. This is more suited to language instruction, particularly in CLT methods, but it can be used for any subject.

According to experts in the field, including Reid (1987), Peacock (2001), Razak, Ahmad, and Shah (2007), and others, language instruction goals can be met and learning can be improved when instructors take into account students' individual learning styles. The best language instructors, according to Gafoor and Babu (2012) and Grasha (1996), take their students' individual learning styles into account while designing lessons. Those academics argue that effective educators never impose their own chosen

method of instruction on their students but instead actively listen to and respond to their students' learning motivations.

It is also clear that, as of late, attempts to formally start making learners the center of pedagogic activities have begun in Ethiopia. Many felt that the 1994 Education and Training Policy (ETP) would usher in a new era of efficient classroom management in the nation's educational system (Getachew & Derib, 2006). Significant reforms to the country's educational systems included new approaches to teaching and learning that take into account students' unique backgrounds, preferences, and abilities. As a result, the policy's efforts to put students at the centre of language pedagogy and urge teachers to take into account their students' diverse learning styles in the classroom appeared to have begun around that time.

The current study focused on visual, auditory, kinesthetic/tactile, individual, and group perceptual learning styles, although there are other ways to categorize learners' preferences. The goal was to help classroom teachers accommodate students with these types of preferences. So, the essence of these styles is outlined below.

The chosen taxonomy is also useful for determining the pedagogical approaches used by the educators. Therefore, this model was chosen for the current study since it allowed for a harmonious blend of the two groups' preferred methods of training. This allows instructors to readily cater to students with a variety of learning styles, including those who are more visual, aural, kinesthetic, group, or individual (Peacock, 2001). The auditory teaching style is characterized by teachers who prefer to deliver information orally through well-structured lectures; the group teaching style is characterized by teachers who frequently assign group projects both within and outside of the classroom and who actively promote student collaboration and independent study; and so on.

Study Context and Initiations

All eleven of Ethiopia's regional governments have the opportunity to shape the education systems in their respective areas according to local conditions; however, these plans will ultimately contribute to the improvement of Ethiopia's education system as a whole. Many experts in the field of education and public policy have noted that this is likely the reason why the 1991 government change in Ethiopia was seen as a watershed moment in the country's educational history (the researchers' experience). Teachers should be prepared with the professional knowledge, abilities, and interests that are appropriate to the teaching profession and should adhere to the various learning styles of students, according to the 1994 ETP (Temesgen, 2017).

In this hypothetical situation, the Oromia Regional State Government has launched a number of initiatives meant to raise the standard of education in the area. Primary school teachers with a diploma or above need to have enough and effective training in order for the campaigns to be implemented. This is why the few TTIs that were already in existence were upgraded to the level of college of teacher education (CTE), where competent diploma instructors are required to undergo training and graduation. There isn't a

streamlined process for prospective teachers to enroll in college and select their major. In order to get admission to universities for diploma-level teacher training, applicants must first pass the most rigorous examinations, from which they risk expulsion if they do not pass.

Despite going through all of this and receiving training from certified teachers in the CTE, EFL trainees still failed to meet expectations in both their final products and their classroom practices (Temesgen, 2017). In the end, there were two main goals that an EFL certificate holder should have accomplished: 1) Students are expected to do well on the COC exit exams, which measure their knowledge and skills as a teacher; 2) They should demonstrate strong performance in their teaching practicums. This discrepancy prompted the present researcher to investigate whether or not EFL instructors adequately accommodate their students' diverse learning styles when instructing them in the English language. Other factors may also play a role in determining students' final grades.

In short, despite all the efforts to train competent teachers, many EFL [teacher] candidates were discovered to lack the necessary level of competence. This motivated the current researcher to inquire as to whether the trainees have been taught the language in a manner that suits them best, or at least how most students are taught. Additionally, the Higher Diploma Programme (HDP) stresses the importance of college teachers adapting their teaching methods to the unique learning styles of their students if they want their students to succeed academically and the quality of higher education to remain high (HDP, 2011). HDP training is a worldwide initiative that aims to improve the abilities of faculty members in all areas of education. Teachers are required to participate in this training because of the widespread belief that it will provide them with fresh and useful information on assessment strategies, successful methods of instruction, and other related topics. So, the purpose of this study was to find out if English as foreign language (EFL) instructors are aware that their students have different preferred methods of learning. Has ELT been making any effort to tackle these styles?

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Research paradigm and design

Since most other research philosophies assume things based on pre-existing or antecedent conditions, this study followed the pragmatic research paradigm, which states that assumptions should be based on current situations, actions, and consequences. Researchers with a pragmatic viewpoint prioritize real-world problems and draw their conclusions from actual experiences rather than abstract theories (Robson & McCartan, 2016). Therefore, rather than concentrating on a specific preset approach, researchers stress the need of understanding the topic and solving the study challenge using all accessible methodologies. To that end, mixed-methods research, which draw from a variety of sources to understand the issue at hand, are well-suited to this worldview (Willis, 2007). Additionally, a mixed-methods strategy combining qualitative and quantitative data was utilized to compensate for the limitations

of data derived from a single source (Mertens, 2010; Dornyei, 2007). A mixed-methods strategy was chosen for the study because multiple types of data were used to examine the problems related to EFL teaching methods and how instructors made an effort to cater to their students' different learning styles.

This study utilized a descriptive survey design, one of several that have been regularly employed by different researchers. This design was chosen because there is a lack of research on learning and teaching methods in TEFL, particularly in Oromia CTE situations. Descriptive survey research lends itself well to investigations of such novel phenomena for which adequate empirical studies are hard to come by, and extensive data collection is required for such an undertaking. Ary et al. (2010) states that descriptive survey studies are used to shed light on a situation, people, or event in its operational context. However, these studies may not delve into the reasons behind an event's occurrence or non-occurrence. They are more suited to research areas that are still relatively new or unexplored. Additionally, Cohen et al. (2007) stated, "Many educational researches are descriptive; that is, they are set out to describe and interpret what exists and what is not, but not why is it or why is it not."

The study's intended participants were English as a Foreign Language (EFL) educators and their students at the Dembi Dollo and Mettu CTEs in Oromia, two regions of southwestern Ethiopia. The study used a comprehensive sampling strategy to recruit both college EFL instructors (n = 20) and EFL students from the third year (n = 40) of the program. Since the number of EFL instructors

and students at the institution was manageable (NT=60), this sampling strategy was employed to ensure that all participants could fill out the questionnaire and be observed in class. Many researchers, like Dornyei (2007), Ary et al. (2010), and Grey (2004), strongly suggest this type of inclusive sampling.

Research Instruments

Classroom observation and questionnaires were the primary study tools. When performing related studies, questionnaires are recommended to obtain people's factual, behavioural, and attitude data (Bhattacherjee, 2012; Brown, 2007; Dornyei, 2007). The researchers in this study reasoned that a questionnaire would be the best way to systematically gather information regarding the instructors' preferred methods of instruction, as well as their thoughts and practices in this area. To that end, we combed through a variety of relevant literature to compile two sets of questionnaires: one to gauge teachers' perceptions of their own efforts to cater to students' individual learning styles, and another to gauge teachers' actual awareness of their students' learning styles.

Another important method used in this investigation was observation. Rather than depending on second-hand stories of the necessary data, it allows an investigator to examine directly into what is happening, which is something that many research specialists value. As a result, it relies on eyewitness accounts (Denscombe, 2007; Robson, 2002). This study followed a similar pattern: the method was recognized and employed because it was thought to fulfill the

need; the instrument was chosen because it was thought to provide real-time data on how teachers actually accommodated different learning styles in your classroom. As a result, the researcher filled out a checklist designed for this very reason while standing on the sidelines of the classroom, observing the scenarios unfold. In order to determine if the teachers have been making an effort to cater to their pupils' individual learning styles, the researcher created an observation checklist that centers on commonalities. According to Cohen et al. (2007), a researcher should take into account his or her prior knowledge, expectations, and experiences with the topic at hand while developing an observation plan. In this case, the researcher took it upon himself to do just that.

Auditory (oral-aural or lectures, etc.), visual (charts, diagrams, written notes, etc.), kinesthetic/tactile (movements, involvements, dramatizing, etc.), individual (doing things alone), and group (doing things with others) styles were the primary foci of the observation theme and the taxonomies used in this study. The researcher primarily concentrated on basic preset instructional elements to achieve this effect. These elements include the following: instructional materials or aids teachers bring to class (e.g., videos, Power Points, flip charts, etc.), classroom organization (individual, pair, or group work), lesson types (e.g., the tendency towards lecture or interactive methods), and other related classroom scenarios that teachers engage in while teaching English at CTEs. The convenience and obvious security issues at Demdi Dollo CTE prompted the researchers to re-observe classrooms in Mettu CTE, where

conditions were rather stable in March and April 2022, when the data for this study was being collected.

The Validity and Reliability of the Tools

Prior to being utilized in the research, the instruments' validity and reliability were thoroughly examined. The advisors' and experts' comments and revisions were used to check the instruments' validity in terms of content, face validity, and construct validity. Furthermore, the items' reliability was validated through the use of pre-existing statistical tests, specifically the Cronbach alpha value, which measures the items' internal consistency.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The research results and their discussion are presented in this section. So, the researcher would like to mention right away that the technique of parallel or concurrent discussion is applied. This method uses concurrent presentations rather than dedicated spaces for analysis and debate; instead, it compares and contrasts the results with those of other researchers in the field. Many researchers think this is the best way because it is easy for readers to understand (Cohen et al., 2007).

EFL teachers' cognizance of students' learning styles

There has been conflicting evidence in the research on EFL instructors' awareness of their students' individual learning styles in relation to the preferred methods of

instruction. Teachers, according to Tuan (2011) and Soliven (2003), are aware of the fact that students learn in different ways. To ensure that all students, regardless of their learning style, are able to benefit from classroom instruction, teachers should adapt their methods accordingly. In contrast, Shaari, Yusoff, Ghazali, Osman, and Dzahir (2014) found that instructors often fail to modify their lessons to accommodate students' preferred learning styles because they are unaware of their students' individual preferences and true in ELT settings as well. Additionally, Aliye, Zeleke, and Mekuria (2022) discovered that students' and teachers' preferred methods of learning do not align. This finding suggests that instructors might not be fully aware of their students' unique learning styles. In light of the fact that this research aims to examine whether or not EFL instructors are aware of their students' diverse learning styles, this section addresses that question.

Table 1

The EFL Teachers' Cognizance of Different Learning Styles

No.	Statements	N	M	SD
1	Learning style differences do not exist among EFL students in learning the same course.	20	4.25	0.62
2	Failure to understand our students' learning styles when teaching can affect the students' achievements	20	2.75	0.71
3	Classroom teachers are the important figures that should determine what and how students learn.	20	4.6	0.50
4	Students' learning styles should be addressed by the subject teachers to bring holistic improvements on students'	20	2.9	0.73
5	Students should learn in the way their teachers prefer to teach them than in the ways they prefer to learn.	20	4.15	0.83
6	A single teaching style the teacher uses is enough to teach all students in the class; no need of employing different teaching styles as is wastes teachers' times	20	4.45	0.69
7	Students' learning styles can have influence on our teaching	20	2.30	0.58
8	Accommodating students' various learning styles is difficult and impossible in ELT context.	20	4.7	0.47
	Grand Average	*20*	*3.76*	*0.66*

Table 1 shows that the EFL teachers were given a questionnaire with around eight items. Teachers' familiarity with their students' preferred learning styles and how those preferences affect the efficacy of classroom instruction and other learning activities was the intended focus of the survey. The obvious goal of each item and question was to see if instructors are aware of their students' preferred learning styles and, if not, how this knowledge impacts lesson planning and assessment.

Results demonstrated that items with low means and high standard deviations were created to assess instructors' understanding of and approach to various learning styles and accommodations for them (i.e., questions with implicit meaning). In contrast, items with

clearly stated questions aimed to assess instructors' subject knowledge had low standard deviation values and high means. Item 2, Item 4, and Item 7 all asked about the benefits of accommodating students' learning styles, and in all three cases, the mean and standard deviation were modest (M = 2.75; SD = 0.71, M = 2.9; SD = 0.73, and M = 2.30; SD = 0.58). In addition to these three points, the benefits of understanding and catering to students' individual learning styles have demonstrated strong values (see to the table above for the findings). Overall, the results indicate that EFL instructors at the chosen CTE are unaware of their students' preferred methods of learning English. For each item given to explore this information, they should have given the opposite grade (high for the one requesting low) if they had known it well (see Table 1).

But other studies have shown outcomes that are at odds with this one. Several academics, including Gafoor and Babu (2012), Al-Deeb (2016), Cabrillana and Mayany (2017), and Cassidy (2004), have asserted that modern educators understand their students' unique learning styles and preferences. Scholars contend that instructors may not actually instruct their students despite having extensive knowledge of their individual learning styles, contrary to what instructional style preference theories would have

them believe. Actually, this demands additional examination.

EFL Teachers' Practices in Accommodating Students' Learning Styles

The second research question (RQ 2) aimed to find out if EFL instructors are making an effort to cater to their students' various learning styles in the classroom. Two sets of surveys were prepared to achieve this goal: one for instructors to use in reflecting on their own teaching practices, and another for students to use in assessing those practices. Classroom observation was also used to confirm the results obtained.

Teachers' self-perceived practice

In order to ensure that all students' needs were met, instructors were required to reflect on their own methods of instruction. This section of the questionnaire comprised nine items designed to gather information about instructors' efforts in relation to accommodating procedures. The primary goal of administering these items was to determine how often and how much EFL instructors use a variety of teaching strategies to accommodate their students' diverse learning styles in the classroom. An overview of this fact could be shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2

EFL Teachers' Self-reported Practice of Accommodations

No.	Statements	N	M	SD
1	I plan in advance to teach the English language in a way I can accommodate learners' various learning styles.	20	4.20	0.69
2	I employ different teaching styles or lesson presentation techniques in teaching English language.	20	4.45	0.60
3	I design and bring different language tasks or activities that appeal to different learning styles and apply in the class.	20	4.25	0.62
4	I believe that students are happy and motivated when I accommodate their different learning styles preferences in a classroom.	20	4.30	0.66

Table.2 continues...

5	I use different Teaching Aids such as charts, videos, shows, flashcards, pictures, models, etc. when teaching the different aspects of English language.	20	4.60	0.50
6	During practicums (teaching practices), I encourage EFL teacher candidates to practice designing different activities that can support learners with different learning styles.	20	3.95	0.76
7	I employ varied teaching techniques or methods while teaching the different aspects of the English language.	20	4.35	0.74
8	In teaching the English language courses, I predominantly use one adapted teaching style or technique that I have been accustomed to.	20	2.25	0.78
9	I teach English language in the way or style my students want to learn. For example, learning by seeing, by listening, by doing, by moving or doing, etc.	20	4.5	0.60
	Summated M and SD	20	*4.09*	*0.66*

Higher mean values and relatively low standard deviation results were registered in items that were aimed to explicitly examine teachers' self-evaluations in relation to learners' varied learning styles (e.g., Item 2, Item 5, Item 7, Item 9, and other items), as shown in Table 2 above. The means are all quite close to 5, the highest point on the Likert scale. Item 8 (refer to Table 2) demonstrates that teachers in this case were asked the opposite way around, indicating that they do not accommodate or address their students' learning styles.

Based on the results, it is clear that EFL teachers have a high opinion of their own accommodation procedures (summated M = 4.09; SD = 066). This case's outcome showed that English teachers have been making an effort to cater to their pupils' individual learning styles. What this means is that teachers are making claims about how they are catering to their students' preferred learning styles through things like utilizing a variety of instructional and technological materials in English language classes, designing and bringing a variety of activities or tasks that can entertain different groups of learners, etc.

Students' Evaluation of Teachers' Accommodation Practice

In a similar vein to how instructors were asked to reflect on their own teaching methods, students were also asked to assess how well their English language instructors catered to their own learning styles. Using this, we were able to collect first-hand accounts from educators on their encounters with students' varying learning styles and their subsequent attempts to accommodate them in language instruction. This section followed the same format as the teachers' questionnaire and consisted of eight questions (one of which is missing since it applies only to teachers) designed to determine how often and how effectively teachers have used a variety of instructional strategies to meet the needs of their students. The case summary utilizing mean values and standard deviations is presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3

A Summary of Students' Evaluation of Teachers' Accommodation Practice

No.	Statements	N	M	SD
1	Your English language teachers employ different teaching styles or lesson presentation techniques in teaching English language.	40	1.80	0.60
2	Your English language teachers design and bring different language tasks or activities that appeal to different learning styles and apply in the class.	40	1.98	0.58
3	Your English language teachers make you happy and motivated to learn the language by addressing your different learning styles preferences in a classroom.	40	1.93	0.61
4	Your English language teachers use different Teaching Aids such as charts, videos, shows, flashcards, pictures, models, etc. when teaching the different aspects of English language.	40	2.13	0.56
5	During practicums (teaching practices), your English language teachers encourage you to practice designing different activities that can support learners with different learning styles.	40	2.15	0.70
6	Your English language teachers employ varied teaching techniques or methods while teaching the different aspects of the English language.	40	2.05	0.57
7	In teaching the English language courses, your teachers predominantly use one adapted teaching style or technique that they have been accustomed to.	40	4.3	0.76
8	Your English language teachers teach in the way or style their students prefer to learn. For example, learning by seeing, by listening, by doing, by moving or doing, etc.	40	1.95	0.59
	Summated M and SD	40	2.28	0.62

Table 3 shows that students' assessments of their teachers' pedagogical strategies for addressing students' unique learning styles indicate that teachers do not take students' preferences into account when planning lessons. It is clear that all the items that are supposed to reflect teachers' practices had extremely low mean scores. All the item mean values were significantly lower than the average item mean value of 3.00. Item 7, for instance, had a high mean value (indicating students' agreement on teachers' use of an invariable teaching style) (M = 4.28; SD = 0.64), but other items or questions asked students to assess the usage of only one adaptable teaching style. Students' responses about how their teachers accommodate various learning styles likewise had a summative mean value that was lower than the average (M = 2.29; SD = 0.66). In conclusion, the findings from this section may suggest that the CTEs seldom made an effort to cater to their students' individual learning styles when instructing them in English.

The two sets of responders, the educators and the students, came up with contrasting results. The researcher conducted multiple classroom observations with four EFL volunteer teachers (TGe, TGi, TT, TS) who have been teaching at Mettu CTE. This was done to ensure the reliability of the results and to draw a valid conclusion regarding the EFL

teachers' practice of accommodating learners' different learning styles. About 16 sessions were conducted, four times with each instructor, in order to gather enough data on the teachers' pedagogical practices and classroom activities related to the English language classes. The data needed for this purpose was collected using checklists that were specifically designed for this purpose. Based on the themes that were developed, the data were transcribed, organized, and analyzed qualitatively:

1. *The instructor's preferred ways of instruction,*
2. *The type of lessons and exercises that the instructor employed,*
3. *The tools or resources that the instructor uses in the classroom and*
4. *The strategies that are employed to keep the classroom organized throughout class*

According to the Theory of Differentiated Instruction (DI), in order to cater to students' individual learning styles, classroom instructors should consider the themes described above. If this is not done, it suggests that the learning styles of the kids are not being tried to be addressed.

The majority of EFL teachers did not adequately accommodate their students' different learning styles, according to classroom observations. It appears that teachers were not trying to modify their teaching strategies to cater to the diverse range of learning preferences and styles exhibited by their students. The results of the many classroom observations led researchers to conclude that almost all of the CTEs' English as a foreign language teachers failed to make use of many learning modalities in their lessons. While some teachers may have used chalk and board to write words and incomplete phrases here and there, the majority of language classes relied on an oral-aural technique in which teachers would read aloud language themes while pupils listened. Consequently, there may be a limited group of students who benefit most from this style of teaching since they learn best by listening. Finally, the overall mean value (M = 4.09; SD = 0.66) was higher than the average mean value (A) when considering the responses of teachers regarding their own practices. Considering that students reported very little practice (M = 2.28; SD = 0.62), it may be inferred that EFL teachers have used accommodating strategies. Triangulating the results and reaching a valid conclusion regarding the teachers' practice, classroom observation yielded results that were identical to the results from the student responses. It has come to light that EFL teachers do not employ a range of pedagogical approaches that could potentially meet the needs of students with extremely varied learning styles. In essence, the three instruments' findings indicate that EFL instructors at Mettu College of Teachers Education and Dembi Dollo have not been considering their students' varied learning styles when teaching English. Students' general level of skill and test scores in the language may be affected by this issue.

In any case, studies on learning styles and preferences conducted by Mulalic, Shah, and Ahmad (2009) provide solid evidence that teachers should strive to accommodate their students' individual learning preferences and styles in the classroom. When students' learning styles are identified, teachers should

make accommodations by offering a variety of classroom activities that cater to different learning preferences. The most effective teachers, say Gafoor and Babu (2012), take their students' learning styles into account while planning lessons. Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010, 2011) further argue that the core principle of differentiated instruction is to create a range of classroom activities that allow all student groups to actively engage in the course.

A summary of teachers' classroom presentation practices

There were three EFL teachers who were witnessed teaching English lessons many times. In practically every class, the teachers used the identical procedures and pedagogies from beginning to end. For instance, in an oral education session, they may present the day's topic, give it out loud, ask pupils to react in chorus, but only a few would really participate. Teachers would always leave the classroom after reviewing the day's lesson's main points and encourage the students to return the following day. A lot of the time, teachers were just talking, which would be great for students who learn best by hearing; yet, other times, they were writing partial sentences on the board, which could work for students who learn best by seeing. Visual, kinesthetic, tactile, group, or any mix of these learning styles were not addressed through the utilization of different activities. Outside of a handful of preliminary oral inquiries, teachers did not step in during any of the class activities to give students more leeway to do things their own way or compare notes. One could say that most of the class sat idly and listened to the teacher lecture, with only a few of students (volunteers) contributing anything of value. Teachers of English as a foreign language have only had success with their presentations with students who learn best when they are either listening or speaking out loud. Teachers should have made better use of the whiteboard by writing down more than just the lesson's topic and showing other notes and information for students. Nothing seemed to have been scheduled for the day in terms of classwork or activities, except than a few of questions.

CONCLUSIONS

It was found that English as a foreign language teachers fail to consider their students' individual learning styles. Because they don't completely understand their students' unique preferences in this area, EFL teachers at the CTE may struggle to accommodate their students' diverse needs when it comes to studying English. There seemed to be a general mismatch between the ways that EFL instructors taught the language and the ways that their pupils learned it. Finally, it's important to mention that future researchers or those already working on the subject could be able to tackle similar issues, including the interplay between different variables, or expand the scope of the same topic to include many study locations and different research methods.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

medicinal plants and practices used against malaria.

DECLARATION

There is no conflict of interest in this work.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All data were included in the article.

REFERENCES

Al-Deeb, N. (2016). Matching learning styles with teaching strategies. *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages Journal,1*, 1-21.

Aliye, G., Zeleke, T. & Mekuria, Z. (2022). A study on the compatibility between EFL learners' preferred learning styles and teachers' teaching styles: Colleges of teachers' education in Oromia, Ethiopia, https://www.google.10.5861/ijrse.2022.318

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education* (8th edition). USA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Bhattacherjee, A. (2012). *Social science research: Principles, methods and practices.* Textbooks collection. http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/oa Textbooks/3

Brown, H., D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching,* (5th edition). Longman: Pearson Education.

Cabrillana, H., A. & Mayany, L., C. (2017). Teaching styles and achievement: Student and Teacher Perspectives. *Journal of English Literature* (JEL), *8*(4), 1-46.

Cassidy, S. (2004). Learning styles: An overview of theories, models, and measures. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *24*(4), 419 - 444.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007*). Research methods in education*. London and New York: Routledge

Denscombe, M. (2007). *The good research guide: For small-scale social research projects* (3rd edition). McGraw-Hill House: Open University Press.

diversity with quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods. (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dorji, J. (2017). Communicative language teaching as conceptualized by Bhutanese English as second language teachers. *Indonesian EFL Journal, 3*(1), 1-12.

Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: OUP.

Gafoor, K., & Babu, H. (2012). *Teaching style: A conceptual overview. Teacher education in the new millennium,* New Delhi: APH. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318 054965

Getachew, A., & Derib, A. (2006). Language Policy in Ethiopia: History and Current Trends. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Science*, *2*(1), 37-58.

Grasha, F., A. (1996). Essays on teaching excellence: Towards the best in the academy. *A publication of The Professional & Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, 7,*(5).

Grey, D., E. (2004). *Doing research in the real world*. London: Thousand Oaks, Sage Publication.

HDP. (2011). *The higher diploma pogramme for teacher educators.* Ministry of Education: Addis Ababa.

Jie, L., & Xiaoqing, Q. (2006). Language learning styles and learning strategies of tertiary-level English learners in China. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, *37*(1), 67-90.

Mertens, D. M. (2019). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Sage publications.

Mulalic, A., Shah, P. M., & Ahmad, F. (2009). Learning-style preference of ESL students. *Asean Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *1*(2), 9-17.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Peacock, M. (2001). Match or mismatch? Learning styles and teaching styles in EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), 1-20.

Razak, N. A., Ahmad, F., & Shah, M.P. (2007). Perceived and preferred teaching styles (methods) of English for specific purposes (ESP) students. *Jurnal e-Bangi*, *2*(2), 1-20.

Reid, J. M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL quarterly*, *21*(1), 87-111.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research: A resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers* (2nd edition). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Robson, C., & Mc Cartan, K. (2016). *Real world research: A resource for users of social research methods in applied settings* (4th edition). UK: John Wiley & Sons publisher.

Shaari, A. S., Yusoff, N. M., Ghazali, I. M., Osman, R. H., & Dzahir, N. F. M. (2014). The relationship between lecturers' teaching style and students' academic engagement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *118*, 10-20.

Soliven, S.R. (2003). Teaching styles of high school physics teachers. http: //www .hiceducation .org /EduProceedings.

Sreenidhi, S., K. & Helena, T., C. (2017). Styles of Learning Based on the Research of Fernald, Keller, Orton, Gillingham, Stillman, Montessori and Neil D Fleming. *Journal of International Journal for Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Field*, *3*(4), 17-25.

Temesgen, D. (2017). *The impact of pre-service primary English language teacher training on post-training practice.* (PhD Dissertation), University of South Africa.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2005). Differentiating Instruction: Why Bother? *The Magazine of Middle Level Education, 9*(1), 12-14.

Tomlinson, C. A., & Imbeau, M. B. (2010). *Leading and managing a differentiated classroom*. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Tomlinson, C., & Imbeau, M. B. (2011). *Managing a differentiated classroom: A practical guide*. USA: Scholastic Printing.

Tuan, L. T. (2011). EFL learners' learning styles and their attributes. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 2*(2), 299- 320.

Zebari, M., Allo, A. & Mohammedzadeh, B. (2018). Multiple Intelligences - Based Planning of EFL Classes. *Journal of Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 9*(2), 98-103.