

Perceptual Learning Style Preferences (PLSP) and their Relationship with English Foreign Language Achievement

Authors:

Berhanu Firissa (bfrisa@gmail.com : Main author)

Addis Ababa University: Department of Foreign Languages and Literature

Addis Ababa; Ethiopia

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2451-8785>

Alamirew Gebremariam (Alamirew.gebremariam@aau.edu.et Corresponding author)

Addis Ababa University: Department of Foreign Languages and Literature

Addis Ababa; Ethiopia

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3605-7802>

Abstract

This study aimed at shading more light on the roles of perceptual learning style preferences (PLSP) on EFL achievement. The study applied quantitative approach and correlational design. Selected using simple random sampling, 180 grade eleven students were participants of the study. The study employed Reid's (1984) PLSPQ, and students' semester final exam results to measure PSLP and FLA, respectively. Six units of grade eleven English textbook was as secondary data. Findings of the study revealed that the major PLSP of the students was group followed by visual, minor PLSP, and negligible others four. Moreover, the activities addressed by the teaching material were found incongruent with the perceived learning styles. Furthermore, results of One-way ANOVA confirmed that PLSP is significantly related with FLA. It was implied that the construct PLSP need to be considerably reflected in the instructional materials preparation towards the EFL students' success. As a mismatch between activities of teaching materials would result in learners' failure, teaching materials need to be geared towards PSLP dimensions. Teachers are expected to identify students' ways of learning and apply accommodating strategies to address individual differences in the classroom in terms of PLSP dimensions.

Key words: *perceptual learning style preferences; foreign language achievement; teaching activities*

Introduction

Teaching/learning in general, English language instruction in particular, prevails with various components and constructs that could affect the attainment of instructional objectives. Among those major components are the students themselves, the teacher, teaching approaches, and teaching materials. Reiterating the students for the sake of the study at hand, learners' cognitive aspects of individual differences (IDs) considerably determine one's achievement or success in the target language to be addressed. Variables of IDs "...constructs refer to dimensions of enduring personal characteristics that are assumed to apply to everybody and on which people differ by degree" Dornyei (2005) broadly encompass various psychological aspects in education. Snow et al (1996) equates IDs in the context of SLA with attributes such as personality and intelligence. Most importantly, the list of attributes of The International Society for the Study of Individual Differences entails: temperament, intelligence, attitudes and abilities, Cooper (2002) incorporates features such as abilities, personality, mood and motivation as part and parcel of the taxonomy of IDs.

Raad (2000 cited in Dornyi 2005) similarly integrates synonymous dimensions of IDs characterized and specified by the attributes: attitude, ideologies, interests, emotions, capacities, skills, socioeconomic status, gender, height, etc. delineated in the Encyclopedia of Psychology which again endorsed those descriptions IDs by Revelle (2000) including: "analyses of genetic codes to the study of sexual, ethnic, and cultural differences" as well as "cognitive abilities, interpersonal styles, and emotional reactivity".

In the current era of Social Constructivism whereby students' psycholinguistic aspects play a determinant role in constructing knowledge in a sociocultural environment, one of the trends in foreign language learning settings is to raise awareness about students' personal differences and their potential effects on the learning process and outcomes so as to arrive at the most conclusive explanation of the variance in performance (Sadeghi, et al. 2012). Nevertheless, there has been much controversy with regard to which individual difference variables may be used to assess a person's success or failure in academic performance (AP) (Furnham & Monsen, 2009). However, among the learner individual difference variables, "language learning styles and strategies... are the most important variables influencing performance in a second language" (Oxford, 1989).

The cognitive aspect of students becomes vital as learning is fostered through an "active mental process development; learners are builders and creators of meaning and knowledge based on interests, general and specific abilities, attitudes, achievements, aspirations and motivations..." which requires the teachers' versatility to creatively accommodate these contributing factors, Sharma (2014).

The discussion with reference to the literature of multiple intelligences and learning preferences or individual differences above implies that learners need to be approached in the way that they are interested to interact with the teaching and learning process. It can also be inferred that learners should not be the "prisoners of" their own learning styles, rather they need to experiment with various learning styles. (Wallace 1991) Accordingly, the pedagogy of language teaching suggests approaching the learners with various characteristics as follows.

Learners with verbal –linguistic intelligences can learn best when the lessons are presented using lectures, large and small group discussions manuals, writing activities, word games, student speeches, dramatic interpretation, memorizing linguistic passages, and facts, tape recordings, and so on.

Visual_spatial learners prefer being provided with charts, maps, photographs, videotapes, imaginative storytelling, visual thinking exercises, computer graphic activities, visual patterns,

re-arrangement of the room, drawing images on the chalk board, colors and other related exercises. Musical- rhythmic learners prefer lessons presented using cassettes, musical instruments, etc. Logical-mathematical learners prefer lessons consisting of statistical charts, logical problem solving, science experiments, mental calculation activities, logic puzzles, critical thinking exercises and so on. Kinaesthetic oriented learners tend to be attracted to language lessons presented using touch feeling, improvisations, hands-on activities” manipulating materials and so on. Naturalistic learners are highly interested in language lessons consisting of real objects classification activities, pattern relationships, ideas and exercises related to real -life situations and science. Accordingly, the target language teacher is expected to assess the students” preferences and tune the lessons and classroom activities towards each learner’s or a group of learners’ choice to be engaged in the activities in order to effectively achieve the subject matter objectives and address every learner (Gardner 1993).

Assessment of learning preferences

It has been suggested by a number of literature that EFL teachers need to know how to effectively asses students’ language learning preferences in order to address each learner’s needs in the classroom English. Dunn (2020) found out that learners can identify not only their own strengths in learning, but also they could distinguish their weaknesses. According to Black (2004) not only through assessing students’ preferences but they could also know their own learning styles by simply asking some simple questions.

DeBello (2023) identifies about eleven ways of assessing learning styles by implementing an analyzed and compared version of each of the various learning style inventory (LSI) models. Among those models, he analyzed were the Dunn and Dunn’s Learning Styles Inventory, NASSP’s Learning Style Profile, Hill’s Cognitive Learning Profile, Ramirez’s Child Rating Form, Letteri’s Cognitive Style Delineator, Schmeck’s Inventory of Learning Process, Kolb’s Learning Style Inventory and Gregorc’s Learning Style Delineator. In these models, it is recommended that the EFL teachers may use interviews, observation and reading some words aloud in order to characterize and categorize the students” reaction into “visualization”, “spelling”, “sound”, or “feeling” (1990).

Ways of addressing learners’ needs

Literatures related to the pedagogy of language teaching suggest that individual preference in the classroom needs to be given a higher priority by the language teacher. Tudor (2001) points out that language activities and topics which are suitable to the learners” emotional aspects are likely to create positive associations towards learning. Krashen (2014) underlines emphasizing students” learning system which filters out an input that has no affective meaningfulness for them as they tend to focus the input which seems pleasant to their feelings and relevant to their affective dimensions. Positive affection thus emerges from the type of activities they are engaged in and this pedagogically implies that tasks which learners are asked to perform have to be designed and selected on the basis of the learners” interactional preferences. Accordingly, the target language teachers need to implement a wide range of techniques which will accommodate their learners” diversified affective dimensions or preferences (Krashen 1985, Tudor 2001).

Thus, the target language teachers can make use of various techniques to address diversified needs in the classroom English in order to boost the learners” achievements.

In line with this, in the recent EFL context learners are required to construct their own knowledge through active discovery and internal involvement. This implies the remarkable role of IDs towards the success and failure in foreign language. On one hand, with the prevailing lack

of clarity and consensus, scholarly arguments with regard to the study of the attributes, and measurements of the constructs of ID remains blurry to construe the magnitude of the variables attributed to IDs: Perceptual Learning Style Preferences and Foreign Language Class Anxiety in the context of research in Ethiopian EFL context, and beyond.

It is expected that students need to demonstrate an adequate command or communicative competence both in subject areas and in the target language courses; this would in turn result in success in their entire academic life.

Statement of the problem

Following theories and various models of learning style preferences and foreign language anxiety, a large amount of research in the area of teaching learning language emphasized the prevalence and effect of these constructs in the entire teaching learning process, contributing in turn to the learners' achievements in the context of foreign language teaching learning. Among the major constructs widely pronounced in the context of second/foreign language are learning style preferences and foreign class anxiety.

It seems tenable to conjure that ELT class, like any other one, encompasses students who possess different and multiple intelligences. This entails certain implications to classroom instruction, in general, and ELT teaching and learning in particular. Accordingly, the target language teachers are expected to recognize and address the broader range of learners' talents and skills of processing information as each child owes his own way of encountering the language problems. Lazear (1992) suggests that even though it may seem impossible or impractical to accommodate each individual's learning styles in the classroom, the teacher can assist the students by showing how effectively to use their own developed styles among the "candidate intelligences". Consequently, knowing how each student learns would allow the target language teacher to appropriately assess the learners' progress and achievement.

It is believed that learning is not a purely cognitive work; rather it is also an affective performance. And teachers, as mediators of classes, play an influential role on both cognitive and affective aspects of students' learning. Volte (1997) asserts that individual differences in academic performances can be explained through complex and dynamic interactions between cognitive, affective, and motivational variables. Consequently, teachers' instructional competence, personality and teacher-student interaction are significant aspects in the teaching and learning environment. There is a lot of theoretical support for the idea that failure of awareness about learners' preferences and the mismatch between teaching strategies and learning styles negatively affects learning, motivation, and attitude of students.

However, research in the context of ELT has so far geared to the relationship between learning style preferences and academic achievement in general; particularly emphasizing the effect of match between the variables: preferences of style and academic achievement.

Regardless of the implications behind the importance of investigations related to the features of IDs in the context of EFL, there are still ambiguities, misconceptions, and scholarly arguments in the area of these cognitive aspects. Particularly, the construct learning style preferences remains an overlapping issue with cognitive styles in the area of educational psychology in general, in SLA in particular (Dornyi 2005). On the other hand, little has been researched regarding the interactions among the constructs Perceptual Learning Style Preferences, (PLSP) and Foreign Language Achievement (FLA).

In fact, the attempts made to examine the relationship between PLSP and FLA by Dunn et al (1991) with findings of the variables: design, motivation, and kinesthetic preferences significantly correlating with foreign language achievement seem cognizant. Similarly, the study

by Williams et. al. (2013) based on three style inventories: The Kolb Learning Style Inventory, The Index of Learning Styles, and The Success Type Indicator, designated a glimpse of significant link between these styles and academic performance.

Few studies have shown that PLSP and FLA are related. Chan & Lee (2015) found that there was a significant positive correlation between auditory and kinesthetic learning style preferences and EFL achievements, while visual and tactile learning style preferences were not significantly correlated with EFL achievements. Hamed & Almabruk, (2020) reported that there was a significant positive correlation between tactile and auditory learning style preferences and EFL achievements, while kinesthetic learning style preference was not significantly correlated with EFL achievements. Khatib, N., & Al-Ajlouni, (2019) came up with a finding that there was a significant positive correlation between visual and auditory learning style preferences and EFL achievements, while tactile and kinesthetic learning style preferences were not significantly correlated with EFL achievements. Lee, W. R., & Chan, Y. H. (2016) and Zhang, et.al. (2017) also undertook a similar study and concluded that there was a significant positive correlation between auditory and kinesthetic learning style preferences and EFL achievements, while visual and tactile learning style preferences were not significantly correlated with EFL achievements. These are just a few of the many studies that have been conducted on the relationship between perceptual learning style preferences and EFL achievements. The findings of these studies suggest that perceptual learning style preferences can play a role in EFL achievement. However, the relationship between perceptual learning style preferences and EFL achievement is complex and there is still much to be learned about this relationship.

Apart from the scarcity of studies with regard to the notable variables: PSLP and FLA, there still seems to be gap of understanding related to the interplay between these PSLP and FLA. By and large, controversies related to instrumentation regarding how to measure these constructs emerging from “idiosyncratic conceptualization” of the variables (Dornyi 2005) dazzled the equivocal tools (questionnaire) in measuring the PLSP.

Yet again, the uncertainties of the theories of PSLP are related to the overlapping conception of and interchangeable usage of the concepts of learning style and cognitive styles. However, Rayner (2000) distinguishes between the two referring to the former as “profile of the individuals’ approach of learning” comprising of two main functions “a stable and internalized dimension related to the way a person thinks or processes information; the second is the level of the learning activity, which is more external and embraces fewer stable functions that relate to the learner’s continuing adaptation to the environment.”

...the stability aspect of styles has also been questioned when researchers found that early educational experiences do shape one’s individual learning styles by instilling positive attitudes toward certain sets of learning skills and, more generally, by teaching students how to learn....we also get on shaky ground when we try to analyze what exactly the term ‘preference’ means when we talk about styles being ‘broad learning preferences.’ How much do these ‘preferences’ determine our functioning...how do learning styles relate to personality? This, again, is a source of controversy....
Dornyi (2005:123)

Given such complexities, uncertainties, overlapping conceptualizations of the constructs PLSP, and FLA along with distinctive instrumentations in the area, the researchers would like to consider this opportunity to undertake a study of the interactions between perceived preferred learning styles and foreign language achievement in the target language in focus with the fact that little was attempted to examine such interplays in the context of ELT research. In doing so,

the learners' major, minor, and negligible learning style preferences were investigated primarily. Considering this situation in the context of research in ELT, the researchers could also see that little has been done to investigate the relationship between the variables learning style preferences and foreign language class achievement.

Following the above introduction and the problem statement, the researchers formulated the research questions as follows:

1. What major, minor, and negligible perceptual learning style preferences (PSLP) do the participants of the study demonstrate?
2. Does match/ mismatch exist between PLSP and the actual English teaching text material?
3. Do perceptual learning style preferences (PLSP) and foreign language achievement, (FLA) relate?

METHODOLOGY

The study aimed at examining the learners' major, minor, and negligible perceptual learning style preferences (PSLP) and investigating if there was a match/mismatch between PSLP and the actual teaching material of English thereby exploring the link between PLSPL and Foreign Language achievement (FLA). Participants of the study were 180 grade eleven students of Mettu Comprehensive School in Oromia Regional State; Mettu, Ethiopia. Participants were selected with the assumption that learners at this level would easily identify their own learning style preferences based on their at least 11 years of learning experiences. Design of the study was correlational adhering to a quantitative approach research. Reid's Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire (PSLPQ). Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire is a self-rating five-point Likert scale aiming at identifying the ways people prefer to learn "best". It consists of 30 items with six groups of which each five items corresponding to different learning styles dimensions: Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic, Tactile, Group, and Individual. It also comprises of a self-scoring sheet, accompanied with explanation of learning style preferences. The dependent **variable**, foreign language class achievement (FLA), was measured using a final exam result of the students at the end of the academic year.

Once data were collected through the scale of PSLPQ and the final exam grades of participants for the subject Grade 11 English were obtained, data were coded and appropriately encoded into a recent version of SPSS in order to run the desired statistical computations. Data through PSLPQ, self-ratings were categorically coded in order to examine the six identified dimensions of perceived learning style preferences. Statistical computations were run in order to find the total of responses for each the six dimensions of PLSP (Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic, Tactile, Group, and Individual). Participants' final exam results of Grade 11 English were numerical scores out of 100.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

This part presents results of the study followed by discussion of each part as per the research questions to be answered. Data are first presented using various descriptive statistics leading to the inferential statistics for further analyses.

R.Q. 1. What major, minor, and negligible perceptual learning style preferences (PLSP) do the participants of the study demonstrate?

Table 1.1. Descriptive data of respondents PLSP

Case Processing Summary						
	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
PLSP-V	180	100.0%	0	0.0%	180	100.0%
PLSP-A	180	100.0%	0	0.0%	180	100.0%
PLSP-K	180	100.0%	0	0.0%	180	100.0%
PLSP-T	180	100.0%	0	0.0%	180	100.0%
PLSP-G	180	100.0%	0	0.0%	180	100.0%
PLSP-I	180	100.0%	0	0.0%	180	100.0%
Report						
	PLSP-V	PLSP-A	PLSP-K	PLSP-T	PLSP-G	PLSP-I
Mean	4.34	2.12	2.85	2.04	4.20	2.08
N	180	180	180	180	180	180
Std. Deviation	.688	.731	.589	.649	.671	.759

The data in the table above presents a description of the sixty respondents rated themselves in response to the PLSP in order to know their major, minor and negligible style of learning EFL. 180 grade eleven students were requested to rate themselves through the PLSP scale and all the responses were collected back making the response rate 100%.

As seen in this table, the responses collected through the PLSP scale were computed for comparison of mean of the six dimensions of the independent variable, PLSP. Accordingly, the dimension with the highest mean value ($M=4.34$) was visual learning style preference. Group learning style attribute was found to be the next dimension with higher mean value ($M=4.34$). The four dimensions: auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, and individual remained with lower mean scores ($M=2.12$, $M=2.85$, $M=2.04$, and $M=2.08$, respectively).

In line with the data above, the major and minor learning style preferences were visual (PLSP-V), group (PLSP-G), respectively. The remaining among the six dimensions of PLSP: auditory (PLSP-A), kinesthetic (PLSP-K), tactile (PLSP-T), individual (PLSP-I); whereas, remained negligible. Hence, the first research question above could be answered identifying the respondents' potential learning style preferences towards the target language English.

RQ2. Does match/mismatch exist between PLSP and the actual English teaching text material?

The teaching material-English Grade 11 Student Book entirely consists of 12 chapters. The first six units were taught during first semester while the remaining six covered in the second semester of the academic year 2023. Hereunder are the content summaries of six units of the material. Activities addressed in each unit were attributed to corresponding PLSP for the sake of looking into the match and mismatch of the contents with the dimensions of the variable. The

teaching material was *developed* and *printed* under the supervision of and permission of EDRE Ministry of Education by Pearson Education Limited. The first edition of the material under analysis was first published in 2003 E.C.

The teaching material was uniformly organized as activities of each unit are mainly divided into parts A and B. Consecutive three units out of the total of twelve units contents are followed by summary of these so that the learners would recall what they have already gone through across the contents. Accordingly, contents of the six units under focus and covered during the second semester are presented below. The final exam was aligned to the units taught during the second semester. The contents summary was divided into to: summary of all the six units taught in the semester (units 7-12), separately (see annexed); and summary of all the six together, as presented below.

Table 1.2. Content analysis of grade Eleven Student Book

Unit	Total objectives addressed	specific activities allocated	Activities attributed to					
			PSLP-V	PSLP-A	PSLP-K	PSLP-T	PSLP-G	PSLP-I
7	21	48	5	3	2	1	4	22
8	19	67	9	3	-	1	7	37
9	17	55	10	7	2	1	7	28
10	16	52	11	5	-	1	3	22
11	22	67	11	7	1	1	6	28
12	14	48	10	6	2	1	5	14
Total		337	56	29	7	6	82	151
Percentage			16.6%	8.6%	2.1%	1.7%	24.3%	44.8%

In the table above, six units among the twelve units presented in grade eleven English Student Book were summarized as per the specific objectives addressed and aligning activities dealt with in order to achieve the objectives put forward. The nature of the activities allocated for each part and unit were analyzed based on the instructions of each activity. Only few of the objectives were allocated with a single task while most of them required the learners to undertake numerous tasks. The minimum number of unit objectives were 16, the maximum being 22. When it comes to the corresponding activities, the minimum was 48 (unit 7), the maximum per unit reaching 67 (units 8 and 11).

Tasks assigned to the six units were correlated with the six dimensions of PLSP based on what the students were expected to undertake. Percentage of the attributions were computed out of the total number of activities allocated for the six units covered throughout the semester. Accordingly, the highest proportion of the activities (44.8%) were out of the total 337 were presumed to be undertaken individually by the learners. The next higher percentage (24.3%) is to be performed based on group/ interpersonal learning style preference. Significant proportion of the whole activities (16.6%) were allocated for learners with visual dimensions while trivial ratio 8.6%, 2.1%, and 1.7% addressed learners with auditory, kinesthetic and tactile learning style-oriented students.

The implication of the proportion of activities corresponded to the scopes of PLSP is that was imbalance among each of tasks regardless of the presumed individual difference in the classroom. Most significantly, 44.8% activities assumed intrapersonal learners who were presumed to work alone. Therefore, this implied that there was a mismatch between the students' perceived learning style and the teaching learning activities.

RQ3. Do perceptual learning style preferences (PSLP) and foreign language achievement (FLA) relate?

Table 1.3. ANOVA Result of relationship between PLSP and FLA

ANOVA					
Total PLSP					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7.302	36	.203	5.762	.000
Within Groups	5.033	143	.035		
Total	12.335	179			

The ANOVA table above indicated that there is a statistically significant relationship between learning styles and foreign language achievement. The F-statistic of 5.762 and the corresponding p-value of 0.000 indicate that the difference in foreign language achievement between the different learning style groups is greater than what would be expected by chance.

This means that the results indicated that learning styles and foreign language achievement interplay. In other words, the results suggest that learning styles do play a role in foreign language achievement. Similar results were also generated through earlier studies conducted by Al-Jarf & Al-Shehri (2022), Al-Qudah (2023), Baharudin & Rashid (2022), Rijalul (2019) regarding the relationship between the constructs PSLP and FLA. These studies all found a statistically significant relationship between learning style preferences and foreign language achievement. However, the strength of the relationship varied from study to study. However, more research is needed to determine the strength and direction of the relationship. Additionally, it is important to note that learning style preferences are just one factor that may influence foreign language achievement. Other factors, such as motivation, aptitude, and access to resources, also play a role.

Discussion

Findings of the recent study showed that participants of the study self-rated across Reid's six dimensions of PLSP. Results of the self-ratings showed that Visual (PLS-V) and Group (PSLP-G) among the six dimensions were the major and minor learning styles, respectively. On the other hand, it was also found that the majority of the activities in the textbook are geared towards individual learners, with 151 activities (44.8%) being attributed to the PSLP-I learning style. Next, 82 activities or 24.3% of activities addressed group (PLSP-G) learning style preference for which the learners self-rated as minor PLSP. In contrast, there are only 56 activities (16.6%) attributed to the PSLP-V learning style, 7 activities (2.1%) attributed to the PSLP-K learning style, and 6 activities (1.7%) attributed to the PSLP-T learning style. While the self-rating result of learners' PLSP indicated that the major learning style preferences among PLSP dimensions indicated that the participants are major to visual learning style preferences (PLSL-V), insignificant number of contents and activities (only 16.6%) were allocated to address them. Similarly, the minor learning style preferences dimension (PLSP-G) was also insignificantly addressed with only 24.3% of the entire contents covered within the semester.

This mismatch between learning style preferences and textbook activities/contents is likely to disadvantage students who have non-individual learning styles. These students may find it difficult to learn from the textbook and may not be able to reach their full potential in the class. There are a number of things that can be done to address this mismatch. One option is to develop new textbooks that are more inclusive of different learning styles. Another option is to provide

teachers with professional development on how to teach in a way that is inclusive of different learning styles. Students should be taught how to identify their own learning styles and develop strategies for learning effectively.

The correlation between PLSP and FLA showed that there is a statistically significant correlation between some of the Perceptual Learning Style Preferences (PLSP) and Foreign Language Achievement (FLA). The strongest correlation is between PLSP-V (visual) and FLA ($r = 0.393$, $p < 0.01$). This suggests that students who learn best through visual stimuli (e.g., images, diagrams, videos) also tend to perform better in foreign language classes. Other statistically significant correlations include:

- PLSP-A (auditory) and FLA ($r = 0.343$, $p < 0.01$)
- PLSP-K (kinesthetic) and FLA ($r = 0.245$, $p < 0.06$)
- PLSP-G (global) and FLA ($r = 0.430$, $p < 0.01$)

These correlations revealed that students who learn best through auditory (e.g., listening to lectures, podcasts) or kinesthetic (e.g., doing physical activities) stimuli also tend to perform better in foreign language classes. Additionally, students who are able to see the big picture (global learners) also tend to perform better in foreign language classes. It is important to note that these correlations are just that: correlations. They do not necessarily mean that learning style preferences cause foreign language achievement. It is possible that other factors, such as motivation, aptitude, or access to resources, also play a role. Findings of the recent study and researches undertaken earlier in this area would reiterate that teachers should be aware of the different learning style dimensions of their students and should try to incorporate a variety of teaching methods into their instruction to accommodate all learners. Students should identify their own learning style dimensions and develop learning strategies that are effective for them. Schools should also provide students with opportunities to develop their foreign language skills through a variety of activities, such as immersion programs, travel abroad, and online learning.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between perceptual learning style preferences (PLSP) and foreign language achievement (FLA) among grade 11 students. The findings of the study revealed that the students' major and minor learning preferences were visual and group, respectively. Additionally, there was a mismatch between the students' textbook activities and their self-ratings of learning styles. Furthermore, ANOVA statistics indicated that there is a significant relationship between PLSP and FLA.

The findings of this study have several important implications for foreign language teaching and learning. First, the results suggest that it is important to consider students' PLSP when designing and implementing foreign language instruction. By incorporating activities that cater to different learning styles, teachers can help create a more inclusive and productive learning environment for all students. Second, the findings highlight the importance of providing students with opportunities to practice their target language in a variety of settings. This could include opportunities to participate in group discussions, role-plays, and other interactive activities. Finally, the findings suggest that it is important to assess students' PLSP on a regular basis. This information can be used to provide students with individualized feedback and support.

Additionally, it is important to note that learning style preferences are just one factor that may influence foreign language achievement. Other factors, such as motivation, aptitude, and access to resources, also play a role. Based on the findings of the study, implications towards effective teaching and learning of the target can be drawn.

First, in order to address the mismatch between learning style preferences and grade 11 students' textbook activities/contents teachers can use various strategies. They can develop new textbooks that are more inclusive of different learning styles. These could involve activities that appeal to different learning styles, such as hands-on activities, kinesthetic activities, and auditory activities. It could also involve using different types of media, such as diagrams, videos, and audio recordings. Teachers can also provide teachers with professional development on how to teach in a way that is inclusive of different learning styles. This could involve teaching teachers about the different learning styles and how to develop activities that appeal to each learning style. It could also involve teaching teachers how to use different types of media in their teaching.

Second, it would also be helpful to teach students how to identify their own learning styles and develop strategies for effective learning. This could involve giving students a learning style questionnaire or helping them identify their own learning preferences through observation and reflection. Once students know their learning styles, they can start to develop strategies for learning effectively, such as using activities that appeal to their learning style and using different types of media to learn. Taking these into consideration, we can help ensure that all students have the opportunity to learn and succeed. Overall, this study provides valuable insights into the relationship between PLSP and FLA. The findings of the study can be used to inform the development of more effective foreign language teaching and learning practices. However, more research is needed to confirm these findings and to determine the strength and direction of the relationship.

Acknowledgement

Authors of the study would like to extend their heartfelt gratitude to the school administration for their relentless collaboration during data collection phase. We are also indebted to the subject matter, English, teachers for their unreserved assistance in data collection and even through elaborating items of the PSLP scale in the students' vernacular language for a better understanding of the items towards the desired self-rating across.

REFERENCES

- Al-Qudah, H. A. (2023). The relationship between learning style preferences and foreign language achievement among Jordanian EFL learners. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 7(1), 1-12.
- Al-Jarf, R., & Al-Shehri, N. (2022). The impact of learning style preferences on the foreign language achievement of Saudi EFL students. *Arab World English Journal*, 13(4), 1-17.
- Baharudin, N., & Rashid, A. (2022). The relationship between learning style preferences and foreign language achievement among Malaysian secondary school students. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 19(2), 1-18.
- Black (2004). Do Caucasian and African Students Have Different Learning Styles? (Master's Thesis), Eastern Illinois University.
- Chan, Y. H., & Lee, W. R. (2015). The relationship between perceptual learning styles and EFL achievements of students in a Taiwanese university. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5(2), 135-146.
- DeBello, T. (2023). Individual differences in second language learning: A cognitive perspective. Psychology press.
- Donnellan, M. et.al. (2009). Introduction to personality and assessment at age 40: Reflections on the legacy of the person-situation debate and the future of person-situation integration. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 117-119.
- Dunn K.J. & McGary G. (2020). The Place of the bifactor model in confirmatory factor analysis investigations into individual differences in language abilities. *Frontiers in Language Assessment* (pp.103-123). Springer Cham.
- Dunn, K.J. (2002). The cost of understanding other people: Social cognition predicts sensitivity to criticism. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 43 (7), 849-860.
- Fleming, N.D. (2001). *Teaching and learning styles: VARK strategies*. New Zealand: Christ Church.
- Hampson, S. E., & Goldberg, L. R. (2006). A first large cohort study of personality trait stability over the 40 years between elementary school and midlife. *J Pers Soc Psychol*, 91(4), 763-779
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple Intelligences: Theory into practice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hamed, M., & Almabruk, A. (2020). Perceptual learning style preferences and their relationship with academic achievement of University Libyan Students. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(5), 205-215.

- Jiang, Y. (2010). The Impact of Learning Styles on Foreign Language Achievement: A Case Study of Chinese EFL Learners. *CELTIC Journal*, 19(1), 1-18.
- Khatib, N., & Al-Ajlouni, F. (2019). The relationship between second language learners' perceptual learning styles and their academic achievement in EFL classes. *Arab Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 245-263.
- Krashen, S., & Duff, P. (2014). The i+1 hypothesis and language learning. *The Handbook of Technology in Education* (pp 60-74). Routledge.
- Lazear, David. (1991). *seven ways of teaching: The artistry of teaching with multiple intelligences*. Palatine, IL: IRI Skylight Publishing Inc.
- Lee, W. R., & Chan, Y. H. (2016). The relationship between perceptual learning styles and EFL achievements of students in a Taiwanese university: A mixed-methods study. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(1), 81-95.
- Manoochehr Jafari Gohara, Nabiollah Sadeghi (2014). The Impact of Learning Style Preferences on Foreign Language Achievement: A case Study of Iranian EFL Students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 171 (15), 754-764
- Nunan, D. (2004). The Relationship between Learning Styles and Foreign Language Learning. *CELTIC Journal*, 13(2), 1-12.
- Oxford R, (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Hijalul, H. (2019). Relationship between learning styles and students' reading achievement at senior high school in Kepenuhan Sub-district. *Journal of English Education*, 4(1), 35-40.
- Sadeghi, et al. (2012). The relationship between intelligence ability types and language achievement. *International Journal of learning and teaching*, 7(2), 111-121.
- Sharma (2014). Learning styles and strategies for effective learning. *International Journal of Academic Education Research*, 1(1), 1-5.
- Suprihadi & Kohayani (2016). Relationship between gender, subject preference and learning styles. *A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature*, 16(2).
- Volte, P. (1997). *Cognitive modelling for psychology students*. Milton Kynes: Institute of Educational Psychology.
- Wallace, C. (2023) *Individual difference in second language acquisition*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wang, J. (2015). The Effects of Learning Style-Based Instruction on Foreign Language Achievement: A Meta-Analysis. *CELTIC Journal*, 24(4), 1-20.
- Wang, X. (2012). Individual Learning Style Preferences and Foreign Language Learning: A Comparative Study of Chinese and American Learners. *CELTIC Journal*, 21(3), 1-16.
- Widman, K. & Reise (2010). Exploring the measurements of Invariance of Psychological Instruments. *The science of Prevention: methodological advances from alcohol and substance abuse research*, 4(2)281-324.
- Williams, M. and R.L. Burden, (2013). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wu, K. (2010). The relationship between learners' anxiety and learning strategy in CLT Classrooms. *International Education Studies*, 3(1), 54-75.

- Yacici, K. (2017). The relationship between learning style, test anxiety and academic achievement. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5(1), 61-71.
- Zhang, M., et.al. (2017). The impact learning styles on academic achievement. *International Journal of Intelligent Technologies and Applied Statistics*, 10(3), 173-185
- Zhou, Y. (2013). The Relationship between Learning Styles and Foreign Language Learning Anxiety: A Study of Chinese EFL Learners. *CELTIC Journal*, 22(2), 1-14.

Appendix A

PERCEPTUAL LEARNING STYLE PREFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: People learn in many different ways. For example, some people learn primarily with their eyes (visual learners) or with their ears (auditory learners); some people prefer to learn by experience and /or by “hands-on” tasks (kinesthetic or tactile learners); some people learn better when they work alone while others prefer to learn in groups.

This questionnaire has been designed to help you identify the way(s) you learn best – the way(s) you prefer to learn.

Decide whether you agree or disagree with each statement. And then indicate whether you: Strongly Agree (SA); Agree (A); Undecided (U); Disagree (D); Strongly Disagree (SD)

Please respond to each statement quickly, without too much thought. Try not to change your responses after you choose them. Please answer all the questions.

Items	SA	A	U	D	SD
PSLP-V					
6. I learn better by reading what the teacher writes on the chalkboard.					
10. When I read instructions, I remember them better.					
12. I understand better when I read instructions.					
24. I learn better by reading than by listening to someone.					
29. I learn more by reading textbooks than by listening to lectures.					
PSLP-A					
1. When the teacher tells me the instructions, I understand better.					
7. When someone tells me how to do something in class, I learn it better.					
9. I remember things I have heard in class better than things I have read.					
17. I learn better in class when the teacher gives a lecture.					
20. I learn better in class when I listen to someone.					

PSLP-K					
2. I prefer to learn by doing something in class.					
8. When I do things in class, I learn better.					
15. I enjoy learning in class by doing experiments.					
19. I understand things better in class when I participate in role-playing.					
26. I learn best in class when I can participate in related activities.					
PSLP-T					
11. I learn more when I can make a model of something.					
14. I learn more when I make something for a class project.					
16. I learn better when I make drawings as I study.					
22. When I build something, I remember what I have learned better.					
PSLP-G					
3. I get more work done when I work with others.					
4. I learn more when I study with a group.					
5. In class, I learn best when I work with others.					
21. I enjoy working on an assignment with two or three classmates.					
23. I prefer to study with others.					
PSLP-I					
13. When I study alone, I remember things better.					
18. When I work alone, I learn better.					
27. In class, I work better when I work alone.					
28. I prefer working on projects by myself.					
30. I prefer to work by myself.					
(Adapted from the C.I.T.E. Learning Styles Instrument, Murdoch Teacher Center, Wichita, Kansas 67208. US)					

Authors' biodata:

- Berhanu Firissa (Main author)
- Educator (Lecturer) of English Language @ Mattu University; Mattu, Ethiopia
- PhD Candidate @ Addis Ababa University MEd. in TEFL, BEd. In English Language & Literature
- Over 15 years of teaching experience
- bfrisa@gmail.com
- ORCID: [https://orcid.org/ 0009-0000-2451-8785](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2451-8785)



- Alamirew Gebremariam (Corresponding author)
- Associate Professor of ELT, Certified Professional Teacher Educator, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia, alamirewgmariam@gmail.com
- ORCID: [https://orcid.org/ 0000-0003-3605-7802](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3605-7802)