

Investigating Personalized Learning in EFL Context at University Level

This study was taken as a part of MA. Thesis that was conducted by:

Marwa Nofer Mohyaldeen

Salahdain Univesity-College of Basic Education

Email: marwanofer51@gmail.com

Assist.Prof. Dr. Tahsin Hussein Rassul

Department of English Language, College of Basic Education,

Salahaddin University-Erbil

Email: tahsin.rassul@su.edu.krd

استلام البحث: ٢٠٢٤/٤/٩ قبول النشر: ٢٠٢٤/٥/٩ تاريخ النشر: ٢٠٢٤/١٠/١

[https://doi.org/ 10.52839/0111-000-083-018](https://doi.org/10.52839/0111-000-083-018)

Abstract

Students have a variety of ways to comprehend and retain information. Students will fall behind when the teacher uses teaching methods, strategies, and techniques based on one size fits all. Students' choice, voice, learning styles, and preferences are ignored. It is thought that there is a lack of personalized learning (PL) in the education field in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI), particularly at the university level. The present study aims to investigate EFL students' satisfaction rate of PL implementation in their classrooms and to investigate the EFL teachers' viewpoints on using PL for educational benefits. It also aims to investigate the extent of implementing PL factors by the EFL teachers. The researcher used the quantitative research method. In addition, the students' questionnaire, teachers' questionnaire, and observation checklist were used as tools to collect data for the study. An analysis of the data was conducted using SPSS version 26. The study participants were 28 EFL teachers and 196 EFL students at the English Language Department in the College of Basic Education at Salahaddin University-Erbil. Besides that, the researcher observed eight EFL modules. The study reveals that PL has many educational benefits, including giving students' flexibility to study at their own pace and adapting the instruction according to each student's needs. In addition, students with disabilities and handicaps will not be deprived of the learning process through personalized learning. It also concludes that PL is implemented at a very low rate in the EFL classrooms at the English Department in the College of Basic Education at Salahaddin University-Erbil. Further, it reveals that EFL teachers minimally implement the factors related to personalize learning in the classroom.

Keywords: Personalized Learning, PL, EFL students, learning styles, Personalized Learning Environment

التحقق في التعلم الشخصي في سياق اللغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية على مستوى الجامعة

اتخذت هذه الدراسة كجزء من رسالة الماجستير التي تم اعدادها من قبل:

مساعد البروفيسور د. تحسين حسين رسول
جامعة صلاح الدين / كلية التربية الأساسية
الباحثة: مروة نوفر محيي الدين
جامعة صلاح الدين / كلية التربية الأساسية

الخلاصة

لدى الطلاب مجموعة متنوعة من الطرق لفهم المعلومات والاحتفاظ بها. سوف يتخلف الطلاب عندما يستخدم المعلم أساليب واستراتيجيات وتقنيات التدريس بناءً على مقياس واحد يناسب الجميع. لأنه يتم تجاهل اختيار الطلاب وصوتهم وأساليب التعلم والتفضيلات بموجب هذا. يُعتقد أن هناك نقصاً في التعلم الشخصي (PL) في مجال التعليم في إقليم كردستان العراق (KRI)، وخاصة على المستوى الجامعي. تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى التحقق من معدل رضا طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية عن تطبيق تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية في فصولهم الدراسية، والتحقق في وجهات نظر معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية حول استخدام تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لتحقيق فوائد تعليمية. ويهدف أيضاً إلى التحقق من مدى تطبيق عوامل تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية من قبل معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية. استخدم الباحثون أساليب البحث الكمي. بالإضافة إلى ذلك تم استخدام استبيان الطلاب واستبيان المعلم وقائمة الملاحظة كأدوات لجمع البيانات للدراسة. تم إجراء تحليل للبيانات باستخدام SPSS الإصدار ٢٦. كان المشاركون في الدراسة ٢٨ معلماً للغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية و ١٩٦ طالباً للغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية في كلية التربية الأساسية بجامعة صلاح الدين - أربيل. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، لاحظ الباحثون ٨ وحدات للغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية. تكشف الدراسة أن التعلم الآلي له العديد من الفوائد التعليمية بما في ذلك منح الطلاب المرونة للدراسة بالسرعة التي تناسبهم، وتكييف التدريس وفقاً لاحتياجات كل طالب. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، لن يتم حرمان الطلاب ذوي الإعاقة والإعاقات من عملية التعلم من خلال التعلم الشخصي. ويخلص أيضاً إلى أن تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية يتم تنفيذه بمعدل منخفض جداً في فصول اللغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية في كلية التربية الأساسية بجامعة صلاح الدين - أربيل. علاوة على ذلك، فإنه يكشف أن معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية يطبقون الحد الأدنى من العوامل المتعلقة بالتعلم الشخصي في الفصل الدراسي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التعلم الشخصي، التعلم الآلي، طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية، أساليب التعلم، بيئة التعلم الشخصية

SECTION ONE

1.1 Introduction

The notion of personalized learning is an educational approach aimed at tailoring instruction to meet individual learning styles, needs, and levels of development. Unlike traditional one-size-fits-all teaching methods, it utilizes technology and flexible teaching strategies to provide students with a tailored learning experience. Personalized learning (PL) has a lot of meanings. However, when broken down into two words and simplified, it can be described as a “personal” approach to “learning”. In this regard, PL is a student-centered approach where the learner takes responsibility for their own learning. So, one of the most important elements in personalized learning is to introduce the student’s voice and choice. Teachers should encourage students to decide what to study, how to study the content in the curriculum, and how to express or communicate their opinions, values, beliefs, and reflections (Nhouyvanisvong,2023). Students become intrinsically motivated to learn as a result of personalized learning. Instead of being told what to learn, students can choose an independent path from a variety of options. On top of that, students have an intrinsic drive to succeed because what they choose tends to be deeply important to them.

1.2 The Study Problem

Over time many things have evolved, thus education has shown progress too. Students have a variety of ways to comprehend and retain information. The students will fall behind when the teacher uses teaching methods, strategies, and techniques based on one size fits all. Because students' choice, voice, learning styles, and preferences are ignored thereby. It is thought that there is a lack of personalized learning in Kurdistan Region of Iraq, particularly at the university level. Therefore, this study has the following aims and questions:

The present study aims at investigating:

1. The EFL students’ satisfaction rate of PL implementation in their classrooms.
2. The EFL teachers’ viewpoints on using PL for educational benefits.
3. The extent of implementing PL factors by the EFL teachers in the classroom.

Furthermore, in order to achieve the aims of this study, the following questions were used:

1. How satisfied are the EFL students with PL implementation in their classrooms?
2. What are the EFL teachers’ viewpoints on using PL for educational benefits?
3. To what extent do the EFL teachers implement the PL factors in the classroom?

1.3 Significance of the Study

The study is helpful for EFL teachers to have a clear understanding of the concept of personalized learning in education. Through using PL, teachers can simply adapt educational materials to students' unique needs and learning styles. The study is also significant in highlighting the crucial role of incorporating technology into PL

because EFL teachers need to be aware of the latest technological developments in order to consider implementing them. Further, the study presents an advanced and latest machine-based tool called Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a recent tool for personalized learning. The study also clarifies how students prefer to learn these days, especially at university. Furthermore, the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research can benefit from study recommendations at all Iraqi universities.

1.4. Definition of Basic Terms

Personalized Learning (PL): Pontual et al. (2018) define personalized learning (PL) as an effective approach that is intended to tailor learning to each student's unique abilities, needs, knowledge, skills, learning styles, interests, and can improve student motivation, engagement, and awareness.

Educational Technology (EdTech): It refers to the application of technology within the field of education. It includes a broad range of tools, systems, aids, resources, tactics, and strategies that facilitate the process of acquiring knowledge and skills in educational settings (Kelly,2010, p.22).

Learner Autonomy: Holec (1981, p.3) defines learner autonomy as the student's ability to manage their own learning and to take responsibility for all decisions pertaining to all facets of learning.

Learning Styles: Coffield et al. (2004) define learning styles as a set of an individual's preferences for learning information based on cognitive, emotional, and environmental factors.

SECTION TWO

2.1 Personalized Learning (PL)

Evanick (2023) defines personalized learning as an approach in which learning is tailored to the needs, preferences, interests, skills, and abilities of students. With this approach, students have greater control over their learning process and can proceed at their own speed. Basham et al. (2016) state that personalized learning is an educational approach characterized by its novel nature, as it customizes the learning process to accommodate the distinct requirements, goals, inclinations, and talents of each student. What's more, personalized learning (PL) promotes the development of self-directed exploration and independence in the learning of information, thus it empowers students to assume responsibility for their own learning journey.

2.2 Emergence of Personalized Learning

The concept of personalized learning is not new in the field of education. It has been around in various forms for many years (Brown,2019). The teaching machine that was first invented by Sidney L. Pressey in the mid-1920s was one of the earliest examples of personalized learning. The machine was programmed so that the user could locate the answers to the questions later (Solanki,2019).

Pressey's teaching method was brought back to life by B.F.Skinner approximately thirty years later. Behavioral psychologist B.F. Skinner developed a teaching machine in the 1950s in order to automate and individualize instruction in order to allow students to learn at their own pace. Skinner's 'programmed learning' was further developed in the 1960s and has been successfully implemented in a variety of classroom settings (Allen and Seaman, 2016). Some educators consider that the concept of personalized learning was first introduced by Fred Keller (Sherman, 1992). Therefore, Keller created Personalized a System of Instruction (PSI) that enabled learners to gain knowledge and master content on their own schedule and to be assessed upon completion of each unit (Crosbie and Kelly, 1993). Furthermore, the 21st century has seen a surge in enrollment for online courses. Thus, many scholars think that PL is one of the best ways to personalize someone's learning, especially when the global pandemic catalyzed an inevitable shift toward digital learning because the pandemic prevented a face-to-face learning process (Andriani et al., 2021).

2.3 Advantages of Personalized Learning

Learning that is personalized focuses on self-monitoring, learner engagement, and progress tracking, providing students with the opportunity to learn at the pace they choose and enjoy it. With PL, learners are able to actively participate in the process of acquiring knowledge and applying it effectively (Gao, 2014). Individualized immediate feedback and assistive services are available to learners through PL to

give learners the support they need to deepen their understanding; these services may enable learners to identify areas in which they need additional assistance

(Lalitha and Sreeja, 2020). Personalized learning provides a variety of options, among them collaborative projects and self-paced learning (Huang, 2011). Cheung and Slavin (2012) think that adaptive learning platforms and intelligent tutoring systems in PL make it possible to identify students' strengths and areas for improvement, providing feedback and individualized learning plans. Stefanic (2023) states that personalized learning provides differentiated instruction and tailored accommodations, allowing students with disabilities to obtain knowledge at their own pace and in a manner that is convenient for them. Adaptive technologies enhance their learning experience.

2.4 Basic Elements of Personalized Learning

Personalized Learning has a number of essential elements which are:

2.4.1 Content

To tailor the content for any individual, the teacher can focus attention on specific content, filter out unwanted material, and provide alternative pathways. Each student gets a learning plan based on the way they learn, their knowledge, skills, and interests (Evanick,2023).

2.4.2 Learner Profile

The learner profile consists of a set of information concerning a particular learner. Its purpose is to provide a snapshot of the learner's present level of progress and potential for future growth with regard to self-learning. The profile offers information regarding the preferences, interests, and abilities of the learner. Moreover, it provides a record of the goals and learning plans, it also records the steps taken to fulfill the learning plans. Additionally, the results of the assessment are recorded. Learners may prefer electronic or digital versions of learner profiles because they are tech-savvy and can store information electronically as Word files, Excel, audio files, videos, tablets, or any other electronic device (Gardner and Miller ,1999, p.34).

2.4.3 Student Voice and Choice

Davies (2008) emphasizes the importance of encouraging learners' voice and choice. Whenever students are given a voice over how they learn and a choice over how they actively participate, their motivation to learn increases.

2.4.4 Student Agency

The term student agency describes the learner's capacity to define a goal, analyze, and take responsibility for affecting change. It involves taking action rather than being subjected to action; shaping rather than being shaped; and making responsible actions and decisions rather than complying with those made by others. Additionally, it involves the student playing an active role through a voice and often a choice during the learning process (Tran and Vu, 2017).

2.4.5 Environment

PL can take place everywhere. It is not only restricted to the classroom. Sometimes a student might want to complete his activity in the garden through online platforms, concurrently another student might want to do her activity at the table with her team in a classroom. In this way, two types of learning environments exist in PL: the classroom and the virtual learning environment (VLE). Learning delivery can be enhanced by combining classroom and online platforms. The PL environment is colorful and includes different aids to cater to the different learning styles of each student. As well, in a PL environment, learners contribute significantly to their own learning since they have a voice in developing close relationships with other students and teachers (Bray and McClaskey, 2013, p.15).

2.5 PL Versus Traditional Teaching Methods and Learning

Personalized learning distinguishes itself by its own approach to five variables: instructional objectives, mastery level, resources, learning activities, and time. When learners possess a significant level of autonomy with respect to these five variables, this may demonstrate that education is tailored, differentiated, or personalized (Cruickshank et al., 2006, p.9). Traditional teaching requires learners to physically present themselves in the classroom, interact with teachers face-to-face, and socialize with their peers (Singh, 2023). Friend et al. (2017) believe that PL consistently prioritizes the needs and interests of students. In simple words, students possess agency in determining the course of their own educational journey. On the other hand, student agency is nonexistent in traditional teaching.

Brown (2023) proclaims that students have flexibility in where to sit and how to sit in personalized learning classrooms. Contrary to this, and according to Fernandez et al. (2011), there are several options for arranging seats in traditional methods of teaching, such as (traditional, roundtable, group pods, pair pods, double horseshoe, semicircle, or horseshoe). In line with Keamy et al. (2007, p.73), PL pertains to the incorporation of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) in classrooms. On the contrary, ICT doesn't exist in the traditional way of teaching and learning.

In personalized learning, technology plays a significant role in assessment. The teacher can use technology to assess students' learning and enable them to reflect on their own learning, but the students have to take a formal exam in the traditional method of teaching (Alam, 2022, pp. 395-406.). The traditional teaching methods depend on teacher-centered learning that makes students passive. Whereas, personalized learning depends on student-centered learning where learners are active and the teacher's role is to direct the student's learning (Siren, 2018).

SECTION THREE

3.1 Study Samples

The study was conducted during the academic year 2023-2024 at the English Language Department-College of Basic Education, Salahaddin University-Erbil. The total number of EFL students who participated in the students' questionnaire was (196) and the total number of EFL instructors who participated in the teachers' questionnaire was (28) that is considered suitable for obtaining the data (Creswell and Creswell, 2018, p.26). The distributed number of students from using stratified random sampling was in this way: the first grade included 54 EFL students, the second grade included 52 EFL students, the third grade included 43 EFL students, the fourth grade included 47 EFL students. In addition, the convenience sampling was used to select the modules of EFL classes as follows; the first grade included (Listening and Speaking, Academic Skills), the second grade included (Academic Writing, Diversity Education), the third grade included (Translation, Advanced Speaking), the fourth grade involved (Micro-Teaching, Textbook Analysis).

3.2 The Study Tools

The researchers used students' questionnaire, teachers' questionnaire and observation checklist as tools for collecting data to obtain the clear aims of this study. They constructed the questionnaire items depending on the literature review part and general information that was gained by searching while conducting the study. Furthermore, the checklist items were generated by the researchers based on the literature review and general information gained while searching during the study.

3.3 The Validity of Tools

For face validity and content validity, the researcher submitted the questionnaires to the jury members who were specialized in the field of applied linguistics, English language teaching, and linguistics. The jury members consisted of (13) specialized EFL instructors. They reviewed the content of both students and teachers' questionnaires and provided their feedbacks. Further, they made some modifications. The observation checklist items were also revised by the jury members.

3.4 The Reliability of Tools

Concerning the reliability of both the EFL students' questionnaire and the EFL teachers' questionnaire. The researcher used Cronbach's alpha, because it is considered the most commonly used internal consistency measure (Tavakol and Dennick, 2011). Furthermore, for the reliability of the items in observation checklist, the researcher used Cronbach's alpha. The internal consistency for students' questionnaire is 0.739, and for teachers is 0.894. As well, the internal consistency for the observation checklist items is 0.752.

3.5 Results and Discussions

3.5.1. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Questionnaire, Results and Discussions

After dividing the items of students' questionnaire into eight factors from the factor analysis. Factor analysis belongs to a group of statistical techniques used for data reduction and summarization (Blbas et al., 2017). Frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation (SD) were found for all factors. The students' questionnaire included (29) items. The items consisted of a five-point Likert scale starting from 1 which indicates 'strongly disagree' to 5 which indicates 'strongly agree'.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Responses for the First Factor

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	Standard deviation
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 6	104	53.1%	92	46.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.47	0.50
Item 19	115	58.7%	81	41.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.41	0.49
Item 17	76	38.8%	119	60.7%	1	.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.62	0.50
Item 4	136	69.4%	25	12.8%	35	17.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.48	0.78
Item 22	54	27.6%	126	64.3%	16	8.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.81	0.57
Total											1.56	0.57

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of the students' responses for the first factor. Item 6 reads, 'I have the chance to present a topic since there aren't many students in the classroom'. The mean of this item is (1.47) which it indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with presenting a topic in the classroom. Item 19 reads, 'I have a learner profile that includes all my information'. The mean of this item is (1.41) indicating that the students do not have a learner profile that includes all their detailed information such as academic history, learning preferences, strengths, weaknesses, etc., and it indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with a learner profile. In this respect, Gardner and Miller (1999, p.34) highlight the importance of the learner profile that offers information regarding the preferences, interests, and abilities of the learner. Item 17 reads, 'I find the classroom chairs to be comfy' the mean of this item is (1.62), which indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their

satisfaction with the classroom chairs. Item 4 reads ‘The teacher considers my voice when I want to choose a topic for presentation’. The mean of this item is (1.48), it indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with their voices to be taken into consideration by the EFL teachers. The last item is 22 that reads, ‘I am allowed to assess my classmates’. The mean of this item is (1.81), it indicates that the students show disagreement regarding their satisfaction with being allowed to assess their classmates. The total average of the students’ responses for the first factor is in this way: the mean value is 1.56 and the standard deviation SD is 0.57.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Responses for the Second Factor

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	Standard deviation
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 21	52	26.5%	108	55.1%	35	17.9%	1	.5%	0	0.0%	1.92	0.68
Item 18	75	38.3%	115	58.7%	6	3.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.65	0.54
Item 1	97	49.5%	99	50.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.51	0.50
Item 25	37	18.9%	147	75.0%	12	6.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.87	0.48
Item 8	2	1.0%	70	35.7%	102	52.0%	22	11.2%	0	0.0%	2.73	0.66
Total											1.94	0.57

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of the students’ responses for the second factor. Item 21 reads, ‘I have flexibility in choosing where and how to sit in the classroom’. The mean of this item is (1.92) indicating it indicates that the students show disagreement regarding their satisfaction with having flexibility of sitting the way they feel comfortable. In this regard, Brown (2023) proclaims that students have flexibility in where to sit and how to sit in personalized learning classrooms. Item 18 reads, ‘The classroom’s lighting system is appropriate’. The mean of this item is (1.65) indicating that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with the lighting system of the classrooms. Item 1 reads, ‘The teacher asks about my goals before starting each lesson’. The mean of this item is (1.51), which indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with being asked to set their goals for each lesson. Item 25, ‘The teacher

allows me to reflect on my own learning'. The mean of this item is (1.87) indicates that the students show disagreement regarding their satisfaction with being allowed to reflect on their own learning. In this regard, Helyer (2015) declares that if students finish their tasks without engaging in reflection, their learning outcomes will not advance. Students reflect on their learning to improve and obtain a deeper understanding of the material they have learned. The last item is 8 has the highest average 'The teacher facilitates the material if I find it difficult'. The mean of this item is (2.73) indicating that the students are unsure whether the teacher facilitates the material when they find it difficult. The total average of the students' responses for the second factor is in this way: the mean value is 1.94 and the standard deviation SD is 0.57.

	Strongly disagree		disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	Standard deviation
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 7	97	49.5%	99	50.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.51	0.50
Item 2	142	72.4%	54	27.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.28	0.45
Item 9	102	52.0%	94	48.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.48	0.50
Item 26	136	69.4%	54	27.6%	6	3.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.34	0.53
Item 28	28	14.3%	73	37.2%	26	13.3%	52	26.5%	17	8.7%	2.78	1.23
Total											1.68	0.64

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Responses for the Third Factor

Table 3. shows the descriptive statistics of the students' responses for the third factor. Item 7 reads, 'Lessons are adapted to my unique learning styles and preferences'. The mean of this item is (1.51), which indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with the adaptation of lessons to their unique learning styles and preferences, and the lessons are not tailored to their needs and interests. Item 2 reads, 'I set my learning goals by myself', the mean of this item is (1.28), which indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with being taught by the teachers to set their learning goals by themselves. Ruman (2023) highlights that it is important to know what and how the students wish to learn, and what kind of learning goals they wish to achieve, as well as enabling them to set their own learning goals. Item 9 reads, 'I have a chance to progress at my own pace on the EFL (English as a Foreign Language) course'. The

mean of this item is (1.48), which indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with having the opportunity and freedom to progress at their own pace. Item 26 reads, 'The teacher helps me become more self-reliant in the learning process'. The mean of this item is (1.34) indicates that students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with the EFL teachers' help to enable them to become autonomous learners. The last item is 28 has the highest average reads 'The teacher guides me to use digital resources, such as laptops, smartphones, and tablets to increase my EFL learning, and not only depend on the class materials, PPT slides and handouts'. The mean of this item is (2.78), which indicates that the students show their neutrality and being unsure concerning this item. The total average of the students' responses for the third factor is in this way: the mean value is 1.68 and the standard deviation SD is 0.64.

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	Standard deviation
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 24	29	14.8%	126	64.3%	41	20.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2.06	0.60
Item 3	160	81.6%	34	17.3%	2	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.19	0.42
Item 12	35	17.9%	55	28.1%	41	20.9%	65	33.2%	0	0.0%	2.69	1.11
Total											1.98	0.71

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Responses for the Fourth Factor

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics of the students' responses for the fourth factor. Item 24 reads, 'The teacher consistently provides immediate feedback'. The mean of this item is (2.06) indicates that the students show disagreement regarding their satisfaction with receiving immediate feedback unceasingly. With respect to the importance of giving immediate feedback to students, Lalitha and Sreeja (2020) assert that it increases students' educational experiences. Item 3 reads, 'The teacher adequately tailors the content according to my learning needs and interests'. The mean of this item is (1.19) indicates that the students show a strong disagreement

regarding their satisfaction with the content adaptation. The last item is 12 has the highest average reads, 'I am allowed to do the activities with a group of my friends'. The mean of this item is (2.69) indicates that that the students show their neutrality regarding being allowed to do activities together with their friends in a group. The total average of the students' responses for the fourth factor is in this way: the mean value is 1.98 and the standard deviation SD is 0.71.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Responses for the Fifth Factor

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	Stand ard deviat ion
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 11	55	28.1%	3	1.5%	59	30.1%	72	36.7%	7	3.6%	2.86	1.28
Item 5	141	71.9%	55	28.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.28	0.45
Item 14	28	14.3%	85	43.4%	45	23.0%	37	18.9%	1	.5%	2.48	0.97
Overall											2.21	0.90

Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics of the students' responses for the fifth factor. Item 11 reads, 'The teacher offers different types of activities in the classroom'. The mean of this item is (2.86) indicates that the students show their neutrality concerning their satisfaction with having different types of activities in the classroom. Item 5 reads, 'I have to master the topic of the course before moving on to the next one'. The mean of this item is (1.28) indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with mastering the topic before moving on to the next one. In this regard, Chargois (2013) highlights the importance of mastering a topic before moving on to the next one, as it ensures a strong understanding of the material. The last item is 14 has the highest average and reads 'The teacher assists me when I find an activity is too challenging to complete'. The mean of this item is (2.48), which indicates that the students show disagreement regarding their satisfaction with the teachers' involvement in facilitating challenging activities. The total average of the students' responses for the fifth factor is in this way: the mean value is 2.21 and the standard deviation SD is 0.90.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Responses for the Sixth Factor

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	Standard deviation
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 23	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	21	10.7%	79	40.3%	96	49.0%	4.38	0.67
Item 29	94	48.0%	102	52.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.52	0.50
Item 27	94	48.2%	100	51.3%	0	0.0%	1	.5%	0	0.0%	1.53	0.53
Total											2.48	0.57

Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics of the students' responses for the sixth factor. Item 23 has the highest average reads, 'The ongoing assessment enhances my language learning'. The mean of this item is (4.38) indicates that the students show a strong agreement regarding their satisfaction with the ongoing assessment in increasing their language learning. Item 29 reads, 'I know what artificial intelligence (AI) is because the teacher clarified the usefulness of properly using it to improve my own learning'. The mean of this item is (1.52) indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with their information concerning the benefit of artificial intelligence in improving their learning. The last item is 27 reads, 'The teacher uses the learning management system platforms to enable me to see my own quiz grades and progress'. The mean of this item is (1.53) indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with the use of LMS platforms by the EFL teachers. Concerning this point, Cole and Foster (2007, p.340) emphasize on the advantage of LMS platform such as Moodle in providing students with online access to quizzes, as it can be integrated into a curriculum through which actual quizzes and tasks are supplemented in an online environment. The total average of the students' responses for the sixth factor is in this way, the mean value is 2.48 and the standard deviation SD is 0.57.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Responses for the Seventh Factor

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	Standard deviation
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 15	19	9.7%	113	57.7%	64	32.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2.23	0.61

Item 16	113	57.7%	76	38.8%	7	3.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.46	0.57
Item 13	2	1.0%	96	49.0%	95	48.5%	3	1.5%	0	0.0%	2.51	0.55
Total											2.06	0.58

Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics of the students' responses for the seventh factor. Item 15 reads, 'The activities are connected with my real-life events'. The mean of this item is (2.23), which indicates that the students show disagreement regarding their satisfaction with the type of activities in the classroom. Item 16 reads, 'I honestly believe that the classroom setup motivates and helps me to enjoy learning'. The mean of this item is (1.46) indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with the way the classrooms are designed. The last item is 13 has the highest average reads, 'The teacher assigns the activities including problem-solving'. The mean of this item is (2.51) indicates that the students show disagreement regarding their satisfaction with the assignment of activities that require the use of critical thinking. Regarding this point, Morable (2009) states that in PL classes, students participate in a variety of activities, including problem-solving by taking into consideration their levels and learning styles. The total average of the students' responses for the seventh factor is in this way: the mean value is 2.06 and the standard deviation SD is 0.58.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Responses for the Eighth Factor

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	Stand ard deviat ion
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 10	126	64.3%	70	35.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.36	0.48
Item 20	17	8.7%	48	24.5%	130	66.3%	1	.5%	0	0.0%	2.59	0.65
Total											1.97	0.57

Table 8 shows the descriptive statistics of the students' responses for the eighth factor. Item 10 reads, 'I construct new knowledge based on my pre-existing knowledge'. The mean of this item is (1.36) indicates that the students show a strong disagreement regarding their satisfaction with being able to develop new knowledge from their prior experience. Item 20 has the highest average reads, 'The teacher uses different aids while explaining a topic'. The mean of this item is (2.59) indicates that the students show disagreement regarding their satisfaction with the utilization of various teaching aids by EFL teachers. In this regard, Bray and McClaskey

(2016, pp.15-18) insist that the PL environment is full of aids to cater to the different students' learning styles. The total average of the students' respondent for the eighth factor is in this way: the mean value is 1.97 and the standard deviation SD is 0.57. As a whole, the results of the students' questionnaire confirm that EFL students' satisfaction rate of PL implementation in their classrooms was low.

3.5.2 Descriptive Statistics of the Teachers' Questionnaire, Results and Discussions

After dividing the items of teachers' questionnaire into five factors from the factor analysis, frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation SD were found for all factors. The teachers' questionnaire includes (20) items. The items consisted of a five-point Likert scale starting from 1, which indicates 'strongly disagree' to 5, which indicates 'strongly agree'. The teachers' questionnaire consists of (20) items.

Table 9. Descriptive Statistics of Teacher's Responses for the First Factor

	S. disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		S. agree		Mean	Std. Deviation
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 17	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	13	46.4%	14	50.0%	4.429	0.690
Item 16	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	14	50.0%	13	46.4%	4.393	0.685
Item 5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	11	39.3%	16	57.1%	4.536	0.576
Item 4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	11	39.3%	16	57.1%	4.536	0.576
Total											4.473	0.632

Table 9 shows the descriptive statistics of the teacher's responses for the first factor. Item 17 reads, 'I consider performance assessment in PL classes to be very helpful in offering a more authentic measure of student learning'. The mean of this item is (4.429) indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement about performance assessment in PL classes that provides a more genuine measure of student learning. This finding accords with O'Donoghue's (2009) statement that performance assessment determines learners' ability to put their knowledge and skills into a real-world context. Item 16 reads, 'Summative assessment helps me to determine whether EFL students have met the learning objectives and to figure out areas for improvement'. The mean of this item is (4.393) which indicates that EFL teachers show a strong agreement about the benefit of summative assessment in determining if the learning objectives are met by the EFL students or not, as well as in identifying areas for development. Item 5 has the highest

average reads 'PL allows for more effective adaptation to individual learning styles in the EFL classroom'. The mean of this item is (4.536), which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement regarding PL that has a crucial role in accommodating the diverse learning preferences and styles of students in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom. Item 4 also has the highest average reads, 'Teachers practice the changes based on variables, such as goals, content, learning activities, resources, students' performance levels, time, and pacing' the mean of this item is (4.536) which indicates that EFL teachers show a strong agreement about changes that are practiced by them based on variables such as goals, content, learning activities, resources, the performance level of students, time, and pace. The total average of the teachers' responses for the first factor is in this way: the mean value is 4.473 and the standard deviation SD is 0.632.

Table 10 Descriptive Statistics of Teacher's Responses for the Second Factor

	S. disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		S. agree		Mean	Std. Deviation
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	9	32.1%	18	64.3%	4.607	0.567
Item 6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14	50.0%	14	50.0%	4.500	0.509
Item 1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	12	42.9%	15	53.6%	4.500	0.577
Item 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	6	21.4%	21	75.0%	4.714	0.535
Item 3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	46.4%	15	53.6%	4.536	0.508
Total											4.571	0.539

Table 10 shows the descriptive statistics of the teacher's responses for the second factor. Item 2 reads, 'PL allows for flexibility in adapting content to meet the needs of unique individuals'. The mean of this item is (4.607), which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement about personalized learning that allows for flexibility in customizing the content to meet each of the student's needs, and thus it enables teachers to adjust the content of instruction to suit the individual learning profiles of students. Item 6 reads, 'Personalized learning helps students utilize their previous knowledge as the foundation for new learning'. The mean of this item is (4.500), which indicates that the EFL teachers show agreement about PL that has benefit in encouraging learners to build upon their existing knowledge and experiences and engage in new learning. This result is compatible with that of Driscoll (2005, p.76), who thinks that PL helps students build new knowledge from their pre-existing knowledge and experiences through constructivism theory. Item 1 reads, 'It seems to

me that the implementation of PL aligns well with the learning goals of the EFL courses'. The mean of this item is (4.500) which indicates that the EFL teachers show agreement on using PL in EFL courses because it is concerned with equipping learners with the competencies and language skills necessary in EFL courses. This way, PL aligns with the learning goals that students should achieve in the EFL courses. Item 7 has the highest average reads, 'PL engages students in different activities in the English learning process'. The mean of this item is (4.714) which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement on the students' engagement in various English language learning activities through the use of PL because it engages students in a variety of activities throughout the English language learning process such as interactive language games, authentic language tasks, project-based learning, and activities that involve the four English language skills of the English language. And item 3 reads, 'PL fosters a deeper understanding of EFL content among students'. The mean of this item is (4.536), which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement on the benefit of PL in greater content comprehension, as PL helps the EFL students to gain a greater understanding of the educational materials that are designed in ways that cater to their unique needs, preferences, level, and abilities. The total average of the teachers' responses for the second factor is in this way: the mean value is 4.571 and the standard deviation SD is 0.539.

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics of Teacher's Responses for the Third Factor

	S. disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		S. agree		Mean	Std. Deviation
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 15	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	14	50.0%	13	46.4%	4.429	0.573
Item 12	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	12	42.9%	15	53.6%	4.500	0.577
Item 11	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15	53.6%	13	46.4%	4.464	0.508
Item 14	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	39.3%	17	60.7%	4.607	0.497
Total											4.500	0.539

Table 11 shows the descriptive statistics of the teacher's responses for the third factor. Item 15 reads, 'Formative assessments in PL can assist the teacher in adjusting teaching strategies to better meet the needs of each student'. The mean of this item is (4.429), which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement on the advantage of formative assessment in helping teachers to differentiate their instruction. Item 12 reads 'Students with disabilities and handicaps will not be deprived of the learning process through personalized learning'. The mean of this item is (4.500), which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement on the benefit of PL that is highly helpful for learners with disabilities and impairments. This result comes in accordance with that of Stefanic's (2023) finding, who maintains that PL empowers students with disabilities to receive the necessary support in order to thrive academically and fulfill their goals. Item 11 reads 'PL helps create a positive, diversified, and motivating learning environment for EFL students'. The mean of this item is (4.464), which indicates that EFL teachers show a strong agreement on the benefit of PL in contributing to establishing a diversified, positive and inspiring learning environment for EFL learners. And item 14 has the highest average reads 'In PL, diagnostic assessment pinpoints the student's strengths and weaknesses that help the teacher meet the student's unique needs'. The mean of this item is (4.607), which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement on the benefit of diagnostic assessment in making it clear for the teachers to pinpoint each student's weaknesses and strengths. The total average of the teachers' responses for the third factor is in this way, the mean value is 4.500 and the standard deviation SD is 0.539.

Table 12 Descriptive Statistics of Teacher's Responses for the Fourth Factor

	S. disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		S. agree		Mean	Std. Deviation
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 19	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15	53.6%	13	46.4%	4.464	0.508
Item 8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	13	46.4%	14	50.0%	4.464	0.576
Item 18	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15	53.6%	13	46.4%	4.464	0.508
Item 20	4	14.3%	6	21.4%	6	21.4%	4	14.3%	8	28.6%	3.214	1.449
Total											4.152	0.760

Table 12 shows the descriptive statistics of the teacher's responses for the fourth factor. Item 19 has the highest average reads. 'As a teacher, I believe that my role is to be a coach and facilitator. I walk between groups of learners to simplify the discussions, help students discover, monitor their progress, and help them set their goals', the mean of this item is (4.464), which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement on the role of the teacher in PL that the teacher has different roles in PL classes such as a couch, facilitator, monitor, guide and observer. This finding is in line with that of Blaschke (2019), who emphasizes that the teacher takes the role of a "guide-on-the-side" in PL. It means rather than being the central source of knowledge, teachers guide and support students as they navigate their personalized learning journeys. Item 8 has the highest average reads. PL helps effectively address the diverse language proficiency levels of EFL students'. The mean of this item is (4.464), which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement on the benefit of PL in dealing with students' different levels of English language proficiency such as beginner, intermediate, and advanced. Item 18 has the highest average reads 'I believe that self-assessment advances student's metacognitive skills that are necessary for lifelong learning'. The mean of this item is (4.464), which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement on self-assessment in empowering learners to be actively engaged in monitoring, evaluation, and regulating their own learning process. And item 20 reads 'I believe that it is better to use PL with college students rather than with school students'. The mean of this item is (3.214), which indicates that EFL teachers show their neutrality, and they are unsure in determining whether PL is more effective when implemented with college students than with school students. The total average of the teachers' responses for the fourth factor is in this way: the mean value is 4.152 and the standard deviation SD is 0.760.

Table 13. Descriptive Statistics of Teacher's Responses for the Fifth Factor

	S. disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		S. agree		Mean	Std. Deviation
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 9	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	1	53.6%	1	42.9%	4.393	0.567
Item 13	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	1	39.3%	1	57.1%	4.536	0.576
Item 10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	10.7%	1	39.3%	1	50.0%	4.393	0.685
Total											4.440	0.609

Table 13 shows the descriptive statistics of the teacher's responses for the fifth factor. Item 9 reads 'PL encourages EFL students to be independent and lifelong learners'. The mean of this item is (4.393) which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement on the benefit of PL in creating lifelong learners. Because it enables the student to be a problem solver, autonomous, creative and self-directed learner. Item 13 has the highest average reads 'As a recent technology tool of PL, artificial intelligence (AI) increases learning outcomes through the provision of engaging experiences, adaptive material, and analytical tools', the mean of this item is (4.536) which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement on AI that has a great role in increasing learning outcomes as a new technology tool. Item 10 reads 'I think the student's agency is very important in PL to produce more self-assured learners'. The mean of this item is (4.393), which indicates that the EFL teachers show a strong agreement on the benefit of student agency in PL that can produce confident learners. This finding accords with that of Tran and Vu (2017), who believe that the student agency involves students in making independent decisions and choices rather than accepting those determined by others. The total average of the teachers' responses for the fifth factor is in this way: the mean value is 4.440 and the standard deviation SD is 0.609. As a whole, the results of the teachers' questionnaire confirm that EFL teachers had a positive point of view on using PL for educational benefits.

3.5.3 Descriptive Statistics of the Observation Checklist, Results and Discussion

The observation checklist consisted of five factors related to PL; each of the factors includes four items.

Frequency, percentage, mean, and SD were found for all items of PL factors. The observation checklist consisted of a five-point Likert scale starting from 1 which indicates 'not at all implemented' to 5 which indicates 'fully implemented'.

Table 14 Descriptive Statistics of Observation Checklist

	Not at all implemented		Slightly implemented		Moderately implemented		Largely implemented		Fully implemented		Mean	Std. Deviation
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Item 1	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.375	0.518
Item 2	3	37.5%	5	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.625	0.518

										%		
Item 3	1	12.5%	2	25.0%	5	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2.500	0.756
Item 4	3	37.5%	4	50.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.750	0.707
Total	Learnin g material preferen ces and goals										1.813	0.625
Item 5	7	87.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.125	0.354
Item 6	3	37.5%	4	50.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.750	0.707
Item 7	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	5	62.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	2.875	0.641
Item 8	1	12.5%	5	62.5%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2.125	0.641
Total	Instruct ional consider ations										1.969	0.586
Item 9	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.375	0.518
Item 10	7	87.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.125	0.354

Item 11	7	87.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.125	0.354
Item 12	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.000	0.000
Total	Classroom environment										1.156	0.306
Item 13	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	0	0.0%	3.375	0.518
Item 14	4	50.0%	4	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.500	0.535
Item 15	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.000	0.000
Item 16	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.000	0.000
Total	Assessment										1.719	0.263
Item 17	1	12.5%	2	25.0%	5	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2.500	0.756
Item 18	1	12.5%	3	37.5%	4	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2.375	0.744
Item 19	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	6	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2.750	0.463

Item 20	4	50.0%	4	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.500	0.535
Total	Feedback and reflection										2.281	0.624
Overall 1											1.788	0.481

Table 14 shows the descriptive statistics of the observation checklist that were gained from the data collected by the researcher of this study while observing 8 EFL modules that were Listening and Speaking, Academic Skills, Academic Writing, Diversity Education, Translation, Advanced Speaking, Micro-Teaching, and Textbook Analysis. The results are discussed as follows based on the mean value:

Factor 1. Learning material preferences and goals: The total average mean value for the learning material preferences and goals factor is 1.813 and SD is 0.625. The overall results of factor 1 show that EFL teachers slightly implement this PL factor which is related to learning material preferences and goals.

Factor 2. Instructional considerations: The total average mean for the instructional considerations factor is 1.969 and the SD is 0.586. The overall results of factor 2 show that EFL teachers slightly implement this PL factor which is related to instructional considerations.

Factor 3. Classroom environment: The total average mean for the classroom environment factor is 1.156 and SD is 0.306. The overall results of factor 3 show that EFL teachers hardly implement this PL factor which is related to the classroom environment.

Factor 4. Assessment: The total average mean for the assessment factor is 1.719 and SD is 0.263. The overall results of factor 4 show that EFL teachers don't implement this PL factor which is related to the assessment at all, in other words, EFL teachers mostly depend on the summative traditional paper and pencil exam, and the assessments are not differentiated, as well as there is lack of technology for in the assessment process.

Factor 5. Feedback and reflection: The total average mean for the feedback and reflection factor is 2.281 and the SD is 0.624. The overall results of factor 5 show that EFL teachers slightly implement this PL factor which is related to feedback and reflection.

As a whole, the results of the observation checklist confirm that the extent of implementing PL factors such as (learning material preferences and goals, instructional considerations, classroom environment, assessment, feedback and reflection) by the EFL teachers in the classroom was slight.

SECTION FOUR

4.1 Conclusions

The researchers concluded that, the PL is very important in teaching EFL students and has many educational benefits, such as meeting students' unique learning styles and needs. PL addresses the diverse language proficiency levels of EFL students. It encourages students to be independent and lifelong learners, as well as not only to depend on their teacher. In addition, students with disabilities and handicaps will not be deprived of the learning process through PL. Moreover, with the implementation of personalized learning, the students will not fall behind in their learning process. Besides all these academic benefits of PL, the researchers also concluded that PL is rarely implemented at the English Language Department in the College of Basic Education at Salahaddin University-Erbil. The reasons for this low rate implementation are the lack of technology and the lack of flexibility with students, as technology has the greatest role in PL. In addition, students don't have their own learner profile, and student agency is neglected. As well, the classroom environment doesn't look suitable for completely implementing personalized learning. Since personalized learning has elements and factors, the researchers found that the factors are implemented at a very low rate in the EFL classes. As a result, the PL cannot be accomplished until all factors are included in the teaching and learning process, such as: considering students learning goals, a very good classroom environment, different instructional strategies, conducting different assessments, as well as giving feedback, and involving students to reflect on their own learning process.

4.2 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings and results of the present study, the researchers recommend the following points:

1. Because of the ever-evolving nature of education, it is time for implementing personalized learning, especially for teaching English as a foreign language (EFL). Students will not become lifelong learners if they are only taught through traditional teaching methods.
2. First and foremost, a special budget should be allocated for training school teachers and university instructors to use PL, because many teachers do not have enough information about how to implement this approach.
3. The most important thing in PL is the environment, thus the school and colleges should have different styles of seating instead of fixed desks and chairs in the classroom. The class should include couches, several types of chairs, podiums, whiteboards, different learning aids, and large screens. A well-decorated classroom is preferred for a personalized learning approach, and the room lighting should be good enough. This creates a dynamic and engaging learning environment that caters to different learning styles and promotes personalized learning.

- 4.The teacher should use technology platforms such as Moodle, Edmodo, Canvas, etc. with students to enhance their learning experience, provide interactive and engaging activities, easily assign and track tasks, provide timely feedback, promote collaboration among students, cater to different learning styles, and bridge the gap between classroom learning and real-world applications. This helps create a dynamic and personalized learning environment, where students can take responsibility for their own learning outcomes and teachers can serve as guides and facilitators. Additionally, incorporating technology into the classroom allows teachers to leverage the vast resources available on the internet, giving students access to educational videos, online libraries, interactive simulations, and other digital content that enriches their learning experience.
- 5.Teachers should change their teaching methods and use different strategies and techniques inside the classroom to meet each student's needs. In this way, they can personalize students' learning easily.
- 6.Since most of the students depend only on the PPT slides, it is necessary for teachers to give students freedom of choice of how they prefer to learn, and through which resources.
- 7.Mastery learning works most readily for learners who are falling behind. Since students can move forward as they progress through the curriculum, high-achieving students will not be hampered by their slower or struggling classmates. Therefore, mastery should be one element of learning a subject.
- 8.Students have to be engaged in different activities such as doing hands-on activities, listening to speeches and watching videos, participating in group discussions, project works, working independently, and role-play. They should have an active role in their learning process, and teachers have to account for their daily activities and assignments, and not rely only on the final exam, because the final exam is too stressful and doesn't result in students learning,

most of the students memorize the materials and cannot produce something by themselves.

9.It is necessary for teachers to give students activities that require higher order thinking skills, and consider students' level according to that.

10.Students should be familiarized with artificial intelligence (AI), because it has a great role in PL.

11.Assistive technology can help students with disabilities. In order to give them the possibility to study and learn, schools and universities should provide this technology to students so that they will not be deprived of their rights to learn.

12.Overall, in order to apply personalized learning properly and not neglect its elements, these areas should be taken into consideration (using technology, giving students choice and voice in choosing their preferred content and material to present, enabling students to be lifelong learners through using self-directed learning, promoting students to set their own learning goals both short and long-term, flexibility in selecting learning resources, and giving them flexibility to study at their own place and what they prefer.

4.3 Suggestions for Further Researches

Based on the findings of the present study, the researchers **suggest** the following points for further studies:

- 1.The advantages of PL for disabled students.
- 2.The role of training programs about personalized learning for EFL teachers at the school level.
- 3.Meeting the students' needs through PL implementation.
- 4.Studies how to adapt suitable teaching materials to EFL students' needs in PL.

References

1. Alam, A. (2022). Employing adaptive learning and intelligent tutoring robots for virtual classrooms and smart campuses: reforming education in the age of artificial intelligence. In *Advanced Computing and Intelligent Technologies*, Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, pp. 395-406.
2. Allen, I. E., and Seaman, J. (2016). Online report card: Tracking online education in the United States, Babson Survey Research, 1(1), pp.12.
3. Andriani W, Subandowo M, Karyono H, and Gunawan W. (2021). Learning Loss in Online Learning in the Corona Pandemic Period. *Semin. Nas. technol. Learning*, 1(1), p.1.
4. Basham, J. D., Hall, T. E., Carter, R. A., Jr., and Stahl, W. M. (2016). An operationalized understanding of Duncan. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 31(3), 126–136.
5. Blaschke, L. M. (2019). The pedagogy–andragogy–heutagogy continuum and technology-supported personal learning environments. *Open and distance education theory*, 1(4) pp.75-84.
6. Blbas, H. T. A., Mahmood, S. H., and Omer, C. A. (2017). A Comparison results of factor analysis and cluster analysis to the migration of young people from the Kurdistan Region to Europe. *ZANCO Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences*, 29(4), pp.44-55.
7. Bray, B. and McClaskey, K. (2013). *A step by step guide to personalize learning*. (2nd edition). United States: International Society for Technology in Education.
8. Brown, A. (2023, March 24) Flexibility Is Key in Personalized Learning Classrooms. EdTech. <https://edtechmagazine.com/k12/article/2017/01/flexibility-key-personalized-learning-classrooms>
9. Brown, C. (2019, January 24). The history of personalized learning. *Class craft*. <https://www.classcraft.com/blog/the-history-of-personalized-learning/>
10. Chargois, T. (2013, August 23) Mastery-based learning literature. Aurora Institute. <https://aurora-institute.org/blog/mastery-based-learning-literature-by-tina-chargois-inacol-intern/>
11. Cheung, A. C., and Slavin, R. E. (2012). How features of educational technology applications affect student reading outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 7(3), pp.198-215.
12. Coffield, F., Moseley, D., Hall, E., And Ecclestone, K. (2004). Learning styles and pedagogy in post-16 learning. A systematic and critical review. *Learning and Skills Research Centre*. 1 (1), p.25.
13. Cole, J. and Foster, H. (2007). *Using Moodle: Teaching with the popular open source course management system*. Massachusetts: O'Reilly Community Press.
14. Creswell, J. W. and Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. (5th edition). California: Sage Publications.

15. Crosbie, J., and Kelly, G. (1993). A computer-based personalized system of instruction course in applied behavior analysis. *Behavior Research, Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 25, pp. 366-370.
16. Cruickshank, D. R., Jenkins, D. B., and Metcalf, K. K. (2006). *The act of teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
17. Davies, T., (2008). Learner profile pilot. The International Learning and Research Centre. *The Learner Profile; an e-learning research and development project*, Clare Stead, The International Learning and Research Centre, 2(1), p.33.
18. Driscoll, M. P. (2005). *Psychology of learning for instruction*. (3rd edition). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
19. Evanick, J. (2023, February 24). Personalized Learning Vs. Traditional Classroom Instruction: Which Is More Effective? *ELearning Industry*. <https://elearningindustry.com/personalized-learning-vs-traditional-classroom-instruction-which-is-more-effective>
20. Fernandez, AC, Huang, J, and Rinaldo, V. (2011). Does Where a Student Sits Really Matter? The Impact on Seating Locations on Student Classroom Learning. *International Journal of Applied Educational Studies*, 10(1), pp.67.
21. Friend, B., Patrick, S., Schneider, C., and Ark, T. V. (2017). What's Possible with personalized learning? An overview of personalized learning for schools, families & communities. *iNACOL, The International Association for K-12 Online Learning*, p.27.
22. Gao, P. (2014). Using Personalized Education to Take the Place of Standardized Education. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 2(2), pp.11-13.
23. Gardener, D and Miller, L., (1999). *Establishing Self-Access: From Theory to Practice*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
24. Helyer, R. (2015). Learning through reflection: The critical role of reflection in work-based learning (WBL). *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, 7(1), pp. 15-27.
25. HOLEC, H. (1981). *Autonomy in Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
26. Huang, X. (2011). Study of Personalized E-Learning System Based on Knowledge Structural Graph. *Procedia Engineering, Advanced in Control Engineering and Information Science*, 15, pp. 3366-3370.
27. Keamy, K., Nicholas, H., Mahar, S., and Herrick, C. (2007). *Personalizing education: From research to policy and practice*. Melbourne: Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.
28. KELLY, K. (2010). *What Technology Wants*. New York: Viking.
29. Lalitha T., and Sreeja, P. (2020). Personalized Self-directed Learning Recommendation System. *Procedia Computer Science*, 171, pp.583-592.
30. Morable, L. (2009). Using active learning techniques in TEAL Compendium. Technical Education Division, Richland College, pp. 47-55.

- 31.Nhouyvanisvong,A.(2023,September 23).10 Ways to Personalize Learning. Getting Smart. <https://www.gettingsmart.com/2014/11/01/10-ways-personalize-learning/>
- 32.Pontual Falcão, T., Mendes De Andrade E Peres, F., Sales De Morais, D. C., and Da Silva Oliveira, G. (2018). Participatory methodologies to promote student engagement in the development of educational digital games, *Computers & Education*,116 (2), pp.161–175.
- 33.Ruman, H. (2023, January 24) Your Guide to Personalized Learning: Examples, Benefits & More. Smart Lab. <https://www.smartlablearning.com/personalized-learning/>
- 34.Serin, H. (2018). A comparison of teacher-centered and student-centered approaches in educational settings. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 5(1), pp.164-167.
- 35.Sherman, J. G. (1992). Reflections on PSI: Good news and bad. *Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis*, 25, pp.59-64.
- 36.Singh,A.(2023, March 24). Blended Learning Vs. Traditional Learning: A Detailed Overview of The Two Approaches. eLearning Industry. <https://elearningindustry.com/blended-learning-vs-traditional-learning-a-detailed-overview-of-the-two-approaches>
- 37.Solanki,A.(2019,September 24). Skinner’s Teaching Machine. Medium. <https://medium.com/history-of-education-timeline/skinners-teaching-machine-f3f0edaa6346>
- 38.Stefanic,D. (2023,January 23).Personalized Learning for Special Needs. Hyperspace. <https://hyperspace.mv/special-needs-learning/>
- 39.Tavakol,M. and Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *Int. J. Medical Education*, 2, pp.53-55.
- 40.Tran, L.T. and Vu, T.T.P. (2017). Agency in mobility: Toward a conceptualization of international student agency in transnational mobility. *Educational Review*,70(2), pp 1-21.