
The alignment of lecturers' teaching styles with students' learning styles in the *MKDU* English course: The case of a public university

Rd. M. ALI^{1*}, YULHENLI THABRAN², RENY HERYANTI³, AND DONY EFRIZA⁴

Abstract

This study examines the alignment between lecturers' teaching styles and students' learning styles. The problem stems from differences between the two, which can create conflict in the classroom. Each lecturer has an individual teaching style that tends to follow his or her dominant learning style, and students likewise have their own learning styles. This diversity can lead to classroom conflict and prevent the targets of the teaching and learning process from being achieved. The purposes of this study were to identify lecturers' teaching styles and students' learning styles based on Grasha's teaching and learning style scales, and to use Grasha's teaching style clusters to determine the alignment of lecturers' teaching styles with students' learning styles in the MKDU English course at Jambi University. This study employed a descriptive research design. The subjects were the lecturers who teach the MKDU English course and all students of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jambi University, who were taking the course. The instruments were the Grasha teaching style and learning style questionnaires, and the data were analyzed using the Grasha scales and teaching style clusters. The analysis showed that the lecturers of the English Study Program at Jambi University mainly used the facilitator, personal model, expert, and delegator teaching styles, and to a small extent the formal authority style, whereas the students' learning styles were collaborative, competitive, dependent, participant, independent, and avoidant. Overall, the lecturers' teaching styles and the students' learning styles were congruent.

Keywords

Lecturers' teaching styles, students' learning styles, alignment of teaching and learning styles, *MKDU* English course

Article History

Received 26 February 2026

Accepted 22 September 2026

How to Cite

Ali, RD, M., Thabran, Y., Heryanti, R., Efriza, D. (2026). The alignment of lecturers' teaching styles with students' learning styles in the *MKDU* English course: The case of a public university. *Jurnal Sinar Edukasi*, 7(2), 174-186. <https://doi.org/10.61346/jse.v7i2.307>

^{1*}Universitas Jambi, Indonesia, Corresponding email: raden.m.ali@unja.ac.id

^{2,3,4}Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

Introduction

One way to improve the quality of education is to improve the quality of learning for each student. When students become more active in learning, the quality of human resources also increases. It should be noted, however, that we cannot force others to learn by imitating our own learning style. Students should be allowed to learn in their own way, as long as that way helps them understand the material being studied, because everyone has his or her own learning style and cannot be forced to adopt the same one.

In general, students' learning styles depend on the ways in which they prefer to learn. Some students prefer their lecturer to write everything on the board so that they can read it and then try to understand it. Others prefer their lecturer to explain the material orally so that they can understand it by listening. Still others prefer to form small groups to discuss questions related to the lesson.

The classroom involves teaching and learning processes in which both students and lecturers take part. These processes can be oriented towards the students or towards the lecturer. The characteristic behavior that each individual shows in these processes is called a teaching style or a learning style, and it reflects the personality of the individual concerned.

However, Hidayah et al. (2024) observed that teachers rarely adjust their instruction to students' learning styles, which suggests that much classroom learning still proceeds on the assumption that all students are identical and that the uniqueness of each student's learning style is overlooked. This is consistent with the observation that lecturers tend to rely on their own dominant learning style when they teach. A lecturer who ignores students' individual learning styles may create an uncomfortable learning environment for many students, and a mismatch between the lecturer's teaching style and the students' learning styles may even cause students to become frustrated. Students who are frustrated in learning are unlikely to achieve their best learning outcomes.

Lecturers play a major role in students' learning in the classroom. Students notice everything a lecturer does when explaining a lesson, managing the class, giving feedback, and motivating them; in other words, they notice the lecturer's teaching style. Students respond to what the lecturer does in class, and this response affects their motivation to study. It is not uncommon for students to lose interest in a lesson because they are bored and sleepy. This situation often arises when a lecturer does not know how to present the material well or how to engage students' interest and attention.

A lecturer who follows his or her dominant learning style, that is, the way in which he or she learns most easily, may use it as the basis for deciding which teaching steps are effective. In fact, not all students' learning styles match the lecturer's. As a result, many students' learning styles do not match the lecturer's teaching style, as the following illustration shows. Zhenhui (2001, para. 1) gives these examples of mismatches between teaching and learning styles:

Liu Hong, a third-year English major in Jiangxi Normal University, China, was in David's office again. After failing David's oral English course the previous year, Liu Hong had reenrolled, hoping to pass it this year. Unfortunately, things were not looking promising so far, and she was frustrated. When David asked why she was so unhappy in his class, she said: "I am an introverted, analytic, and reflective student. I don't know how to cope with your extroverted, global, and impulsive teaching style?" Jenny,

an American teacher from California, sat in Dean's office again, feeling perplexed by the students' negative responses to her kinesthetic and global styles of teaching. Despite Jenny's persistent efforts to convince the students of the advantages of her teaching styles, she was told by her Vietnamese colleagues that her attempts were in opposition to the prevalent teaching styles in Vietnam. Jenny had specialized in applied linguistics for a long time and was well trained in the TESOL area in the U.S.A. But all of a sudden, it seemed that all her teaching competence and experience had become useless in such a country where she had never been before.

These cases represent serious mismatches between students' learning styles and a teacher's teaching style. Felder and Henriques (1995) note that such mismatches often occur in language classes and have unfortunate effects on both the quality of students' learning and their attitudes toward the class and the subject. In classes where a mismatch occurs, students tend to be bored and inattentive, do poorly on tests, become discouraged about the course, and may conclude that they are not good at the subject and give up.

Conversely, when students' learning styles and the lecturer's teaching style match, both the students and the lecturer benefit most from the interaction. Proponents of matching argue that students gain more knowledge, retain more information, and perform better when teaching styles match learning styles, and Felder and Henriques (1995) hold that matching teaching styles to learning styles can enhance academic achievement and student attitudes, particularly in foreign language instruction.

The match between lecturers' teaching styles and students' learning styles is therefore widely considered important for students' learning outcomes. Sakata (2024) found a statistically significant positive relationship between secondary school students' learning styles and their academic achievement, and Ricaforte et al. (2025) found that the alignment between teaching methods and students' learning styles was positively correlated with student engagement. These considerations show that teaching and learning styles matter in the classroom, and they prompted the researcher to investigate the alignment of lecturers' teaching styles with students' learning styles in the MKDU English course at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jambi University.

Methodology

This study employed a descriptive research design. The purpose of a descriptive study is to obtain information about a current phenomenon in order to describe the existing conditions in a field. Deckert and Wilson (2023) state that descriptive research determines and describes the way things are. The study was carried out at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jambi University, Mendalo Campus, Jalan Jambi–Muara Bulian. The subjects were all lecturers of the English Study Program who teach the MKDU English course and all students taking the MKDU English course at the faculty.

The instruments were the Grasha–Riechmann teaching style and learning style questionnaires. Anthony F. Grasha was a professor of psychology at the University of Cincinnati whose areas of specialization included cognitive and social processes in human error, learning and teaching styles, cognitive processes in stress and coping, and conflict resolution. Grasha and Sheryl Riechmann developed the Grasha–Riechmann Student

Learning Style Scales (GRSLSS) in 1974 to determine college students' styles of classroom participation. The Grasha–Riechmann model focuses on students' attitudes toward learning, classroom activities, teachers, and peers rather than on the relationships among methods, student style, and achievement. Two questionnaires were used: a lecturers' teaching style questionnaire and a students' learning style questionnaire. The teaching style questionnaire consists of 40 items and the learning style questionnaire consists of 60 items; each item offers five options ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. There are no right or wrong answers in either questionnaire; lecturers and students respond according to their attitudes and feelings toward the particular class.

The questionnaires were closed, Likert-scale instruments used to collect information about the congruence of the lecturers' teaching styles with the students' learning styles. The teaching style questionnaire was given to each lecturer and collected once it had been completed, while the learning style questionnaire was distributed to each student, who was given 60 minutes to complete it. The data from both questionnaires were analyzed through tabulation, classification, determination of congruence and incongruence, and generalization. The scores were classified into Grasha's teaching styles and learning styles, and each student's learning style was then aligned with Grasha's teaching style clusters. Finally, generalizations were drawn from the alignment of the lecturers' teaching styles with the students' learning styles.

Results

This research had four purposes: (1) to identify the teaching styles of lecturers in the English Study Program at Jambi University; (2) to identify the learning styles of students of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jambi University; (3) to determine the alignment of the lecturers' teaching styles with the students' learning styles; and (4) to determine any misalignment between the students' learning styles and the lecturers' teaching styles.

The lecturers' teaching styles and the students' learning styles were measured with the Grasha–Riechmann teaching and learning style questionnaires and rating scales. According to Grasha (2002, p. 154), there are five teaching styles: expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. Table 1. summarizes the findings.

Table 1. *Lecturers' teaching styles*

No.	Teaching Styles	Frequency	%
1	Expert	6	20%
2	Formal Authority	1	3%
3	Personal Model	7	23%
4	Facilitator	11	37%
5	Delegator	5	17%
	Total	30	100%

Thirty lecturers of the English Study Program at Jambi University, eleven men and nineteen women, completed the teaching style questionnaire. The facilitator teaching style was used by

37% of them. This was the most dominant style, and it emphasizes the personal nature of teacher–student interaction. The second most preferred style was the personal model style (23%), followed by the expert style (20%), the delegator style (17%), and, finally, the formal authority style (3%). The students’ learning styles are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. *Students’ learning styles*

No.	Learning Style	Frequency	%
1	Collaborative	61	37%
2	Avoidant	1	1%
3	Participant	23	14%
4	Dependent	27	16%
5	Independent	18	11%
	Total	165	100%

Of the 165 students who completed the questionnaire, 61 (37%) were identified as having a collaborative learning style, 35 (21%) a competitive style, 27 (16%) a dependent style, 23 (14%) a participant style, 18 (11%) an independent style, and one (1%) an avoidant style.

Table 3. *The alignment of lecturers’ teaching styles with students’ learning styles*

Cluster	Teaching Styles	Lecturers (f)	%	Learning Styles	Students (f)	%
Cluster 1	Expert	6	20%	Dependent	27	16%
	Formal Authority	1	3%	Participant	23	14%
				Competitive	35	21%
	<i>Total</i>	7	23%		85	52%
Cluster 2	Personal Model	7	23%	Participant	23	14%
	Expert	6	20%	Dependent	27	16%
	Formal Authority	1	3%	Collaborative	61	37%
	<i>Total</i>	14	47%		111	67%
Cluster 3	Facilitators	11	37%	Collaborative	61	37%
	Personal Model	7	23%	Participant	23	14%
	Expert	6	20%	Independent	18	11%
	<i>Total</i>	24	80%		102	62%
Cluster 4	Delegator	5	17%	Independent	18	11%
	Facilitator	11	37%	Collaborative	61	37%
	Expert	6	20%	Participant	23	14%
	<i>Total</i>	22	73%		102	62%

Note. Percentages are based on 30 lecturers and 165 students. Because each teaching style and learning style appears in more than one cluster, the cluster totals overlap and cannot be added together.

Of the thirty lecturers and 165 students, seven lecturers (23%) and 85 students (52%) belonged to Cluster 1; fourteen lecturers (47%) and 111 students (67%) to Cluster 2; twenty-four lecturers (80%) and 102 students (62%) to Cluster 3; and twenty-two lecturers (73%) and 102 students (62%) to Cluster 4. Overall, 164 of the 165 students (99%) had a learning style represented in at least one cluster; the only exception was the student with the avoidant learning style.

Table 4. *The misalignment of students' learning styles with lecturers' teaching styles*

Learning Style	Students	Percentage (%)
Avoidant	1	1%

Only one student (1%) had a learning style that was misaligned with the lecturers' teaching styles, namely the avoidant learning style, as shown in Table 4.

Discussion

This section discusses the findings of the research. Based on the data collected through the lecturers' teaching style questionnaire and the students' learning style questionnaire, the writer identified the teaching styles used by the lecturers and the learning styles of the students in the English Study Program at Jambi University.

Lecturers' teaching styles, the data analysis showed that the most dominant teaching style among the lecturers of the English Study Program at Jambi University was the facilitator style. This finding does not support Grasha (1994), who reported that the personal model style was the dominant style among teachers across academic levels and courses. The difference may be explained by Grasha's (2002) observation that teaching styles can be affected by factors such as the objectives of the course, the type of course, class size, the subject matter, the length of the teaching and learning process, and the academic discipline.

Facilitator teaching style, this was the most dominant teaching style, preferred by 37% of the lecturers. The finding is consistent with Husin et al. (2023), who found that the facilitator style was the most dominant teaching style among language lecturers, and with Arif et al. (2024), who found that the facilitator and delegator styles were dominant among EFL teachers at a junior secondary school. However, this is not consistent with Sim and Mohd Matore (2022), who found that the facilitator style was the least dominant style among primary school mathematics teachers. This difference may be due to the different subjects taught. Several factors may also make the facilitator style less popular among mathematics teachers: it is time-consuming, it is sometimes used when a more direct approach is needed, and it can make students uncomfortable if it is not employed in a positive and affirming manner (Grasha, 2002).

Expert teaching style, the expert teaching style was used by 20% of the lecturers. According to Grasha (2002, p. 154), a lecturer who uses this style not only possesses detailed knowledge of a subject but also strives to display that knowledge. The expert style was the third most frequently used style in this study. This finding differs from that of Sim and Mohd Matore (2022), whose survey of 97 primary school mathematics teachers found that the

personal model style was the most dominant. Such differences may arise from personal preferences, the subjects taught, and cultural conditions.

Personal model teaching style, the personal model teaching style was used by 23% of the lecturers of the English Study Program at Jambi University. This finding is in line with Grasha (2002), who reported that the personal model style was used predominantly by teachers at all academic levels, including professors, associate professors, and lecturers (tutors). It is also in line with Sim and Mohd Matore (2022), who found that the personal model style was the most dominant style among primary school mathematics teachers.

Delegator teaching style, the delegator teaching style was used by 17% of the lecturers who completed the questionnaire. This style is concerned with developing students' capacity to function autonomously. Students work independently on projects or as members of autonomous teams, and the lecturer is available at the students' request as a resource person (Grasha, 2002). This style is suitable for language lecturers, especially when teaching writing. For example, students can be divided into groups, given different topics, and then asked to present the results of their discussions. However, the delegator style is less suitable when students' readiness to work on tasks independently is low. If it is used continuously in such situations, it may dampen students' enthusiasm because they fear failure.

Formal authority teaching style, only one lecturer (3%) preferred the formal authority teaching style. This style draws on the status the teacher holds among students because of his or her knowledge and role. It is concerned with providing positive and negative feedback; establishing learning goals, expectations, and rules of conduct for students; and identifying the correct, acceptable, and standard ways of doing things, while giving students the structure they need to learn (Grasha, 2002).

A teacher who relies heavily on this style may be bound by rules and standards in ways that limit creativity. This matters because Nun Afifa et al. (2023) found that teachers' creativity greatly increased students' interest in learning; conversely, teachers who are not creative risk leaving students bored and uninterested. In language teaching, standard guidelines of this kind are mainly needed for writing tasks that require a set format, whereas other kinds of writing call for critical and creative thinking.

Students' learning styles, the second- and fourth-semester students in this study displayed all six of Grasha's (2002, p. 169) learning styles. The collaborative style had the highest percentage and the avoidant style the lowest. Each style is discussed below.

Collaborative learning style, the data analysis showed that the largest group of students (37%) preferred the collaborative learning style. Collaborative students like to share their ideas and study with their teachers and classmates. They expand their knowledge through group and team work and are more successful when working in groups. The advantage of this style is that students develop skills for working in groups and teams; its disadvantage is that they may become too dependent on other students and may not be good at studying alone (Grasha, 2002, p. 169). In line with this, Zhou and Colomer (2024) and Jaya et al. (2025) report that learning in groups toward a common goal benefits group members, improving learning outcomes, social and teamwork skills, and personal responsibility.

This finding differs from what might be expected in the Indonesian education system, which has traditionally been teacher-centered and would therefore be expected to produce mainly dependent learners. The predominance of the collaborative style in this study may be

explained by several factors. One is the students' level: the participants were university students, who tend to learn through class discussion. Another is that the lecturers taught in a student-centered way.

Competitive learning style, this was the second most preferred learning style (21%). According to Grasha (2002), competitive students approach learning with the attitude that they should do better than others. They compete for rewards and see their classmates as competitors. They are motivated to outperform others, enjoy competing, and see the classroom as a win-lose situation. They like to attract attention and want to be recognized for their success in class. Such students may have difficulty relating to other students and to cooperative learning environments.

Dependent learning style, the dependent learning style was found among 16% of the students who completed the questionnaire. According to Grasha (2002, p. 169), dependent students are seldom inquisitive and learn only what is required. They see the teacher as an authority and as a source of information and structure, like the structures their teacher develops, and want to be told what to do. Clear instructions from the teacher help them manage their anxiety, but they have difficulty learning on their own and cannot easily handle uncertain situations. The advantage of this style, therefore, is that it helps students manage their anxiety and obtain clear directions; its disadvantage is that it makes it difficult for them to develop autonomy and self-direction as learners and to learn how to deal with uncertainty.

Students with a dependent learning style tend to need more guidance to understand new material, and the material should be presented step by step. Studies comparing the lecture method with cooperative or group-discussion formats have found that the latter produce better learning outcomes (Beigzadeh et al., 2024; Sudarmika et al., 2020). To accommodate students with a dependent learning style (16%), lecturers can therefore incorporate structured discussion into their teaching (Grasha, 2002, p. 154).

Participant learning styles, this learning style was found among 14% of the students. According to Grasha (2002, p. 169), participant students are good class citizens: they like attending class and taking part in activities, are willing to do more than is expected, and give priority to the needs of other students. They want to learn the course content, take responsibility for their own learning, and enjoy participating in learning activities.

Independent learning style, this learning style was found among 11% of the students. Grasha (2002, p. 169) describes independent students as those who like to study alone and are confident in their learning abilities. They consider it important to learn the subject independently and build knowledge on their own, although they may have difficulty seeking help from others. Independent learners are confident and curious; they prefer to think for themselves, work on their own, and do not require highly specific instructions. To accommodate them, lecturers should implement a student-centered learning process, which will enable these students to understand the material well.

Avoidant learning style, only 1% of the students preferred the avoidant learning style. Avoidant students are not enthusiastic about learning or taking part in classroom activities. They generally do not engage with their teachers or classmates and are indifferent to what is happening in the classroom (Grasha, 2002, p. 169). They do not enjoy attending class, do not take responsibility for their learning, and avoid participating in course activities. Similarly, Syafitri et al. (2025) found that low self-confidence, language anxiety, and fear of making

mistakes or of negative evaluation reduced EFL students' willingness to communicate in class, whereas peer support and a non-threatening classroom atmosphere increased it.

In summary, the findings on the learning styles of students in the English Study Program at Jambi University suggest that lecturers do not need to change the diversity of their students' learning styles, but they should be aware that students acquire knowledge, receive information, and solve problems in different ways. Some students need more guidance to identify what is important and to ignore irrelevant details; they may feel lost in some situations and need step-by-step explanations. These characteristics are typical of students with a dependent learning style. Other students may be capable learners but less sensitive to others and less effective in social situations, which is characteristic of the independent learning style.

The alignment of lecturers' teaching styles with students' learning styles, as noted in the Introduction, proponents of matching argue that when students' learning styles and the instructor's teaching style match, both benefit most from the interaction (Felder & Henriques, 1995). It should be noted, however, that Hattie and O'Leary (2025), in a synthesis of 17 meta-analyses, found that studies directly testing this matching hypothesis reported a negligible effect on achievement ($d = .04$), and they argue that teaching students adaptable and effective learning strategies is more productive than matching instruction to learning styles. The alignment reported here is therefore best interpreted as a description of the compatibility between teaching and learning styles in these classes rather than as evidence that matching by itself improves achievement.

The alignment of the lecturers' teaching styles with the students' learning styles was determined using Grasha's (2002, p. 155) teaching style clusters. There are four clusters, each consisting of teaching styles that match particular learning styles. The cluster descriptions below are based on Grasha (2002).

Of the thirty lecturers and 165 students, seven lecturers (23%) and 85 students (52%) belonged to Cluster 1. The expert/formal authority cluster tends toward teacher-centered classrooms in which information is presented, and students receive knowledge. Lecturers with a formal authority teaching style tend to focus on content. This style is generally teacher-centered: the lecturer feels responsible for providing and controlling the flow of content, and students are expected to receive it. An instructor with this teaching style might say, "I am the flashlight for my students; I illuminate the content and materials so that my students can see the importance of the material and appreciate the discipline." Grasha (2002) suggests that these styles work best with students who are less capable with the content and who have stronger dependent, participant, and competitive learning styles. Cluster 1 teaching is also effective when lecturers are willing to control classroom tasks. Although it may be desirable, it does not appear necessary in most circumstances for lecturers to devote time to building relationships with students, nor do they need to be overly concerned with encouraging students to build relationships with one another. The classroom methods this model requires are traditional teacher-centered presentations and discussion techniques.

Cluster 2 comprised fourteen lecturers (47%) and 111 students (67%). The personal model/expert/formal authority cluster is a teacher-centered approach that emphasizes modeling and demonstration and encourages students to observe processes as well as content. Lecturers of this type act as role models by demonstrating skills and processes, and then as coaches or guides who help students develop and apply these skills and knowledge. A lecturer

with this teaching style might comment: “I show my students how to properly do a task or work through a problem and then I will help them master the task or problem solution. It’s important that my students can independently solve similar problems by using and adapting demonstrated methods.” Instructors with this style are interested in encouraging student participation and in adapting their presentations to accommodate various learning styles. Students are expected to take some responsibility for learning what they need to know and for asking for help when they do not understand something. Because they will frequently have to show what they know, students need more knowledge than they would in a lecture class; the coaching of skills and problem-solving abilities that characterizes this kind of teaching leaves them few opportunities to hide their ignorance. It also helps if students have participant, dependent, and collaborative learning styles or are flexible enough to develop them. These styles work well in learning environments where coaching and following the examples of role models are prominent. Teachers must be interested in influencing how learners use the knowledge and skills they are taught, and they must also work to develop relationships with students; research shows that effective models are typically people who are liked and well respected (Bandura, 1986). The classroom methods this model requires are role modeling and coaching or guiding students as they develop and apply skills and knowledge.

Cluster 3 comprised twenty-four lecturers (80%) and 102 students (62%). The facilitator/personal model/expert cluster is a student-centered model for the classroom. Lecturers design activities, social interactions, or problem-solving situations that allow students to practice the processes for applying course content. This teaching style places much more responsibility on students to take the initiative in meeting the demands of various learning tasks, and it works best for students who are comfortable with independent learning and who can actively participate and collaborate with other students. Lecturers typically design group activities that require active learning, student-to-student collaboration, and problem-solving, and they often try to create learning situations that require students to process and apply course content in creative and original ways. The blend of facilitator, personal model, and expert styles in this cluster matches students with stronger collaborative, participant, and independent learning styles. In addition to possessing, or being willing to acquire, the appropriate content knowledge, students need to be willing to take initiative and to accept responsibility for meeting the demands of various learning tasks. Lecturers must exercise some control over the processes used to facilitate learning, but they should be less interested in controlling the specific details of the content students acquire, since some of what students learn in this mode of teaching cannot be programmed in advance. Similarly, there should be more interest in developing and practicing other skills (e.g., the ability to work with others) and a broader range of content-related skills (e.g., critical and creative thinking). Developing and maintaining a professional, friendly, and warm relationship with students is helpful. The classroom methods this model requires are collaborative learning and other student-centered learning processes emphasized consistently throughout a course.

Cluster 4 comprised twenty-two lecturers (73%) and 102 students (62%). The combination of the delegator, facilitator, and expert modes of teaching works best when students have appropriate levels of knowledge and possess independent, collaborative, and participant learning styles. Their capabilities must also include a willingness to take initiative and to accept more responsibility for their own learning. Using the highly student-centered

methods of Cluster 4, or independent study processes, means that teachers must be willing to give up direct control over how learners engage in tasks and over the outcomes. An independent study or collaborative project, for example, would be less interesting if the teacher planned every detail and the outcomes were highly predictable. Teachers must be willing to “empower” students and to develop rapport with them, and the instructor must be viewed as approachable in order to consult effectively with students and to act as a resource person. Good working relationships among students, however, are something the students must largely develop themselves in the context of their tasks. The classroom methods this model requires emphasize independent learning activities for groups and individuals.

Based on the data analysis, the lecturers’ teaching styles, in order of dominance, were facilitator (37%), personal model (23%), expert (20%), delegator (17%), and formal authority (3%), whereas the most dominant learning style among the students was collaborative (37%). According to Grasha (2002, p. 155), both the dominant teaching styles and the dominant learning style fall into Cluster 3, which consists of the facilitator, personal model, and expert teaching styles. This cluster represents a student-centered model for the classroom and provides a good match for students with collaborative, participant, and independent learning styles.

The misalignment of students’ learning styles with lecturers’ teaching styles, only one student (1%) had a learning style that was misaligned with the lecturers’ teaching styles, namely the avoidant style. As stated in the Introduction, the purpose of this study was to determine the alignment of lecturers’ teaching styles with students’ learning styles using Grasha’s clusters. Because the avoidant learning style is not included in any of the clusters, it is considered misaligned with the lecturers’ teaching styles.

Conclusion

The results of the study show that the lecturers and students of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jambi University, exhibit diverse teaching and learning styles. The lecturers apply five teaching styles, namely facilitator, expert, delegator, personal model, and formal authority, with the facilitator and personal model styles predominating. These styles reflect the lecturers’ role in guiding students, setting examples, and encouraging students’ active participation in the learning process.

The students, meanwhile, showed a variety of learning styles. The collaborative learning style was the most dominant, followed by the competitive, dependent, participant, and independent styles, while the avoidant style was found in only one student. The dominance of the collaborative style indicates that students tend to learn more effectively through interaction and cooperation with their peers.

Furthermore, the alignment analysis shows that, in general, there is a relatively high level of compatibility between the lecturers’ teaching styles and the students’ learning styles, as reflected in the grouping of both into Grasha’s teaching style clusters. This compatibility may support a more effective and conducive learning process.

However, one student with an avoidant learning style was not aligned with the lecturers’ teaching styles. Lecturers therefore need to develop more adaptive and varied learning

strategies so that differences in students' learning styles can be optimally accommodated in the learning process.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflicts of interest were reported by the authors.

References

- Arif, N. F., Noni, N., & Korompot, C. A. (2024). Exploring EFL teachers' teaching styles at a junior secondary school. *ARRUS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(3), 373–382. <https://doi.org/10.35877/soshum2624>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Beigzadeh, A., Bazayr, H., Delzendeh, M., Razmi, M. H., & Sharifi, N. (2024). Comparing the effect of lecture method and cooperative teaching method on the learning, communication skills, and attitudes of students: A quasi-experimental study. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, Article 1449538. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1449538>
- Deckert, J., & Wilson, M. (2023). Descriptive research methods. In T. Welsh, J. P. Ambegaonkar, & L. Mainwaring (Eds.), *Research methods in the dance sciences* (pp. 153–165). University Press of Florida. <https://doi.org/10.5744/florida/9780813069548.003.0011>
- Felder, R. M., & Henriques, E. R. (1995). Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28(1), 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1995.tb00767.x>
- Grasha, A. F. (1994). A matter of style: The teacher as expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. *College Teaching*, 42(4), 142–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.1994.9926845>
- Grasha, A. F. (2002). *Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles*. Alliance Publishers.
- Hattie, J., & O'Leary, T. (2025). Learning styles, preferences, or strategies? An explanation for the resurgence of styles across many meta-analyses. *Educational Psychology Review*, 37, Article 31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-025-10002-w>
- Hidayah, N., Gunarhadi, & Karsono. (2024). Elementary school students' learning styles: Perspective of creative thinking skills. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sekolah Dasar*, 8(2), 202–211. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jisd.v8i2.68385>
- Husin, N., Mat, A. C., Husin, N. H. R., & Hashim, N. (2023). Decoding teaching styles of language lecturers. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(6), 1757–1771. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v13-i6/17256>
- Jaya, A., Hartono, R., Wahyuni, S., & Yulianto, H. J. (2025). The power of collaborative learning: How peer interaction improves student learning outcomes? *Journal of Education and Applied Teaching*, 1(1), 1–10. <https://journal.horizonedukasipublisher.com/jeat/article/view/1>
- Nun Afifa, Patahuddin, & Patintingan, A. (2023). The effect of teacher creativity on student learning interest of the seventh grade students at Junior High School 2 Parepare. *La*

-
- Parole: *Journal of Language Teaching and Pedagogy*, 2(2), 19–26.
<https://doi.org/10.31850/laparole.v2i2.2358>
- Ricaforte, R., Pilongo, C. S., & Taroma, G. T. (2025). Learning styles and teaching styles as factors affecting students' engagement of learners with learning disabilities. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, 12(6), 1228–1235.
<https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijrsi/articles/learning-styles-and-teaching-styles-as-factors-affecting-students-engagement-of-learners-with-learning-disabilities/>
- Sakata, M. G. (2024). The influence of learning styles on students' academic achievement in secondary schools at Harari Regional State, Eastern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Archaeology*, 12(2), 49–57. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ija.20241202.14>
- Sim, S. H., & Mohd Matore, M. E. E. (2022). The relationship of Grasha–Riechmann teaching styles with teaching experience of National-Type Chinese Primary Schools mathematics teacher. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 1028145.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1028145>
- Sudarmika, P., Santyasa, I. W., & Divayana, D. G. H. (2020). Comparison between group discussion flipped classroom and lecture on student achievement and student characters. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(3), 171–186.
<https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13312a>
- Syafitri, M., Munir, & Ariyani, A. (2025). The analysis factors affecting students' willingness to communicate in EFL classroom. *International Journal of Language, Education, and Literature*, 2(3), 407–416. <https://journal.unm.ac.id/index.php/IJLEL/article/view/8264>
- Zhenhui, R. (2001). Matching teaching styles with learning styles in East Asian contexts. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 7(7). <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Zhenhui-TeachingStyles.html>
- Zhou, T., & Colomer, J. (2024). Cooperative learning promoting cultural diversity and individual accountability: A systematic review. *Education Sciences*, 14(6), Article 567.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14060567>