Kuwaiti College Students' Learning Styles and Multiple Intelligences

Abstract:

The study was focused on discovering the dominant learning styles and multiple intelligences that were exhibited by English as a foreign language (EFL) Kuwaiti students at the College of Basic Education (CBE) in Kuwait. One aim of the study was to rank order their most dominant learning styles and multiple intelligences. Another aim was to draw implications for teaching strategies and study materials that suit the Kuwaiti students' learning styles and multiple intelligences. Data collection utilized a data elicitation instrument divided into two parts: one on learning styles (Oxford, 1998), and one on multiple intelligences (Christison, 1998b). Part one of the instrument targeted the students' learning styles and part two was focused on their multiple intelligences. The researchers employed the Excel software program to generate means, percentages, rankings, and standard deviations. Data analysis identified the dominant learning styles of Kuwaiti students which were dominated by a global learning style, followed by an intuitive style, then closure-oriented, and then a visual, and finally an extroverted learning style. As for multiple intelligences, the Kuwaiti students were mainly interpersonal, visual, kinesthetic, logical-mathematical, linguistic, naturalist, intrapersonal, and lastly musical. Implications for research were drawn for conducting further studies in other EFL settings in order to develop teaching techniques that accommodate students' learning styles and multiple intelligences and to design teaching tasks and activities that further expand students' existing learning styles and multiple intelligences.

Keywords: Learning styles, multiple intelligences, English as a Foreign Language (EFL)

1. Introduction

The time is ripe for a closer examination of learning in college classrooms. Recent questioning of the value of higher education focuses on the worth of undergraduate education and on the quality of learning that takes place in college classrooms. In response, many colleges and universities have focused on changes that center on improving teaching and learning. In the past two decades, we have seen a focus on teaching techniques in college classrooms, a movement that emphasizes active learning, the value of out-of-class learning, and the importance of student access to the Internet on college campuses. Without focusing on the core of understanding "how" our students learn academic material, however, we remain at the periphery of understanding how learning takes place in college classrooms. One change that could begin to maximize students' learning would create "learning-centered" campuses (Barr & Tagg, 1995). To create such a campus, we need to know how college students learn, to understand barriers to students' learning, and to develop classroom techniques that promote learning among college students.

The theories of multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1999) and learning styles (Oxford, 1998) have validated the existence of various ways of learning and the existence of various types of intelligences. These theories have challenged time-worn assumptions about learners and learning that can exclude students and that limit our ways of thinking about the role of the college student in the classroom. The literature on learning styles and multiple intelligences identified several general practices that promote learning for college students such as instructional models that deviate from the lecture format including visual presentations, site visits, and use of the Internet, varying expectations for students' performance, from individual written formats to group work that includes writing and presentation, interpretation of theatrical, dance, musical, or artistic work, and performance of actual tasks at a work site, as well as choices that allow students to capitalize on their personal strengths and interests. If most college classes could incorporate just a few of these practices, colleges would develop into more learning-centered communities and would move toward meeting the learning needs of a greater portion of their students. However, many important questions about college students' learning remain to be explored through research. Although literature exists to describe innovations in the classroom designed to foster learning using various methods and techniques, differences in learning across classes and culturally-influenced differences in learning need to be systematically explored.

In an effort to add to the existing knowledge base in this new area of investigation, this study sought to discover the dominant multiple intelligences and preferred learning styles of a representative sample of the EFL student population at the College of Basic Education in Kuwait. A major assumption of the study is that if teaching methodologies in Kuwait were adjusted to suit Kuwaiti students' preferred learning styles and multiple intelligences, then better student performance can be realistically expected at the end of a course of study. As a result, the present study was conducted to emerge with general profiles of Learning styles and multiple intelligences of the Kuwaiti student population.

2. Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was two-fold: (1) to discover the general learning styles profiles of the Kuwaiti students, and (2) to identify the dominant intelligences profiles for the Kuwaiti students of the College of Basic Education in Kuwait. The evidence-based information provided by the study will be used to inform college EFL teachers about the most appropriate choices of content and teaching methodology that may work with Kuwaiti college students' preferred learning styles and multiple intelligences. Implications of the study can, therefore, be used to make recommendations about teaching methods and academic content which may suit the multiple intelligences and learning styles of college-level EFL students in Kuwait The study aimed to find answers for the following research questions:

1- What were the general profiles of the College of Basic Education students' learning styles?

2- What were the dominant profiles of the College of Basic Education students' multiple intelligences?

To emerge with a comprehensive view of college-level students' needs in the EFL setting of Kuwait, the study sought to identify the general profiles of students from different majors in terms of both preferred learning styles and multiple intelligences. With a few notable exceptions (e.g., Manee, Nadar, & Jahrami, 2013), there is a dearth of research on this area of investigation in the Kuwaiti context. The present study aimed, therefore, to provide a descriptive analysis of college-level EFL students from the College of Basic Education by drawing general student profiles that described their respective learning styles and multiple intelligences.

3. Significance of the study:

Understanding the role of individual differences among learners as an important variable that can impact the language learning process is supported by findings and insights from studies of individual differences which show that while language learners may employ the same language learning strategies or processes, they may approach the language learning task very differently from one another (Skehan, 2014). Based on this body of evidence, teachers started to adopt methods that accommodate their students' individual differences in terms of how they approach learning and process new information. Most teachers realize nowadays that individual differences among learners can impact learning processes and teaching procedures. An increased understanding of learning styles and multiple intelligences, or the ways in which language learners approach the learning task can, therefore, help teachers make better decisions about what to teach and how to teach it to ensure optimal learning conditions. The interest in learning styles and multiple intelligences demonstrates the present study's recognition of the fact that learners need to be accommodated when teachers make decisions about course content and teaching methodology. The study, therefore, sought to discover the learning styles and multiple intelligences of Kuwaiti college students in order to make this information available to teachers to facilitate better teaching conditions in the college classroom.

4. Review of the literature:

Various tests and instruments were developed by language teaching researchers to measure different dimensions of individual differences such as attitudes and motivation (Gardner & Lambert, 1972), and then to establish correlations between these variables and second language proficiency (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). More recent research, however, has looked at other more robust variables associated with individual differences which seem to correlate positively with successful language learning including learning styles (Oxford, 1998) and multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1999). This review was divided into four sections. The first section discussed learning styles. The second section described multiple intelligences. The third section reviewed the influence of the students' culture in determining their preferred learning styles and multiple intelligence. The fourth section reviewed studies that investigated the potential learning problems that arise from a mismatch between students' learning styles and teaching styles, and the need for more research in EFL settings to help teachers accommodate learning styles and multiple intelligences in their teaching plans.

4.1 Learning styles:

Learning styles were defined by Reid (1998) as "internally-based characteristics, often not perceived or consciously used by learners, for the intake and comprehension of new information" (p. ix). For example, an analytic learner likes to analyze language elements in detail, while a global learner is believed to prefer learning through global exposure to a second/foreign language. Learning styles might consequently influence the learner's response to different methods of presenting language in the classroom. For example, in dealing with a new text, an analytic learner might search for small details and try to follow accurately the precise relationships between different parts of the texts, while a global learner might prefer to predict and infer to get an overall understanding of the same text. There are few published studies that investigated Kuwaiti college students' learning styles. Manee et al. (2013), for example, focused on the learning style preferences of Allied Health Sciences college students at Kuwait University. They found that "students' learning styles may evolve during their academic and practical training, and as they become socialized into the qualified health professional role" (p. 255). They also noted that the majority of students under study fell into the general learning style of "assimilator" (Kolb, 2014). This learning style is distinguished by a student's preference to be exposed to a large amount of information to be assimilated at a later stage. Consequently, the researchers suggested that educators at the College of Allied Health Sciences at Kuwait University adopt a curriculum more-suited to the "assimilator" learning style of the majority of their students.

Studies of second and foreign language learning customarily adopted Oxford's (1998) instrument for language teachers to measure the learning styles of their students along with clear directions for how to score and calculate the data for each group of learning styles. She divided the instrument into perceptual, cognitive, and affective categories of learning styles. The outcome of administering the instrument for a group of students can be in the form of a general profile for the students' learning styles that can then be used by the teacher to design activities and introduce content that are congruent with that group's dominant learning styles. The present study adopted the Oxford instrument as part one of the survey used to collect data on the learning styles of Kuwaiti college students.

4.2   Multiple intelligences

Intelligence was once seen as the ability to perform well on linguistic and logical-mathematical problem solving. This "IQ" (intelligence quotient) concept of intelligence has dominated the academic literature for a long time. However, recent research on intelligence by Gardner (1999) has begun to offer a new paradigm that changed the way educators view intelligence. According to Sauer (1998), the popularity of Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences within the field of education has led many teachers to adopt it as a framework for the development of curriculum and classroom methodology. This development was largely due to the fact that while intelligence, especially as measured by verbal IQ tests, may be a strong factor when it comes to learning which involves language analysis and rule learning, intelligence may play a less important role in classrooms where the instruction focuses more on communication and interaction.   Lightbown and Spada (2006) stated, "In our experience, many students whose academic performance has been weak have experienced considerable success in second language learning" (p. 53).   An unfortunate result of the dominance of traditional views of intelligence was the disenfranchisement of those students who possess abilities in areas that were not assessed by traditional tests of intelligence and were thus neglected by traditional methods of instruction and school curriculums.

Gardner (1999) extended the traditional view of intelligence to eight different components. He suggested that while all humans possess the eight intelligences, each person has his/her own particular blend or amalgam of intelligences. Gardner accepted the traditional conceptualizations of intelligence on which standardized IQ tests are based, but specifies eight components in his theory of multiple intelligences:

- Linguistic intelligence (the ability to use language to express one's feelings and ideas)

- Logical-mathematical (facility in using numbers and mathematical thinking)

- Spatial intelligence (the ability to find one's way around an environment, to form mental images of physical reality)

- Musical intelligence (the ability to perceive and create pitch and rhythmic patterns)

- Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence (fine motor movement, athletic prowess)

- Interpersonal intelligence (the ability to understand others and how they may feel, and to interact effectively with them)

- **Intrapersonal intelligence (the ability to understand oneself and to develop a sense of self-identity)**

- **Naturalist intelligence (sensitivity to nature, natural objects, and natural phenomena).**

It is important to remember, therefore, that "intelligence" is a complex construct and that students as individuals have many kinds of strengths and abilities.

Christison (1998b) developed an instrument for language teachers to measure the multiple intelligences of their students. Using this instrument enabled teachers to collect data on seven of the eight intelligences proposed by Gardner (1999). In a way similar to Oxford's (1998) instrument on learning styles, Christison (1998b) aimed for teachers to produce general profiles of their students' dominant multiple intelligences. When this systematically-collected information is available to teachers, they can accommodate their students' preferred ways of thinking in their lesson plans and teaching activities. In terms of reliability and validity, these two instruments have been designed for ESL/EFL students at the intermediate level and above. The present study adopted Christison's instrument as part two of the survey used to collect data on the multiple intelligences of Kuwaiti college students.

4.3 *The influence of culture:*

There is a growing body of evidence to suggest that a strong relationship exists between students' cultural backgrounds and their preferred learning styles and multiple intelligences. In a seminal study that impacted the way psychologists accounted for cultural differences in patterns of learning and teaching, Rogoff (1991) proposed that culture, as learned by the child from family, community, and school has a strong influence on the cognitive activities practiced by members. Her outlook to children was as "apprentices in thinking, active in their efforts to learn from observing and participating with peers and more skilled members of their society, developing skills to handle culturally defined problems with available tools, and building from these givens to construct new solutions within the context of sociocultural activity" (p. 7). Rogoff provided evidence that American students were influenced by Piaget's theory of meaningful learning which placed a high value on the skill of "understanding" educational materials. Within the same study, Rogoff also demonstrated how Chinese students, being influenced by a Mandarin educational culture, showed a preference toward the skill of "memorizing" educational materials. The results of her study showed that

culture has a strong effect on individuals' preferences for the ways they like to learn new material and process new information.

Within the field of language teaching, several research studies have indicated a strong relationship between students' cultural backgrounds and their learning preferences and thinking tendencies. Hofstede (1986), for example, demonstrated that Chinese children, in learning an ideographic writing system, learn to see patterns and to learn by rote. In a cross-cultural study of the learning styles of Korean, Japanese, and North American students, Reid (1998) found that Korean students, in terms of sensory preference, are more visual than North American or Japanese students. In other words, the study showed that Korean students like to read and receive visual input. Heath (1989), moreover, observed that African children were influenced by their cultures which placed a high value on members' ability for physical expression in the form of ritual dancing, a bodily-kinesthetic intelligence type according to Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences. While Oxford and Burry-Stock (1995) found that Egyptian students take a global approach to learning, Brown (2006) suggested that Anglo-American students have an analytic style. These studies show a strong relationship between culture and learning styles in second/foreign language classrooms. Evidence from general education and anthropology consistently shows, however, that there is always more variation within cultural groups than between cultural groups (Donmoyer & Kos, 1993). Teachers need to be sensitive, therefore, to the difference between "typical" behaviors and preferences, and over-reliance on general trends to the extent of stereotyping students according to widely-held socio-cultural misconceptions. It would be, therefore, more beneficial for the teaching/learning process to explore the influence of culture on students' learning styles and multiple intelligences so that teachers will be in a better position to accommodate these in their teaching plans and strategies.

4.4   Teaching/learning mismatches:

Largely because of the vitality of understanding and successfully utilizing the role of individual differences in the language learning/teaching process, a question worthy of consideration remains whether and in what ways these individual learning styles and multiple intelligences can affect language learning. Evidence collected so far seems to suggest, however, that a possible cause of differences in learning styles or multiple intelligences is the kinds of teaching methodology that learners have experienced during their educational careers, and that this will have been culturally influenced. The general implication of possible mismatches between learners from different cultures and new teaching methods and strategies is clear.

There could be a cultural clash of preferred learning styles and multiple intelligences on the one hand, and teaching methods that may not be congruent with these styles and intelligences, on the other. It would be more beneficial for the teaching/learning process to explore students' learning styles and multiple intelligences so that teachers will be in a better position to accommodate these in their teaching plans and strategies. Moreover, teachers who attempt to incorporate an awareness of learning styles and multiple intelligences within their classrooms need to be culturally-sensitive because of the well-documented role of culture in shaping the preferred cognitive activities of its members, including learning styles and multiple intelligences. An increased understanding of the relationship between culture and learning style and multiple intelligence can help the teacher create a variety of teaching/learning activities that accommodate the range of styles and intelligences of his/her students that are preferred in their culture.

Teachers need to approach learning styles with caution especially if their knowledge of learning styles can lead them to stereotype their students. Stereotypical thinking can seriously prevent teachers from dealing with their students in a realistic way in the classroom. Teachers may instead focus on raising learning styles awareness in their students and training them to extend their preferred styles. In an optimal teaching situation, raising awareness about learning styles and multiple intelligences is essential in order that all students have equal opportunities to use their strengths to learn. According to Christison (1998), teachers should be allowed to "examine their best teaching techniques and strategies in light of human differences" (p. 10). In other words, increased awareness about learning styles issues and addressing them in a constructive manner in the classroom by teachers can help students discover their uniqueness as language learners so they can become fully empowered in the second language learning process. Teachers in EFL settings, however, need the requisite knowledge about their students' learning styles and multiple intelligences so they can develop teaching techniques that address the needs of most learners in their own classrooms. Unfortunately, in many EFL settings, this requisite knowledge is currently lacking. Because most of learning styles and multiple intelligences studies were conducted in English as a Second Language (ESL) settings, their findings can only be extended to the same populations or to populations that share the same or similar characteristics, which means that the findings can only be trusted on ESL learners. More research on learning styles and multiple intelligences, however, needs to be conducted in settings where English is taught as a Foreign Language (EFL) like Kuwait. According to Schmidt and Celce-Murcia (2002), for example, "English is the main second language being studied in the world today with an estimated 235 million L2 learners" (p. 2). Despite their

large numbers and the variety of conditions in which they learn English, EFL students have unfortunately been understudied in research on language learning and teaching. Consequently, there is a need for studies of learning styles and multiple intelligences that focus on populations of students learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL). EFL teachers need reliable information gained from empirical studies about their student's learning styles and multiple intelligences so that they can feel more certain about the kinds of lesson plans and teaching strategies they need to introduce in order to successfully accommodate the broad needs, styles, and intelligences of most learners in their classrooms. Thus, there is a need for this study to discover the learning styles and multiple intelligences of Kuwaiti college students in Kuwait.

5. Methodology:

In order to obtain information to answer the research questions, two surveys were developed by the researchers that were derived from Oxford (1998) for measuring learning styles and from another survey developed by Christison (1998) for measuring multiple intelligences. It should be noted here that the scope of the data elicitation tools used in any research imposes limits on the researchers intending to use them to reach a clear understanding of the phenomena under study. According to Reid (1998)" these two instruments have been designed for ESL/EFL students at the intermediate level and above" (p. xiv). Each of them has long provided dependable information for ESL/EFL classrooms.

Data elicitation instruments, however, must be interpreted in light of the reliability and validity of the instrument actually used in the research. Furthermore, if an instrument has been created without adequate consideration of the audience and purpose of the research, the results might not be generalized, even for the subjects of the study. We need to ask, for instance, whether the instrument has been norm-referenced for the target population of the study, which in this case consists of a group of EFL learners at the college level in Kuwait. In other words, we need to inquire: Does the instrument measure what it professes to measure? Have the results been replicated in similar circumstances with a similar target audience? Or, is the instrument targeted, for example, at native speakers of English, or at ESL/EFL students with different levels of language proficiency, or at a different age group? Particularly for ESL/EFL students, a major concern is whether the instrument has been carefully designed for easy comprehension and understanding by foreign language learners? Even though researchers might find the information interesting, if the information is incorrect, it might distort the researchers' findings about the subjects' learning styles and multiple intelligences.

At the very least, students and researchers should be confident about the strengths of the instrument. Therefore, and in order to further ensure the validity and reliability of the survey for the present study, extensive care was taken to translate both instruments into the Arabic language. Even though the researchers sought to insure easy access (i.e. comprehension) by Freshman-level students in EFL countries, extreme care was taken to retain the same language that was used in the standardized survey instruments. Moreover, enough care has been taken to phrase the questions unambiguously to ensure that the respondents reliably answered the questions the researchers intended. In terms of reliability and validity, the instrument used in the study can be safely considered valid for the target population of the study which consists of college-level EFL students at the intermediate level and above.

5.1 Data Collection:

The survey instrument that was used in the present study was translated into Arabic to facilitate comprehension for the participants. Part one of the survey was devoted for measuring learning styles, and part two was devoted for measuring multiple intelligences. Data collection consisted of two phases: (1) distribution of part one of the survey, and (2) distribution of part two of the survey. After translation into Arabic the survey was distributed in two phases among different groups of students from different academic departments. The participants were enrolled as Freshman-level students in Kuwait's College of Basic Education (N=138), where N represents the number of students who actually responded to the survey.

5.2 Data Analysis:

The research questions were focused on finding the general profiles of learning styles and multiple intelligences for the Kuwaiti students from the College of Basic Education. Once the items of the survey instrument were scored, the points for each of the multiple intelligences and learning styles were totaled for each student. Subsequently, these points were totaled for the Kuwaiti students according to their majors. This step was facilitated by using the *Microsoft Excel* software program. *Excel* was also used to generate the means, standard deviations, percentages, and ranks for each of the learning styles and multiple intelligences for each student who participated in the study. In order to demonstrate the dominant learning styles and multiple intelligences, tables 1 and 2 were generated to highlight different aspects of the survey data with descriptive statistics.

6. Results and discussion:

The results of the survey provided a glance into the learning styles and multiple intelligences of the Kuwaiti students.

6.1 Learning styles

Table 1 displays the Kuwaiti students' learning styles, and gives the means, standard deviations, percentages, and rankings of each of the learning styles in the five sections of the survey instrument.

Table 1. General Learning Styles Profiles of the Kuwaiti Participants

Categories	Item Responses		
	Mean	**SD**	**% (Rank)**
Section 1			
Visual	18.32	3.27	36.68 (1)
Auditory	14.86	3.61	29.50 (3)
Hands-on	17.18	4.07	34.11 (2)
Section 2			
Extroverted	17.54	4.85	60.84 (1)
Introverted	11.29	5.19	39.16 (2)
Section 3			
Intuitive	19.73	4.96	50.78 (1)
Concrete-sequential	19.13	4.45	49.22 (2)
Section 4			
Closure-oriented	19.70	4.87	57.90 (1)
Open	14.32	3.98	42.10 (2)
Section 5			
Global	19.77	3.55	56.57 (1)
Analytic	15.18	4.10	43.43 (2)

Part one of the survey instrument consisted of five sections each relating to a distinct learning styles category. Section 1 "How I use my physical senses to study" was devoted to the visual, auditory and hands-on "tactile" senses of perception. Kuwaiti students showed a strong preference for both visual and hands-on "tactile" learning styles (visual: M=18.32; hands-on: M=17.18). In addition to a visual learning style, Kuwaiti students showed a preference for hands-on learning, which means that they not only can learn from visual stimuli, but also can benefit from doing projects, working with objects, and moving around the classroom (doing presentations and simulations). In section 2 "How I deal with other people," Kuwaiti students demonstrated a greater preference for an extroverted learning style than an introverted learning style. This means that Kuwaiti students can enjoy a wide range of social, interactive tasks (games, conversations, discussions, debates, role plays, etc.) as opposed to individual or

independent work or study. Section 3 "How I handle possibilities" distinguishes between a person's uses of his/her intuition in decision-making as opposed to a person's use of analytic thinking and concrete-sequential organization. Kuwaiti students scored closely on both intuitive (M=19.73) and concrete-sequential (M=19.13) learning styles which means that they can switch modes easily from intuitive to concrete-sequential. In section 4 "How I approach tasks" which is related to whether a person likes to have a close-structured working environment or an open discovery-oriented mindset, the Kuwaiti students showed a preference for closure. They like to be explicitly given step-by-step instructions on how to accomplish projects and perform tasks. This style contrasts with the open-ended style which is more related to discovery learning in which information is learned in an unstructured way. Finally, in section 5 "How I deal with ideas," Kuwaiti students showed a clear preference for a global learning style which indicates that they both like to get the main ideas and to communicate even if they don't know all the words or concepts. An analytic person, by contrast, would focus more on details, logical analysis, and contrasts.

6.2   Multiple intelligences:

Table 2 displays the dominant intelligences found in Kuwaiti students, with the means, percentages, ranks, and standard deviations for each of the intelligences.

Table 2. General Multiple Intelligences Profiles of the Kuwaiti Participants

Categories	Item Responses		
	Mean	SD	% (Rank)
Interpersonal	8.83	2.05	15.79 (1)
Visual	7.83	2.28	14.00 (2)
Kinesthetic	7.44	2.01	13.31 (3)
Linguistic	7.10	2.10	12.69 (4)
Logical	7.08	2.67	12.66 (5)
Naturalist	6.60	2.61	11.80 (6)
Intrapersonal	5.87	2.21	10.49 (7)
Musical	5.17	3.21	9.25 (8)

In Table 2, the Kuwaiti students showed a very high score for interpersonal intelligence (M=8.83), with visual intelligence

(M=7.83) ranking second and kinesthetic intelligence (M=7.44) ranking third. Most noticeably, the result that showed Kuwaiti students' musical intelligence (M=9.25) ranked the last may be related to the Islamic cultural context in which music is not highly respected. It is important to note in Kuwaiti students that the mean totals are not as important as the relationships between intelligences, which are indicated by their relative strengths (Armstrong, 1994; Campbell et al., 1996). It only means that in the Kuwaiti group's intelligence profile, interpersonal intelligence is the strongest within that group.

6.3   Conclusion"

The results of the data analysis revealed that the ranking of the general profile for the Kuwaiti students was dominated by a global learning style, followed by an intuitive style, then closure-oriented, and then a visual, and finally an extroverted learning style. As for multiple intelligences, the Kuwaiti students were mainly interpersonal, visual, kinesthetic, logical-mathematical, linguistic, naturalist, intrapersonal, and lastly musical. The information provided by this study can be used to suggest the most appropriate choices of teaching strategies that suit the Kuwaiti students' preferred learning styles and multiple intelligences. Each intelligence and style preference exhibited by the Kuwaiti students offered significant strengths in learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL). English teachers in Kuwait can recognize their students' strengths as interpersonal learners who are extroverted and who also have visual intelligences and hands-on tactile skills. Students can also identify, analyze and use their strengths to succeed in their academic studies, to develop their social relationships, and to learn English successfully.

7.   Implications for Further Research:

The procedures used in the methodology of the present study for data collection and analysis can be employed in the future studies of learning styles and multiple intelligences by researchers working within in other EFL college settings. The findings of these studies can be used by EFL teachers to design teaching strategies and materials that accommodate their students' learning styles and multiple intelligences. Due to the relatively small sample size of the study, future research may incorporate larger samples of participants to be able to make more solid generalizations about Kuwaiti students' learning styles and multiple intelligences.

8.   Implications for Pedagogy:

Teachers in EFL contexts can enhance their students' multiple intelligences and learning styles by raising their awareness of the intelligences and learning styles that they do *not* have. Tasks and activities that do not seem quite as suited to their students' intelligences and style preferences will help students stretch their abilities and styles beyond their ordinary "comfort zones" and expand their learning and intelligences potentials. For example, the results of the study showed that the Kuwaiti students are global learners who show a lack of interest in analytic problem-solving. The essential recommendation here is that students will not lose their basic strengths by trying something new; they will simply develop other aspects of their intelligences and learning styles that are likely to be very helpful in the EFL classroom. Teachers in Kuwait may, therefore, raise their students' awareness that they need to learn to use analysis and logic in order to study and learn more effectively.

9. References

Barr, R., and J. Tagg (1995). From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education. Change. (November- December).

Brown, H.D. (2006). Principles of language learning and teaching. (5th Ed.) New York: Pearson ESL.

Christison, M. A. (1998a). An introduction to multiple intelligence theory and second language learning. In J. M. Reid. (Ed.), Understanding learning styles in the second language classroom (pp. 1-14). Prentice Hall Regents.

Christison, M. A. (1998b). Multiple Intelligence Inventory for Teachers. In J. M. Reid. (Ed.), Understanding learning styles in the second language classroom (pp. 157-159). Prentice Hall Regents.

Donmoyer, R., & R. Kos (Eds.) (1993). At-risk students: Portraits, policies, programs, and practices. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gardner, H. (1999). The theory of multiple intelligences. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gardner, R., and W. Lambert (1972). Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning. Rowley, Mass.: MIT Press

Genesee, F. (1976). The role of intelligence in second language learning. Language Learning, 26(2), 267-280.

Heath, S. B. (1989). The learner as cultural member. In M. Rice. & R. Schiefelbusch (Eds.), The teachability of language (pp. 333-350). Baltimore: Paul H. Books.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 310-320.

Kolb, D. A. (2014). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: FT Press.

Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (2006). How languages are learned. (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Lincoln, F., & Rademacher, B. (2006). Learning styles of ESL students in community college. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30 (5), 485-500.

Manee, F., Nadar, M., & Jahrami, H. (2013). Learning styles of allied health sciences students at Kuwait University. International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation, 20(5), 255-259.

https://doi.org/10.12968/ijtr.2013.20.5.255

Manikutty, S., Anuradha, N.S., & Hansen, K. (2007). Does culture influence learning styles in higher education? International Journal of Learning and Change, 2(1), 70-87.

Oxford, R., & Bury-Stock, J.A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL)." System, 23(2), 153-175.

Oxford, R. (1998). Style Analysis Survey (SAS): Assessing Your Own Learning and Working Styles. In J. M. Reid. (Ed.) Understanding learning styles in the second language classroom (pp. 179-186). Prentice Hall Regents.

Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. Language Learning, 43(4), 593-616.

Reid, J. M. (1998). Understanding learning styles in the second language classroom Prentice Hall Regents.

Rogoff, B. (1991). The cultural context of cognitive activity. In B. Rogoff, Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context. (pp. 42-61). New York: Oxford University Press.

Sauer, C. (1998). Developing a survey for Multiple Intelligences. In J. M. Reid. (Ed.), Understanding learning styles in the second language classroom (pp. 100-106). Prentice Hall Regents.

Schmidt, N., Celce-Murcia, M. (2002). An overview of Applied Linguistics. In N. Schmidt (Ed.). An introduction to Applied Linguistics (pp. 1-16). London: Arnold.

Skehan, P. (2014). Individual differences in second language learning. London: Routledge.