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The purpose of the present study was to relate the findings of a survey of learning styles and multiple intelligences that was distributed among two different cultural groups of Freshman-level EFL students in Taiwan and Kuwait in order to confirm its consistency for developing teaching techniques appropriate for each group’s general profiles. Data collection consisted of a survey adopted from two standardised instruments. Part one of the survey targeted the students’ preferred learning styles and part two was focused on multiple intelligences. Data analysis identified the dominant learning styles and multiple intelligences in each group. Implications were drawn for conducting other cross-cultural studies in EFL settings in order to develop teaching techniques that accommodate each cultural group and to design teaching tasks and activities that expand the two groups’ present learning styles and intelligences.
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Introduction

One of the major differences between traditional methods of teaching and more contemporary ones is that modern teaching methods always strive to better accommodate individual differences among learners. Not only do most language teachers realise that their major role in the teaching/learning equation is to provide better conditions for learning, but also that individual differences among learners can impact learning processes and teaching procedures. Given what we know about the impact of individual differences on the language learning process, it is no longer valid to assume, for instance, that there is an easy and direct relationship between the instructional objectives of our lessons and the learning outcomes of our students. At a minimum, research on individual differences should make teachers skeptical of claims that a particular teaching method or textbook will suit the needs of all learners. As a research area, understanding the ways in which learners differ from one another has become of fundamental concern to those involved in second/foreign language learning, either as teachers or researchers. A considerable body of research exits into individual differences, focusing on factors such as aptitude, motivation, attitudes, personality, and then to establish correlations between these factors and second language proficiency (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). Recent research efforts have looked at other more robust variables associated with individual differences which seem to correlate positively with successful language learning. Researchers working on studies of learning styles (Lincoln & Rademacher, 2006), and multiple intelligences (Christison, 1998a), for
example, have shown that an understanding of learning styles and multiple intelligences can create optimal learning conditions in the language classroom. Reid (1998) also suggested that if language teachers know more about the ways in which their students go about learning new material, they will make better decisions on what to teach and how to teach it. Armed with this knowledge, teachers can adopt teaching strategies and language content that are consistent with the learning styles and multiple intelligences of their students.

Far from being a homogeneous group for which a uniform set of materials and teaching methods can be recommended, students in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings learn English in a variety of conditions and in a wide spectrum of national and cultural contexts. Schmidt and Celce-Murcia (2002) stated that ‘English is the main second language being studied in the world today with an estimated 235 million L2 learners’ (p. 2). In attempting to highlight the role of the cultural context in cognitive development, researchers have investigated whether culture can influence the learning styles of specific cultural groups (e.g., Manikutty, Anuradha, & Hansen, 2007). New research studies are therefore needed on the cross-cultural aspects of learning styles and multiple intelligences. Cross-cultural studies can enable teachers in EFL countries to be better informed about their students’ respective learning styles and intelligences. Teachers can also design materials, teaching tasks, and associated activities congruent with the abilities and preferences of these populations.

**Purpose of the study**

The purpose of the study was twofold: (1) to identify and rank the general profiles of learning styles and multiple intelligences that characterise Freshman-level Taiwanese and Kuwaiti students, and (2) to determine the extent to which the instrument demonstrates consistent results about the respondents’ learning styles and multiple intelligences. The two collaborating researchers, one from Taiwan and one from Kuwait, aimed to provide as full a picture as possible of Taiwanese and Kuwaiti students by drawing general student profiles that describe their respective learning styles and multiple intelligences. These two groups were considered by the researchers to be distinct from a cultural as well as a linguistic point of view. While the Taiwanese group has a Confucian, Mandarin orientation, the Kuwaiti group has a Muslim, Arabic cultural background. Like many other cultural groups within EFL settings, however, they both share a common interest in learning EFL as the primary tool of communication in today’s global world. The research questions of the study were:

1. What were the general profiles of the Taiwanese and Kuwaiti students’ learning styles?
2. What were the general profiles of the Taiwanese and Kuwaiti students’ multiple intelligences?
3. What was the extent to which the instrument demonstrated consistent results about the respondents’ dominant learning styles and multiple intelligences?

**Review of the literature**

This review discusses learning styles and multiple intelligences as they have emerged in the field of second/foreign language education as two significant aspects of learning potential in the language classroom. Then, the role of culture and its influence on
learning styles and multiple intelligences are addressed with a focus on the potential learning problems that may arise from a mismatch between the students’ preferred ways of learning and teaching styles.

**Learning style**

Learners have clear preferences for how they go about learning new material in the EFL classroom. The term ‘learning style’ has been used to describe an individual’s natural, habitual, and preferred way of absorbing, processing, and retaining new information and skills (Oxford, 1998). Learning styles might consequently influence the learner’s response to different methods of presenting English as a foreign language in the classroom. The growing interest in learning styles is in recognition of the fact that learners differ in ways that need to be taken into account when teachers make decisions about course content and teaching methodology. There is a broad range of learning styles that have been addressed in the literature. For example, people who say that they cannot learn something until they have seen it would fall into a group called ‘visual’ learners. Other people, who seem to need only to hear something once or twice before they know it, may be called ‘aural’ learners. For others, who are referred to as ‘kinesthetic’ learners, there is a need to add a physical action to the learning process. In contrast to these perceptually-based learning style distinctions, considerable research has focused on a cognitive learning style distinction between analytic and global learners. An analytic learner likes to analyse language elements in detail, while a global learner is believed to prefer learning through global exposure to a second/foreign language. 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 a text, while a global learner might prefer to predict and infer to get an overall understanding of the same text. There exists also a similar distinction between the cognitive learning styles of field-independent and field-dependent learners. The distinction between these cognitive learning styles refers to whether an individual tends to separate details from the general background or to see things more holistically.

Oxford (1998) developed an instrument for language teachers to measure the learning styles of their students along with 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.

**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. There is a growing awareness among teachers, however, that intelligence is a complex construct and that individuals have many kinds of abilities and strengths, not all of which can be measured by traditional IQ tests. Over the years, IQ tests were often associated with success in school, and a link between intelligence and second language learning
success has been reported. Many studies using a variety of intelligence ‘IQ’ tests and different methods of assessing language learning have found that IQ scores were a good means of predicting success in language learning. However, some recent studies have shown 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. Genesee (1976), for example, conducted a study on French immersion students in Canada and found that while intelligence was related to the development of French second language reading, grammar, and vocabulary, it was unrelated to oral productive skills.

Research on intelligence by Gardner (1999) has begun to offer a new paradigm that changed the way educators view intelligence. Sauer (1998) noted that 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 nascent interest in Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences by language teachers is consistent with the need to accommodate learner individual differences in order to promote optimal learning conditions in the classroom. Gardner 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 conceptualisations of linguistic intelligence and logical-mathematical intelligence on which standardised IQ tests are based, but added the following six other components in his theory of multiple intelligences:

- 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).

Christison (1998b) developed an instrument for language teachers to measure the multiple intelligences of their students. Using this instrument will enable 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 role 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 ‘memorising’ 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’ behaviours and preferences, and over-reliance on general trends to the extent of stereotyping students according to widely-held socio-cultural misconceptions.

Evidence collected from American mainstream classrooms suggests 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. Possible mismatches between learners from different cultures and new teaching methods and strategies can be detrimental to the students’ success in learning a second/foreign language. 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. Poole (1992), for example, demonstrated in a discourse analysis study of the English native speaking teacher of non-native fifth grade students interactions that the teacher’s Middle American ways of classroom
management were incongruent with the ways in which her Hispanic students were socialised into their native language by their parents at home. 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.

**Methodology**

After reviewing the available instruments in the literature to fulfill the purpose of the research, the two researchers adopted one survey instrument for the study by combining two widely-used standardised survey instruments: One introduced by Oxford (1998) for measuring learning styles and another introduced by Christison (1998b) for measuring multiple intelligences. Having the same survey as a data elicitation instrument made it possible to easily compare the results from the two groups from Taiwan and Kuwait. To ensure the soundness of the survey, extensive care was taken to retain the same language that was used in the standardised survey instruments. Adequate consideration of both audiences was taken during the design of the survey that was used in the study. For example, the researchers refined the items of the survey instrument used in the present study to ensure easy access (i.e., comprehension) by Freshman-level students in EFL countries. Moreover, cross-checking provided additional confirmation about the reliability of the responses.

**Data collection**

The survey instrument used in the present study consisted of learning styles and multiple intelligences. During June, 2007, the survey was distributed among two groups of: (1) Freshman-level students in a Taiwanese university (N=138), and (2) Freshman-level students in Kuwait’s College of Basic Education (N=112), where N represents the number of students who responded to the survey in both countries. The rates of non-respondents among students who received the survey were 3% for the Taiwanese group and 5% for the Kuwaiti group.

**Data analysis**

Once the items of the survey instrument were scored, the points for each of the intelligences and styles were totaled for each student in both groups. Subsequently, these points were totaled for the Taiwanese and Kuwaiti groups. This step was facilitated by using the Microsoft Excel software programme. Excel also helped determine the means, standard deviations, percentages and ranks for each of the learning styles and multiple intelligences for both groups. In order to demonstrate the relationships of the dominant learning styles and multiple intelligences for each group, three tables were used to display different aspects of the survey data.

**Results and discussion**

The results of the survey provide a glance into the learning styles and multiple intelligences in both groups. Table 1 displays the two groups’ 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.
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. The Taiwanese group scored highest on the visual learning style (M=17.04) which means that they mostly rely on the sense of sight, and that they learn best through visual means (e.g., videos). The Kuwaiti group showed a strong preference for both visual (M=18.32) and hands-on ‘tactile’ (M=17.18) learning styles. 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’, both the Taiwanese and the Kuwaiti groups demonstrated a greater preference for an extroverted learning style than an introverted learning style. This means that both groups 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 use of his/her intuition in decision-making as opposed to a person’s use of analytic thinking and concrete-sequential organisation. The Taiwanese group showed a clear preference for an intuitive learning style (M=16.10) while the Kuwaiti group 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, both the Taiwanese and Kuwaiti students showed a preference for closure. They both like to be explicitly given step-by-step instructions on how to accomplish projects and perform tasks. This style

Table 1. General learning styles profiles for the Taiwanese and Kuwaiti groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Kuwait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% (Rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>36.13 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>32.20 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>31.67 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverted</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>56.85 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverted</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>43.15 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>52.87 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete-sequential</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>47.13 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure-oriented</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>53.90 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>46.10 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>54.06 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>45.94 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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’, both groups 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.

Table 2 displays the dominant intelligences found in both the Taiwanese and Kuwaiti groups, with the means, percentages, ranks, and standard deviations of each intelligence. In Table 2, the Taiwanese group gained a very high score on both visual (M=7.80) and interpersonal intelligence (M=7.78) indicating these intelligences to be most dominant. Table 2 also shows that musical intelligence (M=6.62) ranked third for the Taiwanese group. The Kuwaiti group showed a very high score for interpersonal intelligence (M=8.83), with visual intelligence (M=7.83) ranking second.

It is important to note in both groups that the mean totals are not as important as the relationships between intelligences, which are indicated by their relative strengths (Campbell, Campbell, & Dickenson, 1996). In the two groups’ profiles above, notice, for example, that the mean score for each group’s interpersonal intelligence is different: The Taiwanese group scored a mean of 7.78 points, and the Kuwaiti group scored a mean of 8.83 points. Yet, this does not mean that one group has a ‘stronger’ or ‘better’ interpersonal intelligence than the other. It only means that in the Kuwaiti group’s intelligence profile, interpersonal intelligence is the strongest within that group.

Table 3 relates each group’s highest ranked intelligences to their learning styles profiles.

Table 2. Dominant intelligences profiles for the Taiwanese and Kuwaiti groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th></th>
<th>Kuwait</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% (Rank)</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>14.99 (1)</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>14.95 (2)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>12.72 (3)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>Kinesthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>12.23 (4)</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>Logical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>11.71 (5)</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>11.49 (6)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>Naturalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesthetic</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>10.91 (7)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalist</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>11.01 (8)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>Musical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The relationship between the dominant multiple intelligences (MIs) and learning styles in the Taiwanese and Kuwaiti groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taiwanese students</th>
<th>Learning styles</th>
<th>Kuwaiti students</th>
<th>Learning styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIs</td>
<td></td>
<td>MIs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial/Visual (1)</td>
<td>Visual (1)</td>
<td>Interpersonal (1)</td>
<td>Extroverted (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal (2)</td>
<td>Extroverted (1)</td>
<td>Spatial/Visual (2)</td>
<td>Visual (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kinesthetic (3)</td>
<td>Hands-on (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 confirms the results of both the learning styles and the multiple intelligences parts of the survey. For example, in the Taiwanese group, the fact that visual intelligence ranked highest is consistent with the visual learning style which relies on the sense of vision for learning. It can be said here that both the ability and the style of the Taiwanese group are consistent with each other in terms of their preference for a visual learning style and having a visual intelligence. In terms of how a person relates to others, the Taiwanese group ranked second highest on interpersonal intelligence (i.e., people-oriented) and also highest on the learning style of extroversion. Table 3 shows that the results of both parts of the survey are consistent for the Kuwaiti group as well. For example, the Kuwaiti group showed a learning style profile in which extroversion ranked first, followed closely by visual perception, and third by hands-on learning. These three learning style preferences were reflected in the multiple intelligences profile of the same group in which interpersonal intelligence ranked first, followed closely by visual intelligence, and third by kinesthetic intelligence. Thus, the overall picture for both groups as far as their intelligence profiles are concerned is consistent with their results on the mean scores for learning styles.

Conclusions
The results of the survey can be used to increase awareness of each group’s strengths and abilities. Students can identify, analyse and use their strengths to succeed in their academic studies, to develop their social relationships, and to learn language. The general profiles for each group showed that while the dominant learning style preferences of the Taiwanese group were visual in the first place, followed by global, then closure-oriented, then extroverted, and intuitive in the last place, whilst the Kuwaiti group preferred mostly 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 Taiwanese group’s general profile was mainly visual, interpersonal, musical, logical-mathematical, intrapersonal, kinesthetic, and lastly naturalist, while the Kuwaiti group was mainly interpersonal, visual, kinesthetic, logical-mathematical, linguistic, naturalist, intrapersonal, and lastly musical. The final conclusion of the study was that the survey instrument showed a high degree of internal consistency for both groups’ scores on learning styles and multiple intelligences. The information provided by this study can be used to suggest the most appropriate choices of teaching strategies that suit the Taiwanese and Kuwaiti students’ preferred learning styles and multiple intelligences. Each intelligence and style preference exhibited by both the Taiwanese and Kuwaiti groups offers significant strengths in learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Teachers in Taiwan can recognise their students’ strengths as visual learners who have high interpersonal skills and who are at the same time extroverted learners. Teachers in Kuwait can also recognise their students’ strengths as interpersonal learners who are extroverted and who also have visual intelligences and hands-on tactile skills.

Implications for further research
The procedures used in the study for data collection and analysis can be employed in the future by researchers working within other cultural settings. The findings of these studies can be used by EFL teachers everywhere to design teaching strategies and materials that accommodate their students’ learning styles and multiple intelligences.
Furthermore, teachers in EFL countries can enhance their students’ intelligences and learning styles by raising their student’s awareness of the intelligences and learning styles that they do not use and by developing them. Tasks and activities that do not seem quite as suited to their students’ intelligences and style preferences will help them 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 both the Taiwanese and the Kuwaiti groups are global learners who show a lack of interest in analytic problem solving. Teachers in both countries may, therefore, raise their students’ awareness to learn to use analysis and logic in order to study and learn more effectively. 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 helpful in the EFL classroom.
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