DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 863 EC 143 128

AUTHOR Cage, Bob N.
TITLE Teaching by Learning Styles: A Viable Alternative for Academically Gifted Students.
PUB DATE 13 Feb 82
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (Austin, TX, February, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Academically Gifted; Academic Aptitude; *Cognitive Style; Intermediate Grades; Self Concept; *Study Habits

ABSTRACT

The study explored the relationship among learning style, self report or self concept, academic achievement, and academic aptitude of 60 academically gifted fourth, fifth, and sixth graders. Ss were administered the Learning Style Inventory, Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale, California Achievement Test, and California Short Form of Academic Aptitude. The investigation suggested that more common variance in achievement can be accounted for by a combination of learning style variables with self concept alone; and that controlling for cognitive aptitude, in addition to self concept, does not significantly enhance the relationship. Sixty percent (N=36) of Ss preferred not to study in late morning; none of these 36 Ss preferred to study in the morning; 12 preferred the afternoon; and the remainder were indifferent to the time of day for studying. Tables with statistical data are appended. (SB)

TEACHING BY LEARNING STYLES: A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR ACADEMICALLY GIFTED STUDENTS

Dr. Bob N. Cage
Director, Bureau of Educational Research and
Professor, Educational Administration
University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi 38677

Paper Presented
at
The Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational
Research Association, Austin, Texas,
February 13, 1982

TEACHING BY LEARNING STYLES: A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR ACADEMICALLY GIFTED STUDENTS

Introduction

Sufficient research in recent years has shown that children grouped by learning style rather than by cognitive achievement show significantly more cognitive growth in the areas of reading and mathematics (Burton, 1981; Carbo, 1980; Cavanaugh, 1979; Dunn and Dunn, 1978; Kusler, 1979; Price, 1981; Trautman, 1979). Studies with academically gifted children have shown that they have distinct learning styles differentiating them from non-gifted (Griggs and Price, 1979; Dunn and Price, 1980). When children's learning styles are matched with teacher's teaching styles, the research shows the greater the congruence the higher the grade point average (Anderson and Bruce, 1979; Cafferty, 1980).

These findings support the present learning style theory that both children and adults have a unique learning style (Witkin, et.al., 1967; 1977), that learning styles remain consistent across subject matter (Copenhaver, 1979), and that learning style theory attempts to relate educational practice to psychological theory through a reciprocal relationship (Hunt, 1981).

After a thorough review of the literature, Bracht (1970, p. 627) concluded that "no single instructional process provides optimal learning for all students". More recently, Barbe, et.al. (1979) concluded that student modality strengths (learning styles)

should be considered in instructional planning. Further, they believed that instructional planning should include the selection and development of media and materials based upon student modality preferences.

Barbe (1981) also stated that teachers teach the way they learn best rather than by how they were taught, as has been held historically. Teachers need to recognize the various learning styles among their students and teach to those styles.

Purpose

The purpose of this paper was to explore the relationship among learning style (Dunn, Dunn and Price, 1975; 1977; 1979), self-report self-concept (Piers and Harris, 1969), academic achievement (California Achievement Test, McGraw-Hill, 1980) and academic aptitude (California Short Form of Academic Aptitude, 1979) of 60 academically gifted children in grades four, five and six. Sufficient research has demonstrated the relationship between achievement and self-concept (Dunn, et.al., 1979; Purkey, 1970; Brookover, 1964) but the evidence remains inconclusive when the relationship of learning styles, cognitive achievement and self-concept are investigated, holding aptitude constant.

Rationale

The theoretical basis for this investigation stems from the work of Witkin (1967), Messick (1969; 1976) and Purkey (1970). The professed consistency of learning styles across curricula

suggests that cognitive achievement may be more highly related to learning style than to traditional cognitive and affective variables. Academically gifted students (IQ>120), theoretically, should excell in academia, however grade reports provide inconsistent evidence.(Dunn and Price, 1980). This research looks at the interrelationship of these variables within a compressed range of grade point averages and a high relationship between achievement and aptitude.

Methodology

Sixty fourth, fifth and sixth grade children from a university community in North Mississippi, chosen to participate in an academically gifted (enrichment) program by their teachers and counselor, were used in this study. Criteria for inclusion in the enrichment program included an IQ>120 (WISC-R), a grade point average of B+ or better and teacher recommendations. The children are drawn from study halls or regularly scheduled classes for their enrichment class.

The Learning Style Inventory (Dunn, Dunn and Price, 1975) and Piers-Harris Self-concept Scale (1969) were administered in October, 1981. Data from the Spring, 1981, testing of the California Achievement Test were used as cognitive achievement; data from the California Short Form of Academic Aptitude during the same testing period were used for the aptitude measure.

Multiple linear regression and partial correlation were used to analyze the data (Nie, et.al., 1975). T-scores generated

from the Learning Style Inventory (LSI) profile analyses and raw scores from the Piers-Harris Self-concept Scale were the independent variables. Scale scores from the reading, language arts and mathematics sub-tests of the California Achievement Test were the dependent variables. Scale scores from the same three cognitive areas on the California Short Form of Academic Aptitude were used as control variables (Nie, et.al., 1975, p. 332). Pearson single order correlation coefficients and partial correlation coefficients were also generated for comparative purposes.

Results

The data in Table I show the LSI variables loading into the multiple regression equation by cognitive area. For reading achievement, eight learning style variables loaded before self-concept and in combination accounted for 53 percent of the total variance in the reading achievement scores. As seen in Table A in the Appendix, 23 LSI variables in combination with self-concept explained 64 percent of the variance in the reading scores.

For language arts achievement, seven variables loaded prior to self-concept and in combination explained 53 percent of the variance in the the language arts achievement scores. Table B in the Appendix shows that 21 LSI variables in total loaded and with the Piers-Harris measure accounted for 61 percent of the total variance.

Table I

Independent Variables Loading in Multiple Regression Analysis by Cognitive Achievement Area

		Reading Achievement
LSI	21	Prefers not to study in late morning
LSI	8	Persistence in doing school work
LSI	3	Prefers warm room
LSI	24	Does not need mobility
LSI	9	Does not see self as responsible
LSI	19	Prefers intake
LSI	12	Does not necessarily like to study with peers
LSI	18	Does not prefer to study by kinesthetic modality
PH		Self-concept
		Multiple R = .73
		R^2 = .53
		Language Arts Achievement
LSI	21	Prefers not to study in late morning
LSI	8	Persistence in doing school work
LSI	3	Prefers warm room
LSI	19	Prefers intake
LSI	17	Does not prefer tactile learning modality
LSI	20	Does not prefer to study in the morning
LSI	10	Does not prefer structure
PH		Self-concept
		Multiple R = .73
		R^2 = .53

Table I
(continued)

Mathematics Achievement

LSI	18	Prefers not to learn by kinesthetic modality
LSI	16	Prefers not to learn by visual modality
PH		Self-concept
LSI	21	Prefers not to study in late morning
LSI	5	Believe they are not motivated
LSI	1	Prefers sound as background for studying
LSI	3	Prefers warm room
LSI	19	Prefers intake
LSI	12	Does not necessarily like to study with peers
LSI	8	Persistence in doing school work
LSI	7	Is not teacher motivated

Multiple $R = .77$
$R^2 = .59$

In contrast, only two variables loaded before self-concept when mathematics achievement was the dependent variable (See Table I). When the first 11 variables were considered in the loadings, they accounted for 59 percent of the total variance in mathematics achievement. In Table C (See Appendix), 23 LSI variables, along with self-concept explained 62 percent of the total variance in mathematics achievement.

For comparison purposes, a partial correlation matrix was generated using achievement scores as the dependent variable, learning style variables (1-24) as the independent variable, and aptitude and self-concept as control variables, both independently and in combination.

When aptitude was the controlling variable, the single largest partial correlation coefficient between achievement and learning style was -.40 for language arts achievement and desiring a structured environment; a +.35 for mathematics achievement and being responsible; a -.24 for reading achievement and need of mobility. When self-concept was the controlling variable, the single largest partial correlation coefficient between achievement and learning style was -.53 for language arts achievement and studying in late morning; a -.42 for mathematics achievement and kinesthetic modality preference; and a -.35 for reading achievement and studying in late morning.

When aptitude and self-concept were both used as control variables, the single largest partial coefficient between achievement and learning style was -.40 for language arts and studying

in late morning; a +.32 for mathematics and being responsible; and a -.25 for reading and need of mobility.

Conclusions

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship among variables of achievement and aptitude in reading, language arts and mathematics; variables of learning style (K=24); and the variable of self-concept. Previous research has shown the high association between achievement and self-concept (Purkey, 1970; Brookover, 1964; Dunn, et.al., 1979) and achievement and aptitude (California Achievement Test, 1980; California Short Form of Academic Aptitude, 1979). This investigation suggests that more common variance in achievement can be accounted for by a combination of learning style variables with self-concept than by self-concept alone; and that controlling for cognitive aptitude, in addition to self-concept, does not significantly enhance the relationship.

In closing, a few additional comments about the learning style variables that accounted for the major part of the variance in achievement of these 60 academically gifted students. Thirty-six (60 percent) of these Ss preferred not to study in late morning; of this 36, none of them preferred to study in the evening; five preferred to study in the morning; 12 preferred to study in the afternoon; the remainder were indifferent to time of day for studying. For scheduling purposes of academically gifted students, it seems apparent that activity periods should come just before lunch; and giving home work assignments may be counter-productive.

Extremely bright students are persistent in their studies, more so in reading and language arts than in mathematics. They prefer a warmer room to a cooler one, prefer to eat or chew while they are studying and do not necessarily like to study with peers. Students high in reading achievement did not desire mobility, in contrast to students in language arts and mathematics who were indifferent about the idea. Good mathematics students, however, prefer not to learn by kinesthetic or visual modalities, believe they are not motivated toward learning, prefer sound as a background while studying and have a higher self-concept than their counterparts in reading and language arts. This discrepancy of similar learning styles for reading, language arts and mathematics does not support Copenhaver's (1969) research which showed a consistency across these same disciplines.

In summary, certain learning style variables, taken in combination, are significantly related to higher achievement among academically gifted students. This finding further supports the position that teachers of academically gifted students should use learning style preferences in their teaching strategies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, W. and Bruce, S. W. A plan for matching learning and teaching styles. In O. B. Kiernan (Ed.) Student Learning Styles, Diagnosing and Prescribing Programs. Reston, Virginia: NASSP, 1979, pp. 81-88.

Barbe, W. B. and Milone, M. N. What we know about modality strengths. Educational Leadership, 38, 5, 378-80., 1981.

Barbe, W. B., Swassing, R. H. and Milone, M. N. Teaching through modality strengths: concepts and practices. Zaner-Bloser, Columbus, Ohio, 1979.

Bartko, J. J. and Carpenter, W. T. On the methods and theory of reliability. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 163, 5, 307-317, 1976.

Bracht, G. H. Experimental factors related to aptitude-treatment interactions. Review of Educational Research, 40, 5, 627-641, 1970.

Brookover, W. B. Self-concept of ability and school achievement. Sociology of Education, 37, 271-278, 1964.

Burton, E. An analysis of the interactions of field independence/dependence and word type as they affect word recognition among kindergarteners (Doctoral dissertation, St. John's University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1981, 42, 2994-A. (University Microfilms No. 8119602)

Cafferty, E. An analysis of student performance based upon the degree of match between the educational cognitive style of the teachers and the educational cognitive style of the students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1981, 41, 2908-A. (University Microfilms No. 8101213)

California Achievement Test, CTB/McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Monterey, California, 1980.

California Short Form of Academic Aptitude, CTB/McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Monterey, California, 1979.

Carbo, M. An analysis of the relationships between the modality preferences of kindergarteners and selected reading treatments as they affect the learning of a basic sight-word vocabulary (Doctoral dissertation, St. John's University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 41, 1389-A. (University Microfilms No: 8021790)

Cavanaugh, D. Meeting the needs of individuals through their learning styles. In O. B. Kiernan (Ed.), Student Learning Styles, Diagnosing and Prescribing Programs. Reston, Virginia: NASSP, 1979, pp. 99-108.

Cohen, J. Weighted kappa: nominal scale agreement with provision for scaled disagreement or partial credit. Psychological Bulletin, 70, 4, 213-220, 1968.

Copenhaver, R. The consistency of learning styles. The Teacher Educator, 15, 3, 2-6, 1979-80.

Dunn. R. and Dunn, K. Teaching Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles. Reston, Virginia: Reston Publishing Company, Inc. (Prentice-Hall Co.), 1978.

Dunn, R., Dunn, K. and Price, G. Diagnosing learning styles: a prescription for avoiding malpractice suits against school systems. Phi Delta Kappan, 58, 418-20, 1977.

Dunn, R., Dunn, K. and Price, G. Identifying individual learning styles. In O. B. Kiernan (Ed.), Student Learning Styles, Diagnosing and Prescribing Programs. Reston, Virginia: NASSP, 1979, pp. 39-54.

Dunn, R., Dunn, K. and Price, G. Learning style inventory. Lawrence, Kansas: Price Systems, Inc., 1975.

Dunn, R. and Price, G. Identifying the learning style characteristics of gifted children. The Gifted Child Quarterly, 24, 1, 33-36, 1980.

Dunn, R., Price, G., Dunn, K. and Sanders, W. Relationship of learning style to self-concept. The Clearinghouse, Washington, D.C.: Heldref Publications, 53, 3, 155-8, 1979.

Griggs, S. and Price, G. Learning Styles of the gifted. In O. B. Kiernan (Ed.), Student Learning Styles, Diagnosing and Prescribing Programs. Reston, Virginia: NASSP, 1979, pp. 63-64.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. and Grablowsky, B. J. Multivariate data analysis, Petroleum Publishing Company, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1979.

Hunt, D. Learning style and the interdependence of practice and theory. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 9, 647, 1981.

Kusler, G. Cognitive mapping and prescriptive education. In O. B. Kiernan (Ed.), Student Learning Styles, Diagnosing and Prescribing Programs. Reston, Virginia: NASSP, 1979, pp. 89-97.

Messick, S. Measures of cognitive styles and personality and their potential for educational practice. In K. Ingenkemp (Ed.), Developments in Educational Testing, London: University of London Press, 1969.

Messick, S. Personality consistencies in cognition and creativity. In S. Messick and Associates (Eds.), Individuality in Learning. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1976, pp. 4-22.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K. and Bent, D. H. Statistical package for the social sciences, 2nd. Ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1975.

Piers, E. V. and Harris, D. B. The Piers-Harris children's self concept scale manual. Counselor Recordings and Tests, Nashville, Tennessee, 1969.

Price, G. Research on learning style. Paper presented at the Third Annual National Conference on Learning Style, New York City, July 15-22, 1981.

Purkey, W. W. Self concept and school achievement. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1970.

Trautman, P. An investigation of the relationship between selected instructional techniques and identified cognitive style (Doctoral dissertation, St. John's University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 40, 1428-A. (University Microfilms No. 7920965)

Witkin, H., Goodenough, D. and Karp, S. Stability of cognitive style from childhood to young adulthood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7, 3, 291-300, 1967.

Witkin, H. A., Moore, C. A., Goodenough, D. R. and Cox, P. W. Field-dependent and field-independent cognitive styles and their educational implications. Review of Educational Research, 47, 1, 1-64, 1977.

APPENDIX

Table A

Multiple Regression
Dependent Variable: Reading Achievement
Control Variable: Reading Aptitude

Summary Table

Variable		Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	Simple R	B	Beta
T21	Late Morning	0.34389	0.11826	0.11826	-0.34389	-0.1614610D-01	-0.19341
T8	Persistent	0.46205	0.21349	0.09523	0.34058	0.1075440D+00	0.40073
T3	Warmth	0.51837	0.26870	0.05522	0.19883	0.7269629D-01	0.46543
T24	Needs Mobility	0.57927	0.33555	0.06685	-0.15119	-0.3748320D-01	-0.38291
T9	Responsible	0.60926	0.37120	0.03564	-0.17829	-0.9863845D-01	-0.52519
T19	Requires Intake	0.63557	0.40395	0.03275	0.13150	0.5132073D-01	0.51414
T12	Peer Oriented Learner	0.66746	0.44550	0.04155	-0.07874	-0.2334150D-01	-0.20166
T18	Kinesthetic Preferences	0.69916	0.48883	0.04332	-0.19705	-0.2331663D-01	-0.08117
PH		0.71451	0.51053	0.02171	0.07175	0.8284473D-01	0.41156
T23	Evening	0.72612	0.52725	0.01672	-0.12635	-0.5123838D-01	-0.29411
T1	Sound	0.74020	0.54790	0.02064	0.01119	-0.2223954D-01	-0.23127
T22	Afternoon	0.74676	0.55766	0.00976	0.08883	-0.2591450D-01	-0.21276
T6	Adult Motivated	0.75500	0.57002	0.01236	0.11868	0.1685138D+00	0.17643
T20	Morning	0.76206	0.58073	0.01071	-0.15753	-0.2339787D-01	-0.21704
T14	Several Ways	0.76825	0.59020	0.00947	0.06986	-0.4262463D-01	-0.37678
T13	Learning with Adults	0.77664	0.60317	0.01296	-0.03862	0.1843481D-01	0.22451
T17	Tactile Preferences	0.78296	0.61303	0.00987	-0.09453	-0.3353671D-01	-0.14662
T11	Learning Alone	0.78769	0.62045	0.00742	0.01814	-0.2464385D-01	-0.15821
T4	Formal Design	0.79237	0.62786	0.00740	-0.11873	-0.9814784D-02	-0.06798
T7	Teacher Motivated	0.79465	0.63147	0.00361	-0.07748	-0.3371301D-01	-0.08778
T10	Structure	0.79648	0.63439	0.00292	-0.00549	0.9635992D-02	0.07310
T2	Light	0.79868	0.63790	0.00351	0.09512	-0.7784237D-02	-0.06029
T16	Visual Preferences	0.79913	0.63860	0.00071	-0.20603	-0.7187629D-02	-0.04386
T15	Auditory Preferences	0.79939	0.63902	0.00042	-0.05958	0.6061208D-02	0.02734
(Constant)						0.3943983D+01	

Table B

Multiple Regression
Dependent Variable: Language Arts Achievement
Control Variable: Language Arts Aptitude

Summary Table

Variable		Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	Simple R	B	Beta
T21	Late Morning	0.50241	0.25242	0.25242	-0.50241	-0.2958196D-01	-0.36147
T8	Persistent	0.56077	0.31446	0.06204	0.29677	0.5079402D-01	0.19307
T3	Warmth	0.61980	0.38415	0.06970	0.23050	0.6956458D-01	0.45431
T19	Requires Intake	0.65145	0.42438	0.04023	0.18316	0.3034561D-01	0.31011
T17	Tactile Preferences	0.67994	0.46232	0.03793	-0.17426	-0.3270308D-01	-0.14584
T20	Morning	0.69546	0.48367	0.02135	-0.28020	-0.2106567D-01	-0.19933
T10	Structure	0.70889	0.50252	0.01885	-0.35095	-0.1681617D-01	-0.13013
T24	Needs Mobility	0.71888	0.51680	0.01427	0.08912	-0.1897795D-01	-0.19776
PH		0.72771	0.52956	0.01276	0.17628	0.7625145D-01	0.38641
T22	Afternoon	0.74120	0.54938	0.01982	0.03785	-0.1552499D-01	-0.13002
T2	Light	0.75231	0.56597	0.01659	0.04154	-0.2112485D-01	-0.16690
T14	Several Ways	0.75965	0.57707	0.01110	0.07147	-0.2519604D-01	-0.22719
T9	Responsible	0.76576	0.58639	0.00932	-0.00668	-0.3372023D-01	-0.13814
T16	Visual Preferences	0.77344	0.59821	0.01182	-0.31672	-0.2070414D-01	-0.12888
T18	Kinesthetic Preferences	0.77725	0.60411	0.00590	-0.20511	-0.2749859D-01	-0.09765
T5	Motivated/Unmotivated	0.77869	0.60635	0.00224	0.03884	-0.2203863D-01	-0.07748
T11	Learning Alone	0.77964	0.60784	0.00149	-0.09132	-0.1581680D-01	-0.10358
T12	Peer Oriented Learner	0.78155	0.61082	0.00298	0.02374	-0.1183823D-01	-0.10433
T13	Learning with Adults	0.78240	0.61215	0.00132	-0.10657	0.4913803D-02	0.06104
T6	Adult Motivated	0.78314	0.61331	0.00117	-0.03789	-0.4723767D-01	-0.05045
T1	Sound	0.78358	0.61400	0.00069	0.12226	0.2940050D-02	0.03119
T23	Evening	0.78368	0.61415	0.00015	0.05020	-0.2964444D-02	-0.01736
(Constant)						0.1437525D+02	

Table C

Multiple Regression
Dependent Variable: Mathematics Achievement
Control Variable: Mathematics Aptitude

Summary Table

Variable		Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Square	Simple R	B	Beta
T18	Kinesthetic Preferences	0.42255	0.17854	0.17854	-0.42255	-0.3780417D-01	-0.26314
T16	Visual Preferences	0.55242	0.30517	0.12663	-0.36052	-0.1737921D-01	-0.21204
PH		0.58893	0.34684	0.04167	0.16429	0.3036226D-01	0.30157
T21	Late Morning	0.61942	0.38369	0.03685	-0.34366	-0.7258743D-02	-0.17385
T5	Motivated/Unmotivated	0.65031	0.42290	0.03922	-0.21436	-0.3994420D-01	-0.27526
T1	Sound	0.68285	0.46628	0.04338	0.27755	0.7549542D-02	0.15696
T3	Warmth	0.70334	0.49469	0.02840	0.03104	0.2144972D-01	0.27457
T19	Requires Intake	0.71979	0.51809	0.02341	0.16002	0.1080631D-01	0.21645
T12	Peer Oriented Learner	0.73490	0.54008	0.02198	-0.06264	-0.1312911D-01	-0.22678
T8	Persistent	0.74976	0.56214	0.02207	0.34336	0.3003697D-01	0.22378
T7	Teacher Motivated	0.75968	0.57711	0.01497	-0.22527	-0.3912287D-01	-0.20366
T22	Afternoon	0.76633	0.58727	0.01016	-0.07336	-0.6412285D-02	-0.10526
T9	Responsible	0.77052	0.59370	0.00643	0.11910	-0.1571629D-01	-0.16730
T6	Adult Motivated	0.77482	0.60034	0.00664	0.07019	-0.4870470D-01	-0.10195
T23	Evening	0.77823	0.60564	0.00529	-0.17141	-0.1145376D-01	-0.13145
T20	Morning	0.78042	0.60906	0.00342	-0.16725	-0.3529967D-02	-0.06547
T13	Learning with Adults	0.78324	0.61346	0.00440	-0.06605	0.3459091D-02	0.08423
T17	Tactile Preferences	0.78622	0.61815	0.00468	-0.35056	-0.1022302D-01	-0.08936
T10	Structure	0.78759	0.62030	0.00215	-0.16894	-0.3835651D-02	-0.05818
T2	Light	0.78889	0.62235	0.00205	0.10875	0.3265072D-02	0.05056
T4	Formal Design	0.78968	0.62359	0.00125	-0.19642	0.3776451D-02	0.05229
T11	Learning Alone	0.78985	0.62386	0.00026	-0.08750	0.3159434D-02	0.04055
T24	Needs Mobility	0.79003	0.62415	0.00029	0.06020	0.1284115D-02	0.02623
T15	Auditory Preferences	0.79024	0.62449	0.00033	-0.07962	-0.2713403D-02	-0.02447
(Constant)						0.1396551D+02	

Your Learning Style Profile

Stimuli | Elements

student's name: _____

Environmental

1. quiet
2. noise
3. bright
4. dim
5. cool
6. warm
7. formal
8. informal

Emotional

9. self
10. adult
11. teacher
12. un-motivated
13. persistent
14. not
15. I AM RESPONSIBLE
16. not very
17. needs
18. needs little
structure
M T W Th F

Sociological

19. self
20. peer
21. peers
22. several
23. adult
24. varied

Physical

25. auditory
26. visual
27. tactile
28. kinesthetic
29. intake
30. no
31. a.m.
32. late a.m.
33. p.m.
34. evening
35. mobility
36. no