

()

*

:

(26)

(579)

:

.

:

.

:

(Eccles et al., 1993)

(Clifford, 1990)

(Alspaugh, 1998)

(Deci and Ryan, 1990)

(Gentry,2000)

(Grigorenko

.2004/4/12

2003/8/10

*

.and Sternberg, 1997)

- .1 (2002) (Gentry et al., 2001) "
- .2 ."
- .3
- .4

()

(Dunn, 1993)

:

:

-1 :

-2 .

a thinking style
a feeling style

(Oakland et al., 2000) Briggs .
an organized style :
a flexible style "

"
.(2002)

"
.(Chan, 2001)

"
.(2001)

) ()
(Oakland et al., 2000) (

.(Dunn and Milgram, 1993)

(Clark,
.1997)

(Oakland et al., 2000) Jung

an extroverted :
an introverted style style

:
.(Renzulli, 1994) (practical style
an imaginative style

(Winner,1996)
(Archambault
(Renzulli, 1994) (Reis et al., 1993) et al., 1993)

(Schiefele, 1991)

(Deci

and Ryan 1985)

(Tobias, 1994)

(Hootstein, 1994)

(Gagne, 1995) (Robinson and Robinson, 1982)

(Gardner, (Bloom, 1985) (Dewy, 1916)
.1991)

(Alexender and Knight,

(Renzulli, .1993)

.1994)

(DeGroot and Pintrich, 1990)

(Kerka, 1992)

(Clifford, 1990)

(Shore et al., 1991)

(Gardner, - 1991)

()

(Grigorenko

.(Renzulli, 1994)

and Sternberg, 1997)

(390)

-4

(Renzulli

(Kettle et al., 1998)

1994)

(978)

(Gentry et al., 2000)

(Pyryt et al., 1998)

(Renzulli, (Dewey, 1916) (Schiefele, 1991)

(867)

1994)

.(Renzulli, 1994)

(Gentry et al., 2000)

(787)

(340)

(Tam, 1997)

(Oakland et al., 2000)

(1554)

(2001)

(2002)

(757)

(Chan, 2001)

(398)

(Gentry et al., 2002)

(2751)

(Gentry et al., 2001)

)
(2221)

.(

:
 (/)
 :
 47
)
 .(
 -14) (36 -27) (13-1) (26
 .(47-37)
 (1)]
 .[(5) (4) (3) (2)
 37
 (3) (2) (1)]
 .[(5) (4)

20

()
 (.92) (18) (26) (579)
 (8)

)
 (Renzulli et al.,1998) (
)
 (Gentry et al., 1999) (
)
 .(

47

:

) .7 ([]) .1

([]) .8 ([]) .2

(1) ([]) .3

:

(28.7) (46.8)

(26) ([]) .4

()) .5

() ([]) .6

(2) ()

(1)

7.48	46.8	[]
5.9	28.7	[]
4.69	26	[]
3.69	18.19	[]
2.72	15.8	[]
3.24	15.22	[]
2.91	13.91	[]
2	6.79	[]

(2)

1	4.32		30
0.91	4.27		13
1.07	4.25		29
0.93	4.25		43
0.85	4.24		8

(5)

0.91	4.27	
0.85	4.24	
0.89	4.19	
0.98	4.05	
0.94	4.03	
0.96	3.99	
0.89	3.98	
0.94	3.87	
1.01	3.78	
1.19	3.69	
1.02	3.67	
1.15	3.52	
1.21	3.33	

(6)

1	4.32	
1.07	4.25	
1	4.12	
1.10	4.06	
1.18	3.88	
1.12	3.73	
1.25	3.53	
1.33	3.33	
1.32	3.31	
1.23	3.04	

(7)

0.93	4.25	
1.11	4.15	
1.18	3.96	
1.12	3.91	

1.19	3.82	
1.19	3.80	
1.21	3.78	
1.15	3.73	
1.39	3.53	
1.30	3.05	
1.31	2.52	

(8)

1.03	4.17	
1.16	3.99	
1.03	3.87	
1.12	3.85	
1.06	3.62	
1.15	3.51	
1.23	3.37	
1.18	3.36	
1.22	3.34	
1.26	3.33	
1.20	3.32	
1.41	3.04	
1.29	2.81	

(9)

7.04	18.87	[]
3.61	12.11	[]
3.52	8.27	[]
2.09	7.87	[]
2.91	7.43	[]
1.91	6.40	[]
1.69	6.39	[]
1.28	3.65	[]

(10)

1.08	4.38	
1.13	4.32	
1.19	4	
1.28	3.65	
1.26	3.36	

(11)

1.05	1.90	
1.16	1.91	
1.15	2.01	
1.20	2.02	
1.20	2.11	

(12)

()

	0.645	24.7	171.23	354	
		22.05	172.20	225	

:

()

.(12)

(Chan, 2001)

)

(

(Gentry et al., 2001)

:

:

.1

(Reis et al., 1993)

(Renzulli, 1994)

(2002

)

- Experiences in Schools and Families, *American Psychologist*, 48: 90-101.
- Gagne, F. 1995. From Giftedness to Talent: A Developmental Model and its Impact on the Language of the Field, *Roeper Review*, 18: 103-111. / 2001
- Gardner, H. 1991. *The Unschooled Mind: How Children Think and How Schools Should Teach*. New York: Basic Books. .14-5 2002
- Gentry, M. et al. 1999. Assessing Middle School Students' Perceptions of Classroom Activities, Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, Montreal, Canada. .1 29
- Gentry, M. et al. 2000. Gifted and Nongifted Middle School Students: Are their Attitudes Towards School Different as Measured by the New Effective Instrument, My Class Activities?, *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 24 (1):74-96.
- Gentry, M. et al. 2001. Gifted Students Perceptions of Their Class Activities: Differences among Rural, Urban, and Suburban Student Attitudes, *Gifted Child, Quarterly*, 45 (2): 115-129.
- Gentry, M. et al. 2002. Examining Perceptions of Challenge and Choice in Classrooms: The Relationship between Teachers and their Students, *Gifted Child, Quarterly*, 46 (2): 145-155.
- Grigorenko, E. and Stenberg, R. 1997. Styles of Thinking, Abilities, and Academic Performance, *Exceptional Children*, 63: 295-312.
- Hootstein, E. 1994. Motivating Middle School Students. *Middle School Journal*, 31-35.
- Kerka, S. 1994. Self- directed Learning, Myth and Realities. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED365818).
- Kettle, K. et al. 1998. Products of Mind: Exploring Student Preferences for Product Development Using My Way... An Expression Style Instrument. *Gifted Child, Quarterly*, 42: 48-61.
- Oakland, et al. 2000. Temperament-Based Learning Styles of Identified Gifted and Nongifted Students, *Gifted*
- Alexander, P. and Knight, S. 1993. Dimensions of Interplay between Learning and Teaching, *Educational Forum*, 57: 232-245.
- Alsbaugh, J. 1998. Achievement Loss Associated with the Transition to Middle School and High School, *Journal of Educational Research*, 92: 20-25.
- Archambault et al. 1993. Regular Classroom Practices with Students: Results of a National Survey of CLASSROOM TEACHERS. STORRS, CT: National Research Centre.
- Chan, David. 2001. Learning STYLES in Hong Kong, *Gifted Child, Quarterly*, 45 (1): 35-44.
- Clark, B. 1997. *Growing Up Gifted* (5th ed.) Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Clifford, M. 1990. Students Need Challenge, Not Easy Success, *Educational Leadership*, 48: 22-26.
- Deci, E. and Ryan, R. 1985. *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Dewey, J. 1916. *Democracy and Education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dunn, R. and Milgram, R. 1993. Learning Styles of Gifted Students in Diverse Cultures, in R. Milgram et al. (eds.) *Teaching and Counseling Gifted and Talented Adolescents*, Westport, CT: Praeger: 3-23.
- Dunn, R. 1993. Teaching Gifted Adolescents through their Learning Style Strengths, in Milgram et al. (eds.) *Teaching and Counseling Gifted and Talented Adolescents*, Westport, CT: Praeger: 37-67.
- Eccles, J. et al. 1993. Development During Adolescence: The Impact of Stage- environment Fit on Adolescents'

- Centre, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Robinson, N. and Robinson, H. 1982. *The Optimal Match*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schiefele, U. 1991. Interests, Learning, and Motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 26:299-323.
- Shore, B. et al. 1991. Recommended Practices in Gifted Education. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tam, P. 1997. Novice and Experienced Teachers' Instructional Activities in the Classroom. *Educational Research Journal*, 12: 36-50.
- Tobias, S. 1994. Interest, Prior Knowledge, and Learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 64: 37-54.
- Winner, E. 1996. *Gifted Children*. New York: Basic books.
- Chiled, *Quarterly*, 44(3): 183-189.
- Pintrich, P. and DeGroot, E. 1995. Motivational and Self-regulated Learning Components of Classroom Academic Performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82:33-40.
- Pyryt, M. et al. 1998. Learning Style Preferences, *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 13: 71-76.
- Reis, S. et al. 1993. Why Not Let High- Ability Students Start School in January? The Curriculum Compacting Study, Storrs, CT: National Research Centre.
- Renzulli, J. 1994. *Schools for Talent Development: A Practical Plan for Total School Improvement*. Mansfield Centre, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Renzulli, J. et al. 1998. *Learning Styles Inventory*. Mansfield

Learning Styles Preferred by Middle School Students in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

*Azizah Abdul-Aziz Al-Mani' **

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the teaching styles that are applied in middle schools in Saudi Arabia as well as students' learning style preferences. Three questions were investigated: What learning styles are preferred most by students? What teaching motivations are included in them? And do learning style preferences of students differ from common teaching styles in middle school?

The study sample was drawn from middle school students in Riyadh, it included (579) students (males and females) in the ninth grade in private and public schools .

Data analysis showed that the learning styles most preferred by students included learning through verbal interaction, learning by doing, and learning together with colleagues. The least preferred learning styles were: learning by rote, autonomous learning, and doing exercises and solving problems. Further, learning styles preferred by students included some motivating dimensions such as interest, challenge, choice, and enjoyment which are rarely used in teaching styles that are the most common.

This means that common teaching styles do not meet students' learning style preferences, therefore, the study recommended that teachers need to employ strategies that are congruent with students' preferences so that their learning outcomes can be optimized. Also, they need to plan instruction in different styles to suit students' choices.

KEYWORDS: Learning styles, Teaching styles, Education in KSA.

* King Saud University, KSA. Received on 10/8/2003 and Accepted for Publication on 12/4/2004.