YAYASAN AKRAB PEKANBARU
Akrab Juara : Jurnal Ilmu-ilmu Sosial
Volume 11 Nomor 1 Edisi Februari 2026 (128-141)

12

THE INFLUENCE OF DIFFERENCES IN FIVE LEARNING STYLES ON EXAMINATION ANXIETY AMONG STUDENTS AT MUHAMMADIYAH SAINTEK UNIVERSITY

Suyanto, Fisa Wisnu Wijaya, Purwanto, Nurkomar Hidaya, Warno
Prodi Sains Data Universitas Saintek Muhammadiyah Indonesia
(Naskah diterima: 1 January 2026, disetujui: 28 January 2026)

Abstract

This quantitative study aims to compare pre-examination anxiety levels among 46 university students from various higher education institutions based on five learning style categories (Visual, Auditory, Writing, Kinesthetic, and Social). Data were collected through questionnaires and analyzed using a One-Way ANOVA. The assumption tests indicated that the data were normally distributed (Shapiro–Wilk, p = 0.092) and that variances across groups were homogeneous (Levene's Test, p = 0.791), thereby meeting the requirements for parametric analysis. The main analysis revealed no significant differences in anxiety levels among students with the five learning styles (F(4,41) = 1.954; p = 0.120 > 0.05). Further analysis using the Tukey HSD post hoc test also confirmed the absence of significant differences across all group pairs. These findings indicate that dominant learning styles do not significantly influence students' academic anxiety responses prior to examinations. The results suggest that educators should continue to implement varied instructional strategies and foster supportive learning environments to help all students effectively manage emotional pressure during examination periods.
Keywords: *Differences in Five Learning Styles, Exam Anxiety*

Abstrak

Penelitian kuantitatif ini bertujuan untuk membandingkan tingkat kecemasan sebelum menghadapi ujian pada 46 mahasiswa dari berbagai perguruan tinggi ditinjau dari lima kategori gaya belajar (Visual, Auditori, Menulis, Kinestetik, dan Sosial). Data dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner dan dianalisis menggunakan uji One-Way ANOVA. Hasil uji asumsi menunjukkan bahwa data berdistribusi normal (Shapiro–Wilk, p=0,092) dan varians antar kelompok bersifat homogen (Levene Test, p=0,791), sehingga memenuhi syarat analisis parametrik. Hasil analisis utama menunjukkan bahwa tidak terdapat perbedaan tingkat kecemasan yang signifikan di antara mahasiswa dengan kelima gaya belajar tersebut (F(4,41)=1,954;p=0,120>0,05). Uji lanjut Tukey HSD juga mengonfirmasi tidak adanya perbedaan signifikan pada seluruh pasangan kelompok. Temuan ini menyimpulkan bahwa gaya belajar dominan tidak memengaruhi secara signifikan respons kecemasan akademik mahasiswa sebelum menghadapi ujian. Hasil penelitian ini menyarankan pendidik untuk tetap menerapkan strategi pengajaran yang variatif serta menciptakan lingkungan belajar yang suportif guna membantu seluruh mahasiswa mengelola tekanan emosional selama masa ujian secara efektif
Kata kunci: Perbedaan Lima Gaya Belajar, Kecemasan Ujian

I. INTRODUCTION

Most developments in the world are the result of human learning (Mousavi et al., 2024). Learning is an essential activity in everyone's life and can take place at home, at school, or in other settings, either individually or in groups, for specific purposes (Saija, 2020). Learning itself is defined as a relatively stable change in behavior as a result of experience (Yazıcı, 2017). In the context of higher education, academic achievement is a primary indicator of student success and is commonly represented by the Grade Point Average (GPA) (York et al., 2015). It has been demonstrated that psychological factors such as beliefs, attitudes, motivation, control over learning, learning styles, cognitive styles, self-efficacy, and anxiety all contribute to academic performance (Khoo et al., 2024).

Academic anxiety is a problem that can affect most aspects of students' learning activities (Kifli et al., 2019). In academic contexts, anxiety tends to disrupt the learning process and reduce achievement, including impairments in attention and memory performance (Kifli et al., 2019). Test anxiety, in particular, refers to feelings of tension, fear, and worry experienced by students in evaluative situations (Ayalp & Özdemir, 2016). High levels of test anxiety may prevent students from demonstrating their actual academic abilities and negatively affect examination performance (Ayalp & Özdemir, 2016).

Previous studies indicate that test anxiety remains a significant issue among university students and requires serious academic attention. Moreover, individual differences, including learning styles, are believed to play an important role in shaping students' emotional responses toward examinations. However, empirical evidence examining the relationship between learning styles and test anxiety remains limited, particularly in higher education contexts.

Therefore, this study was conducted to address this gap by comparing pre-examination anxiety levels among 46 students from various higher education institutions based on five learning style categories: Visual, Auditory, Writing, Kinesthetic, and Social. The findings of this study are expected to provide valuable insights for educators in developing instructional strategies and supportive learning environments to help students manage academic anxiety effectively.

II. THEORETICAL STUDIES

Academic anxiety is generally caused by tension, stress, pressure, or confusion experienced by individuals in both mental and physical forms (Khoo et al., 2024). This type of anxiety can manifest through physical symptoms such as trembling, sweating, rapid heartbeat, and dry mouth, as well as cognitive impairments including loss of concentration, memory difficulties, and difficulty constructing coherent responses during examinations (Gayatri et al., 2023).

Test anxiety often arises from feelings of unpreparedness when academic demands exceed an individual's perceived capabilities (Kurnia et al., 2024). If left unmanaged, test anxiety may lead to avoidance behaviors, reduced classroom participation, and psychological distress (Gayatri et al., 2023). Students frequently experience these symptoms due to overwhelming academic workloads, examinations, and high performance expectations (Kurnia et al., 2024).

Learning styles refer to the ways in which individuals absorb, process, and retain information (Saija, 2020; Kurnia et al., 2024). Understanding students' learning styles is essential for educators in determining appropriate teaching strategies (Saija, 2020). Learning styles represent individual preferences regarding how information is perceived and processed within learning and study contexts (Freire Palacios et al., 2024). Each learner is unique, possessing distinct characteristics, abilities, preferences, and cognitive approaches that differentiate them from others (Ayalp & Özdemir, 2016).

The compatibility between students' learning styles and instructional methods has a significant impact on their academic stress levels (Kurnia et al., 2024). Students who perceive a mismatch between teaching methods and their preferred learning styles tend to experience higher levels of stress and anxiety (Freire Palacios et al., 2024).

Previous studies have reported that test anxiety is more prevalent among tactile-kinesthetic learners (Khoo et al., 2024). Additionally, students with divergent and accommodative learning styles tend to experience higher levels of test anxiety due to their emotional sensitivity, whereas students with convergent and assimilative learning styles often demonstrate better planning abilities that help reduce anxiety during examinations (Mousavi et al., 2024). Effective learning outcomes largely depend on the alignment between

instructional environments and students' preferred learning styles (Freire Palacios et al., 2024).

Educators are expected not only to achieve academic targets but also to support students' mental and emotional development by accommodating diverse learning styles (Kurnia et al., 2024). Creating adaptive and supportive learning environments can help mitigate academic anxiety and improve students' overall learning experiences (Khoo et al., 2024). Understanding learning styles is particularly important during the transition to university, a period often associated with increased academic stress (Freire Palacios et al., 2024).

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a quantitative approach with a comparative research design, aiming to compare students' pre-examination anxiety levels based on their dominant learning styles. The analytical method used is One-Way Analysis of Variance (One-Way ANOVA), as the study involves one categorical independent variable with more than two groups and one dependent variable measured on a numerical scale.

The independent variable in this study is the dominant learning style, which consists of five categories: visual, auditory, writing, kinesthetic, and social. Meanwhile, the dependent variable is the level of pre-examination anxiety, which is measured using an anxiety scale instrument in the form of a questionnaire employing a Likert scale.

Research Instrument

The research instrument used in this study is a questionnaire. Table 1 presents the Likert scale scoring rubric applied in this research.

Table 1. Likert Scale Scoring Criteria

Score	Assessment Criteria	Description
1	**Strongly Disagree (SD)**	**Students completely disagree with the given statement.**
2	**Disagree (D)**	**Students disagree with the statement but still show some tolerance.**
3	**Neutral (N)**	**Students feel neutral or do not yet have a clear opinion.**
4	**Agree (A)**	**Students agree with the proposed statement.**
5	**Strongly Agree (SA)**	**Students strongly agree with and fully support the statement.**

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

The statistical method used in this study is One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), which aims to examine whether there are differences in the mean values of the dependent variable across more than two groups based on a single factor. The One-Way ANOVA model can be expressed as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{Y_{ij} = \mu + \tau_i + \varepsilon_{ij}}$$

where:

- $\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}}$= the value of the dependent variable (anxiety level) for the *j*-th observation in the *i*-th group
- $\boldsymbol{\mu}$= the overall mean (grand mean) of anxiety levels across all groups
- $\boldsymbol{\tau_i}$= the effect of the *i*-th treatment or group (learning style)
- $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_{ij}}$= the random error associated with the *j*-th observation in the *i*-th group

Partitioning of Variance (Sum of Squares)

The total variability of the data in this study is divided into two main components, namely between-group variance and within-group variance, which can be expressed as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{SST = SSB + SSW}$$

where:

- SST (Sum of Squares Total) represents the total variation of students' anxiety levels from the overall mean
- SSB (Sum of Squares Between) represents the variation in anxiety levels attributable to differences among learning style groups
- SSW (Sum of Squares Within) represents the variation in anxiety levels within each learning style group caused by factors other than the treatment

1. (*Sum of Squares Between / SSB*)

$$\text{SSB} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \, (\bar{Y}_i - \bar{Y})^2$$

2. (*Sum of Squares Within / SSW*)

$$\text{SSW} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left(Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_i\right)^2$$

3. (*Sum of Squares Total / SST*)

$$\text{SST} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left(Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}\right)^2$$

where:

- k= number of groups (learning styles)
- n_i= number of observations in the i-th group
- $\bar{Y}_i$= mean anxiety score of the i-th group
- $\bar{Y}$= overall mean (grand mean) of anxiety scores

(*Degree of Freedom*)

The degrees of freedom in a one-way ANOVA are determined as follows:

- **Between Groups:**

$$\text{df}_{between} = k - 1$$

- **Within Groups:**

$$\text{df}_{within} = n - k$$

- **Total:**

$$\text{df}_{total} = n - 1$$

where:

- k= number of groups
- n= total number of observations

(*Mean Square*)

- **Mean Square Between Groups:**

$$\text{MS}_{between} = \frac{\text{SSB}}{\text{df}_{between}}$$

- **Mean Square Within Groups:**

$$\mathrm{MS}_{within} = \frac{\mathrm{SSW}}{\mathrm{df}_{within}}$$

Model Significance Test (F-Test)

The significance of differences among group means is tested using the **F-test**, which is calculated as follows:

$$F = \frac{\mathrm{MS}_{between}}{\mathrm{MS}_{within}}$$

Testing Criteria:

- If the p-value < 0.05, there is a statistically significant difference in mean values among the learning style groups.
- If the p-value ≥ 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference in mean values among the learning style groups.

IV. RESEARCH RESULTS

Based on descriptive statistical analysis, students' pre-examination anxiety levels showed variations in mean scores across different learning styles. Although differences in mean anxiety levels were observed among the visual, auditory, writing, kinesthetic, and social learning style groups, these differences remained within a relatively narrow range. Overall, such variations were insufficient to indicate statistically significant differences without further inferential analysis.

The results of the assumption tests indicated that the anxiety data were normally distributed and that variances were homogeneous across learning style groups. The Shapiro–Wilk test yielded a significance value of p > 0.05, indicating that the data met the normality assumption, while Levene's test produced a p-value greater than 0.05, confirming homogeneity of variances. With both assumptions satisfied, parametric analysis using the One-Way ANOVA was deemed appropriate for testing the research hypothesis.

The results of the One-Way ANOVA revealed an F-value of F(4,41) = 1.954 with a significance level of p = 0.120 (> 0.05). Based on these findings, the null hypothesis (H_0), which states that there is no difference in pre-examination anxiety levels among students with the five learning styles, was accepted, while the alternative hypothesis (H_1), which posits differences in anxiety levels based on learning styles, was rejected. These results were further

supported by the Tukey HSD post hoc test, which indicated that all pairwise comparisons among learning style groups yielded significance values above 0.05, confirming the absence of statistically significant differences in anxiety levels across groups.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Anxiety Levels Based on Learning Styles

Learning Style	Mean	Standar Deviasi	N
Auditori	22.79	4,39	14
Kinestetik	19,88	5,67	17
Menulis	24,29	5,06	7
Sosial	23,00	7,07	2
Visual	18,00	3,85	6

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of students' anxiety levels based on learning styles. Students with a writing learning style exhibited the highest mean anxiety score (M = 24.29), followed by those with social (M = 23.00) and auditory (M = 22.79) learning styles. In contrast, kinesthetic (M = 19.88) and visual (M = 18.00) learning styles demonstrated lower mean anxiety levels. The standard deviations for each group indicate variability in anxiety levels within each learning style category, with differing numbers of respondents across groups.

Table 3. Results of the Normality Test for Anxiety Data (Shapiro–Wilk)

Statistik	Nilai
W	0,95758
p-value	0,09228

Table 3 presents the results of the normality test for anxiety level data using the Shapiro–Wilk test. The Shapiro–Wilk statistic yielded a W value of 0.95758 with a significance level of p = 0.09228 (> 0.05), indicating that the anxiety data are normally distributed. Therefore, the normality assumption required for parametric analysis has been satisfied.

Tabel 4. Hasil Uji Homogenitas Varians Tingkat Kecemasan (Levene Test)

Statistik	Nilai
F hitung	0,4239
p-value	0,7905
Keputusan	Homogen

Table 4 presents the results of the homogeneity of variance test using Levene's Test. The calculated F value was 0.4239 with a significance level of p = 0.7905 (> 0.05), indicating that the variances of anxiety levels across learning style groups are homogeneous. Therefore, the data meet the homogeneity of variance assumption required for conducting a One-Way ANOVA.

Tabel 5. Hasil Uji One-Way ANOVA Tingkat Kecemasan Berdasarkan Gaya Belajar

Sumber	**Df**	**Mean_Square**	**F_Hitung**	**Sig**
Gaya Belajar	4	49,640	1,954	0.11973
Residuals	41	25,404		

Table 5 presents the results of the One-Way ANOVA conducted to compare anxiety levels based on learning styles. The analysis yielded an F-value of F(4,41) = 1.954 with a significance level of p = 0.11973 (> 0.05). These results indicate that there are no statistically significant differences in anxiety levels among students with visual, auditory, writing, kinesthetic, and social learning styles.

Tabel 6. Hasil Uji Lanjut Tukey Tingkat Kecemasan Antar Gaya Belajar

Pasangan Gaya Belajar	**Selisih_Mean**	***p-value***	**Keterangan**
Kinestetik-Auditori	-2,90	0,50832	Tidak signifikan
Menulis-Auditori	1,50	0,96700	Tidak signifikam
Sosial-Auditori	0,21	1,000000	Tidak Signifikan
Visual-Auditori	-4,79	0,31028	Tidak signifikan
Menulis-Kinestetik	4,40	0,31055	Tidak signifikan
Sosial-Kinestetik	3,12	0,92057	Tidak Signifikan
Visual-Kinestetik	-1,88	0,93309	Tidak signifikan
Sosial-Menulis	-1,29	0,99769	Tidak Signifikan
Visual-Menulis	-6,29	0,18518	Tidak signifikan
Visual-Sosial	-5,00	0,74279	Tidak Signifikan

Table 6 presents the results of the Tukey HSD post hoc test, which was conducted to examine differences in anxiety levels across pairs of learning styles. All pairwise comparisons yielded p-values greater than 0.05, indicating that there are no statistically significant differences in anxiety levels among the learning style groups. Thus, the post hoc test results further reinforce the findings of the One-Way ANOVA.

The results of this study indicate that dominant learning styles do not have a significant effect on students' pre-examination anxiety levels. This conclusion is based on the One-Way ANOVA results, which demonstrated a significance value greater than 0.05. Statistically, there are no meaningful differences in anxiety levels among students with visual, auditory, writing, kinesthetic, or social learning styles. These findings suggest that academic anxiety prior to examinations is a condition that can be experienced by students in general and is not directly influenced by specific learning style preferences.

From a descriptive perspective, students with writing and social learning styles exhibited relatively higher mean anxiety levels compared to those in other learning style groups. This condition may be associated with the characteristics of these learning styles, in which students tend to engage more intensively in internal cognitive processes, such as organizing information in written form or participating in extensive social interactions. Such processes may heighten awareness of academic demands and potential failure, thereby triggering anxiety. However, despite these observed differences in mean values, inferential analysis revealed that the differences were not statistically significant.

Conversely, students with visual and kinesthetic learning styles demonstrated relatively lower mean anxiety levels. This may be attributed to their tendency to learn through visual observation or direct hands-on activities, which can facilitate easier comprehension and retention of learning materials. More concrete understanding of academic content may enhance students' confidence when facing examinations. Nevertheless, the lower mean anxiety levels observed in these groups did not indicate statistically significant differences when compared to other learning styles.

The absence of significant differences among learning style groups suggests that pre-examination anxiety is not solely influenced by how students receive and process information. Other factors, such as learning preparedness, prior academic experiences, pressure to achieve specific outcomes, and perceptions of examination difficulty, are likely to contribute more substantially to the emergence of anxiety. Therefore, academic anxiety can be understood as a complex and multidimensional psychological response.

The Tukey HSD post hoc test results, which showed no significant differences across all learning style pairs, further strengthen the conclusion that learning style is not a primary distinguishing factor in students' anxiety levels. The post hoc analysis provides evidence that

the descriptively observed mean differences are not sufficiently robust to indicate real differences among groups. Consequently, learning style differences cannot be used as a reliable predictor of students' pre-examination anxiety levels.

These findings are consistent with several previous studies suggesting that learning styles exert greater influence on learning strategies and content comprehension than on emotional conditions such as anxiety. Test anxiety is more commonly associated with internal psychological factors, including emotional regulation and self-efficacy, as well as external factors such as evaluation systems and academic environments. This indicates that the relationship between learning styles and academic anxiety is indirect and not statistically significant.

Based on these findings, an important practical implication is that educators do not need to differentiate anxiety management approaches based on students' learning styles. Instead, educators are encouraged to implement varied and inclusive instructional strategies and to create safe and supportive learning environments for all students. Efforts such as providing adequate practice opportunities, offering clear explanations of evaluation systems, and delivering emotional support prior to examinations can help students manage anxiety more effectively, regardless of their learning styles.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the descriptive statistical analysis, it can be concluded that students' anxiety levels prior to examinations exhibit variation when viewed in terms of their dominant learning styles. Differences in the mean anxiety scores across learning style groups indicate a descriptive tendency toward variability in anxiety levels. This suggests that each learning style may possess certain characteristics in responding to evaluative situations such as examinations. However, the observed variations cannot yet be interpreted as statistically meaningful differences and remain within the range of normal individual variation.

The results of the statistical assumption tests indicate that the students' anxiety data met the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances, which are the primary prerequisites for conducting a One-Way ANOVA. The fulfillment of these assumptions demonstrates that the data distribution across learning style groups is balanced and does not exhibit significant deviations. Therefore, the results of the One-Way ANOVA analysis can be

considered valid, reliable, and appropriate as a scientific basis for drawing conclusions in this study.

The One-Way ANOVA results revealed that there were no statistically significant differences in anxiety levels among students with the five dominant learning styles, namely visual, auditory, writing, kinesthetic, and social. The obtained significance value exceeded the predetermined significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis (H_0) and the rejection of the alternative hypothesis (H_1). This finding indicates that differences in learning styles do not exert a sufficiently strong influence to significantly differentiate students' anxiety levels prior to examinations.

Thus, it can be concluded that dominant learning style is not a primary factor determining differences in students' pre-examination anxiety levels. Although descriptive differences in mean anxiety scores were observed among learning style groups, these differences were not strong enough to be generalized as statistically significant differences. This finding reinforces the notion that academic anxiety is a complex phenomenon that cannot be explained by a single factor, such as learning style alone.

The findings of this study suggest that students' anxiety levels before examinations are more likely influenced by factors beyond learning styles, such as academic preparedness, mastery of course material, prior examination experiences, learning strategies, academic pressure, and individual psychological conditions, including self-confidence and stress management abilities. These factors may interact with one another and contribute more substantially to the emergence of anxiety than learning style preferences alone.

Overall, the findings of this study provide insight that efforts to reduce students' pre-examination anxiety should not focus solely on adjusting instructional methods based on dominant learning styles. A more comprehensive and holistic approach is required, taking into account various academic and psychological aspects of students. Therefore, the results of this study are expected to serve as a reference for educators and educational institutions in designing more effective support strategies and interventions to help students manage academic anxiety optimally.

Recommendations

For future researchers, it is recommended to examine other factors that may influence students' anxiety levels prior to examinations, such as academic preparedness, learning

strategies, academic pressure, personality traits, or social support. The inclusion of these variables is expected to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the determinants of students' anxiety.

Future studies are also encouraged to employ larger sample sizes or involve respondents from diverse academic programs and institutions. This approach aims to enhance the generalizability of the findings and to allow for the identification of clearer differences among groups.

For educational institutions, the results of this study may serve as a consideration in designing academic support programs and anxiety management initiatives for students prior to examinations. A general and comprehensive approach, rather than one focused on specific learning styles, is considered more relevant in assisting students to manage academic anxiety effectively.

REFERENCES

Ayalp, S., & Özdemir, E. Y. (2016). The relationship between learning styles and test anxiety levels of university students. *International Journal of Educational Research Review, 1*(2), 1–7.

Freire Palacios, L., Ortega Navas, M. C., & Valverde Berrocoso, J. (2024). Learning styles, teaching methods, and academic stress in higher education students. *Education Sciences, 14*(2), 145. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14020145

Khoo, S., Abdullah, A., & Hassan, N. C. (2024). Learning styles, academic emotions, and test anxiety among university students. *Journal of Educational Psychology Studies, 9*(1), 33–45.

Saija, L. M. (2020). Learning styles and teaching strategies in higher education. *International Jurnal of Instruction, 13*(2), 417–432. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13229a

Yazıcı, H. (2017). Learning, experience, and behavioral change in educational psychology. *Educational Research and Reviews, 12*(5), 240–246.

York, T. T., Gibson, C., & Rankin, S. (2015). Defining and measuring academic success.

Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 20(5), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.7275/hz5x-tx03

Dung, L. Q. (2022). *Test anxiety and academic achievement among non-English major students at a university in Hanoi*. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research, 5*(12), 6001– 6009. https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v5-i12-88

Kifli, I., Sunawan, S., & Jafar, M. (2019). Cognitive behavior group counseling to reduce academic anxiety. Jurnal Bimbingan Konseling, 8(2), 119–124. https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jubk/article/view/28170

Kurnia, N. A., Maula, A. A., Alvian, A. R., Shofariyah, N., Zahra, N. L., & Wulandari, A. (2024). Perbedaan tingkat stres akademik siswa berdasarkan gaya belajar mereka di SMPN 1 Candi Sidoarjo. Jurnal on Education, 7(1), 7004–7014. https://jonedu.org/index.php/joe/article/view/7380

Ayalp, G. G., & Özdemir, N. (2016). Relationship between test anxiety and learning styles of architecture undergraduates. Creative Education, 7(3), 364–375. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2016.72036

Yazıcı, K. (2017). The relationship between learning style, test anxiety and academic achievement. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 5(1), 61–71. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2017.050108

Aristawati, A. R., Pratitis, N., & Ananta, A. (2020). *Kecemasan akademik mahasiswa menjelang ujian ditinjau dari jenis kelamin*. *Sukma: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi, 1*(1), 73–80. https://jurnal.untag- sby.ac.id/index.php/sukma/article/view/3637

Damayanti, A. K., & Pratitis, N. T. (2012). *Gaya belajar ditinjau dari tipe kepribadian dan jenis kelamin*. *Persona: Jurnal Psikologi Indonesia, 1*(2), 88–98. https://doi.org/10.30996/persona.v1i2.33

AASyah, M. C. (2014). *Pengaruh motivasi akademik, gaya belajar, dan penyesuaian diri di perguruan tinggi terhadap prestasi akademik mahasiswa tahun pertama* (Skripsi, Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta). Repository UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta. http://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/handle/123456789/27949

Mabrurah, A. N. (2021). *Perbedaan prestasi belajar ditinjau dari gaya belajar pada mahasiswa Fakultas Psikologi*. *Buletin Riset Psikologi dan Kesehatan Mental, 1*(1), 11–17. https://doi.org/10.20473/brpkm.v1i1.23898