

Linguistic Intelligence of Undergraduate EFL Learners in Higher Education: A Case Study

Dian Erlina¹, Lenny Marzulina¹, Annisa Astrid¹, Deta Desvitasari¹, Rani Septi Sapriati¹, Rizqy Dwi Amrina¹, Amirul Mukminin^{2,*}, Akhmad Habibi²

¹Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teaching Sciences, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang, Indonesia

²Doctoral Program in Education, the Graduate School, Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

Received July 22, 2019; Revised August 19, 2019; Accepted September 5, 2019

Copyright©2019 by authors, all rights reserved. Authors agree that this article remains permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License

Abstract The qualitative research with a case study approach was employed to explore and describe the linguistic intelligence of undergraduate EFL Learners of one state Islamic university in Palembang, Indonesia. The data were collected through observation of everyday activities in the classroom, survey, and interview. The participants of this study involved undergraduate EFL Learners. The results showed that there was a small number of the learners who used the language effectively to persuade others (rhetoric), who remembered the written and spoken information easily (mnemonic), who were able to deliver information orally and written (explanation), and who reflected language to talk about language itself (metalinguistic). The results of this study are expected to be beneficial for the students, the managers, and lecturers of English education study program in Indonesia to have deeper understanding about the concept of linguistic intelligence as it is one of factors that can influence the success in language learning.

Keywords Case Study, EFL Learners Multiple Intelligences, Linguistic Intelligence

1. Introduction

Learning a language is still considered as a challenging task for its learners because of their individual differences. According to Crozier, “individual differences may lead to academic success or failure in the area of foreign or second language learning” (as cited in Salahzade & Lashkarian, 2015, p. 88). One of the individual differences is intelligence. According to Gardner (2011) and Armstrong (2002), intelligence is an individual difference influencing to what extent a language learner learns second or foreign language. In learning a foreign language, especially

English, the intelligence is involved. It can be inferred that intelligence plays an important role in language learning effectiveness. As one of the influencing factors in learning a foreign language, intelligence itself has developed throughout years. In the past time, it was defined only as a single property of one’s brain and was measured by IQ test which focused on both linguistic and logical intelligence. This traditional notion of intelligence based on IQ test is very limited (Gardner, 2011; Hoerr, 2000). Instead, Gardner (2011) proposed a theory of Multiple Intelligences consisting of nine types of intelligences, including linguistic intelligence.

As one of the nine types of intelligences, linguistic Intelligence is related to language. It is defined specifically as the capacity to use language effectively in oral and written form (Armstrong, 2009; Gardner, 2011). One of those who possesses high levels of linguistic intelligence is teacher (Armstrong, 2009). By having high linguistic intelligence, teacher conveys the material to the students clearly. Besides, they receive the information easier and understand clearly what other people mean. It can be inferred that linguistic intelligence is connected to language and it is a significant tool for teachers in providing, accepting and understanding knowledge.

In relation to these advantages, EFL learners should have high level of linguistic intelligence to reach their future career as professional English teachers. A professional English teacher is required to have a good English proficiency, such as good fluency in all English skills, namely: listening, reading, writing, and speaking (Husarida, & Dollete, 2019; Marzulina, Nova, Herizal, Holandyah, Erlina, & Lestari, 2018; Mukminin, Ali, & Ashari, 2015; Mukminin, Haryanto, Sutarno, Sari, Marzulina, Hadiyanto, & Habibi, 2018; Mukminin, Masbirorotni, Noprival, Sutarno, Arif, & Maimunah, 2015). It is supported by Butler (2012) who stated that teachers’ English skills have been recognized as an important

qualification for successful English teaching. Thus, it can be claimed that English teacher should have strong linguistic intelligence by having good mastery in English skills.

However, English proficiency among Indonesian is rated low. It was ranked 39th out of 80 countries in the world in 2017 (English First English Proficiency Index, 2017). As a result of low English proficiency of Indonesian, many Indonesians have poor performance in speaking, reading, writing and listening while these skills are the abilities to have in order to encourage linguistic intelligence. This is supported by Shumin, "there has been a lack of literature and information on EFL student teachers' experience in speaking English in Indonesian context" (as cited in Abrar, Mukminin, Habibi, Asyraf, Makmur, & Marzulina, 2018, p. 129). Furthermore, Indonesian reading interest is low. Gewati (2016) states based on survey done by Central Connecticut State University, Indonesia was stated as the 60th rank out of 61 countries in the world in reading interest case" (as cited in Kompas.com, 2016). In fact, many Indonesian learners chose to watching the television rather than reading (as cited in Lestary & Holandyah, 2016, p. 46). Also, Indonesian university students are regarded as weak where they have difficulties to write academically due to those limitations (Harjanto, 2014; Hardono, 2016). Writing skill is very important for EFL learners but this skill is difficult for many EFL learners (Mukminin, Ali, & Ashari, 2015). Last, Megawati, Mustafa and Bahri (2016) found that the ability of the Indonesian EFL students in comprehending the authentic language spoken by a native speaker of English was very low. Even though students have passed 80 hours in listening class for three semesters, this time is not adequate students to reach advanced levels of listening proficiency.

Regarding the problems above, several related studies had been undertaken to investigate the students' linguistic intelligence. Firstly, linguistic intelligence was the dominant intelligence than others which is correlated significantly to all of language skills, namely; speaking, writing, reading, and listening (Ahmadian & Hosseini, 2012; Desvitasari, 2015; Ghafarian & Amiri, 2016; Naseri & Ansari, 2013; Rahimi, Sadighi, & Hosseini, 2011; Wijaya, 2014). Then, linguistic intelligence had positive relationship with linguistic competencies, such as, affixation awareness, recalling lexical items, and students' knowledge of lexicon (Mekhlafi, 2015; Shakouri, Sheikhky, & Teirmourtash, 2016; Parsa, Jahandar, & Khodabandelou, 2013). Additionally, linguistic intelligence was found as one of the dominant intelligence which is affected by some internal and external factors such as, physical and emotional condition, learning styles, teachers, teaching media used and the school programs and there was no difference between male and female linguistic intelligence (Darmawan, 2015; Irvaniyah & Akbar, 2014; Rahmawaty, 2014). It can be claimed that linguistic intelligence was the best predictor on student's linguistic

knowledge and it is not only influenced by internal factors, but also external factors, and between male and female there was no difference of linguistic intelligence.

Based on the findings from the previous studies took an important role in designing this research. Those studies were related to correlational studies and the factors affecting linguistic intelligence. However, there was no research which explores and explains more how the linguistic intelligence of the students is. Furthermore, we decided to do this study as an attempt to provide information for policy makers at the university and faculty levels to help student teachers succeed in becoming future English teachers through knowing their linguistic intelligence. Thus, we were interested in analyzing, exploring, and developing a detailed understanding about the linguistic intelligence of undergraduate EFL learners of one of state Islamic university in Palembang. The following research question guided this study in an attempt to describe and analyze linguistic intelligence of undergraduate EFL learners of one state Islamic university in Palembang, Indonesia: How was the linguistic intelligence of undergraduate EFL learners of one state Islamic university in Palembang, Indonesia?

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Intelligence

Intelligence has developed throughout years. Gardner (2011) says that in the past time, intelligence was defined as a single property of human mind. Also, it only could be measured by standardized instrument called IQ (Intelligence Quotient) test which consists of verbal and logical-mathematical tests. However, there are many cons with this traditional view of intelligence. Gardner (2011) argued that "traditional view of intelligence employed in educational and psychological settings needed reform" (as cited in Esmaeli et al. 2014, p. 2663). He suggested that "the concept of a "pure" intelligence measured by a single IQ score is flawed" (pp. 2663-2664). Then, the new paradigm offers that human mind possess more complex properties. Armstrong (2009) says, "the concept of intelligence began to lose its mystique and became a functional concept that could be seen working in people's lives in a variety of a ways" (p. 9). He says that each person has all intelligences to some degree and displays them uniquely. Therefore, the intelligence is not a single entity, but a variety of talents and everyone has different dominant intelligence. As the combination of different abilities, intelligence is also defined as the ability to solve problems in a given different situation. According to Gardner (2011) and Hoerr (2000), intelligence has more to do with the ability to solve problems and to fashion products that are culturally valued. Based on the concepts above, we tried to conclude the definition of intelligence as the mental

capacity of an individual to find a way to deal with and end the problem and to create the product which can be affected and activated by culture and environment.

2.2. Factors Affecting the Intelligence

As people who have the intelligence, the mental capacity to solve problems and create the product, it can be affected by some factors. Armstrong (2009) states three main factors which affect the growth of intelligence, they are as follow:

- (1) Biological endowment, including hereditary or genetic factors and insults or injuries to the brain before, during, and after birth.
- (2) Personal life history, including experiences with parents, teachers, peers, friends, and others who awaken intelligences, keep them from developing, or actively repress them.
- (3) Cultural and historical background, including the time and place in which you were born and raised and the nature and state of cultural or historical developments in different domains. (p. 27)

The theory of multiple intelligences introduced by Gardner (1983) has developed throughout years. In 1983, Gardner proposed in the book *Frames of Mind* the existence of at least seven basic intelligences, they are linguistic, logical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, musical, spatial, and bodily-kinesthetic intelligence. After that, in 1999, he added an eighth naturalistic intelligence. Moreover, two years later a ninth type of intelligence, existential intelligence, was added to the list (Ramzjoo, 2008).

This theory was proposed in order to make clear about the old concept of intelligence. Gardner's theory states that human beings have a combination of nine types of intelligences which work together to make them different and unique people (Ahmadian & Hosseini, 2012; Al-Mekhlafi, 2015; Ramzjoo, 2008; Samiyan, 2013; Shakouri et al. 2016). Also, Armstrong (2009) claims that each person has all eight intelligences to some degree and displays them uniquely. Thus, the multiple intelligences theory againsts the concept of intelligence which consists of single property of our brain. This provides the new paradigm that our brain consists of more complex properties.

Additionally, according to Armstrong (2009), there are four key points of multiple intelligences theory which are important to remember. Firstly, everyone has all eight intelligences but different level. Also, they can improve each intelligence if they are given the appropriate impulse, improvement and commandment. After that, in people's life, intelligences are always working together in complex ways. At last, there are many ways to be intelligent. Considering the four key points of multiple intelligences, the theory of multiple intelligences gives the contribution to some fields, especially for education. Hoerr (2000)

claims that "the theory of multiple intelligences (MI) brings a pragmatic approach to how the to define intelligence and allows the teachers to use their students' strengths to help them learn" (p.1). Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences immediately plays important role in educational field, it affects learners' achievement as well as their learning strategies (Alhamudin & Bukhori, 2016; Campbell & Campbell, 1999; Samiyan, 2013). In summary, from those claims by some experts, it can be concluded that multiple intelligences provides the charity to education area which is used by human such as teacher and students to help them to be intelligent.

2.3. Linguistic Intelligence

Linguistic intelligence is one of the multiple intelligences proposed by Gardner (1983; 2011), a professor of education from Harvard University. It is defined the capacity to use language effectively whether in oral or written (Armstrong, 2009; Gardner, 2011). Gardner has described "linguistic intelligence as sensitivity to spoken and written language and the ability to use language to accomplish goals, as well as the ability to learn new language" (as cited in Parsa et al., p. 115). Based on the concepts of linguistic intelligence, it can be assumed that linguistic intelligence includes the ability to persuade others using words orally, creative writing skills, and the ability to pick up on other languages easily.

There are four sensitivities of linguistic intelligence related to the language. They should be combined in order to balance the linguistic intelligence. They are the sensitivity of phonology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics (Armstrong, 2009; Gardner, 2011). Besides having the four sensitivities, linguistic intelligence also have some aspects. There are four aspects of linguistic intelligence proved of striking importance in human society. These aspects are the indicators of linguistic intelligence. They are rhetoric, mnemonic, explanation, and metalinguistic (Gardner, 2011; Armstrong, 2009). Gardner (2011) defines, "rhetoric is the ability to use language to convince other individuals of a course of action" (p. 82). It is the ability to use language orally in front of many people to persuade others such as debate and public speaking. Besides rhetoric, the other aspect of linguistic intelligence is mnemonic. It is "the capacity to use language to help one remember information" (p. 82). It can be assumed that the aspect of linguistic intelligence can be the capacities to remember the information. Then, explanation plays important role in teaching and learning process because it is the ability to use language in providing the information. Last, metalinguistic or metalanguage is the fourth aspect of linguistic intelligence. This aspect is the ability to learn language itself. According to Gardner (2011), metalinguistic is "the language potential to explain its own activities" (p. 83). People with this potential are often ask about language when they are not understand. In other words, it is the capacity to use language to talk about itself.

2.4. Characteristics of Linguistically - Intelligent People

As people who have well-developed linguistic intelligence, they have their own characteristics. They would learn any language successfully and perform better than those who have low linguistic intelligence. In other words, people who are able to master the languages meaning that they have high linguistics intelligence. There are some characteristics, activities and possible carriers of people with this intelligence.

Firstly, there are some characteristics of people with high linguistic intelligence.. A person with well-developed linguistic intelligence usually: listen and respond to the sound, rhythm, color, and variety of the spoken word; exhibit ability to learn other languages such as learn through listening, reading, writing, speaking to communicate, discuss, explain and persuade; good at writing; comprehend, paraphrase, interpret, and remember what has been said; read and speak effectively; spells easily; enjoys word games; understands puns, jokes, riddles, tongue-twisters; readily incorporates descriptive language; good story teller; uses complex sentence structure; appreciates the subtleties of grammar and meaning, often, loves to debate issues or give persuasive speeches, and able to explain things well (Laughin, 1999 as cited in Abdallah, 2008; Hoerr, Boggeman, & Wallach, 2010).

Besides the characteristics, linguistically intelligent people also have their own pursuits. Some experts state the activities for linguistic intelligence learners. Armstrong (2009) and Hammoudi (2010) state the activities for linguistic intelligence learners in the classroom, such as: brainstorming, choral reading, debates, extemporaneous speaking, individualized reading, journal keeping, large- and small-group discussions, lectures, manuals, memorizing linguistic facts, publishing (e.g., creating class newspapers), reading to the class, sharing time, storytelling, student speeches, talking books, tape recording one's words, using word processing software, word game, worksheets, writing activities such as, write a story, poem or drama, write an essay, write a newspaper article, write in a learning journal, make a book, interview, do research at the library or on the internet, use a dictionary, and make a presentation.

As what the criteria and some activities mentioned above, some researchers argue that those who possess high levels of linguistic intelligence are linguistic-Librarian, archivist, curator, speech pathologist, lawyer, secretary, typist, proof reader, English teacher, poet, public speaker, orator, writer, novelist, journalist, seminar presenter, translator, scriptwriter, actor, speechwriter, and broadcaster (Armstrong, 2009; Gardner, 2011; Hamoudi, 2010; Lunenburg, 2014; Mekhlafi, 2014; Ramzjoo, 2008; Samiyan, 2013). It can be claimed that people who master the language tend to have high linguistics intelligence, while those who do not put much exposure in language will

have lower ability in linguistic intelligence.

In brief, people with high linguistic intelligence have their own normal behaviors. They learn language more successfully and perform better than others. Also, they will be better than others in performing the language. Therefore, their activities and possible careers are based on their characteristics such as exhibit ability to learn other languages such as learn through listening, reading, writing, speaking to communicate, using language effectively to explain things well and persuade others; good at writing, speaking, reading and listening; easily to remember the information; enjoys word games; uses complex sentence structure grammatically.

3. Methods

3.1. Research Design

This research aimed to investigate the existence of linguistic intelligence of undergraduate EFL learners of one state Islamic university in Palembang, Indonesia. Therefore; the qualitative research design was used in this study; with a case study approach. This research focused on a single unit. It is supported by some experts who say that qualitative research is described as the research which exploring a problem and developing a detailed understanding of a central phenomenon such as situations, activities, relationship, perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of a group of people with in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g Interview, survey, and observation) (Creswell, 2012; Mukminin & McMahan, 2013; Mukminin, Habibi, Muhaimin, Asrial, Haryanto, Setiono, & Sofyan, 2019; Prasojo et al., 2019; Sofwan et al., 2018). Furthermore, According to Creswell (2014), "in qualitative research the researcher seeks to establish the meaning of the phenomenon from the views of participants" ("Research Approach", para. 3). It was used to comprehend the phenomena of the participants naturally and openly. Thus, this study only provided a picture of situation about linguistic intelligence of the participants in the research site and the findings are not for generalization.

3.2. Research Site, Sampling, and Participants

The site of the study was English Education Study Program of one state Islamic university in Palembang, Indonesia. The main subject of this study was undergraduate EFL learners of one state Islamic university in Palembang, Indonesia. The participants were chosen by using purposeful sampling. The aim of this study was not for generalization, it developed deep explorations from a central phenomenon. The best way to understand the phenomena was by purposefully choosing individuals and sites.

In this study, the students' linguistic intelligence was explored. Since the linguistic intelligence is the ability to use language effectively in oral or written (Armstrong, 2009), all of the students of English Education Study Program were considered as the participants to analyze their linguistic intelligence. However, the fourth semester students, consisting of 28 students were chosen as the participants. They were chosen because their activities in the classroom were still language skills and linguistic subjects which enabled us to observe them. According to Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012), "in purposive sampling, investigators use personal judgment, based on previous knowledge of population and the specific purpose of the research, to select a sample" (p. 100). Besides, based on our informal interview, this class was unsatisfied students with their language ability. In addition, because this study was related to qualitative study, only a small number of students were chosen. It is supported by Creswell (2014) and Abrar et al., (2018) who emphasize that qualitative research does not necessarily having a large number of participants. Thus, the fourth semester students, having the smallest number of students of all classes, and higher number of students being dissatisfied with their language ability were chosen as the participants of this study in order to make me easier to get closer relationship and deeper information from them.

3.3. Collection and Analysis

The research data were collected through firstly, students' behavior in their classroom activities was observed for 17 meetings by using video tape, checklist and field notes. The observation was stopped after all of the data were completed. Charmaz said "you stop collecting data when the categories (or themes) are saturated: when gathering fresh data no longer sparks new insights or reveals new properties" (as cited in Creswell, 2014). Besides, we gave the learners survey to make sure whether the result obtained from the observation was appropriate or not with them. This survey was an open-ended questionnaire which consisted of 18 questions about their language skills. In order to gain the additional data and to get the accuracy of data obtained from the observation and the survey, an interview with open ended questions was used. Astrid, Rukmini, Sofwan, and Fitriati (2017) tell that interview is used in order "to clarify the information got from questionnaire" (p. 92). Fraenkel et al. (2012) claims "the purpose of interviewing people is to find out what is on their minds- what they think or how they feel about something" (p. 450). Furthermore, it was semi-structured interview. According to Fraenkel et al. (2012), "semi structured interview is often best conducted toward the end of a study, as they tend to shape responses the researcher's perception of how things are" (p. 451). Those observation checklist, questions of survey and interview in exploring linguistic intelligence of the students were taken from the book entitled *Celebrating Every Learner Activities and*

Strategies for Creating Multiple Intelligences Classroom (Hoerr et al. 2010).

In this study, there were some procedures in analyzing the data of students' linguistic intelligence. These procedures were done orderly based on Creswell's (2014) procedures in analyzing the data in qualitative research. Firstly, we organized and prepared the data for analysis, in terms of filed notes, videos, students' answer of survey and transcribing interviews. Then, we read and looked at all the data. After that, we coded the data. Coding is the process of giving the codes for the data by bracketing chunks (text or image segments) gathered during data collection and writing a word representing a category in a margin (Rossman & Rallis, 2012 as cited in Creswell, 2014; Saldana, 2009). Coding was used in this study in order to make me easier analyzing the data such as images, video, the answers of the survey, and the transcription of interview. It is supported by Alwasilah (2008), he says that without coding and encoding the researcher will be difficult because they are the prerequisites for categories or themes. Then, arranging the themes and classifying the codes into themes. Next, the themes were represented in the qualitative narrative in order to convey the findings of the analysis. The final step is making interpretation of the findings or results by asking the lesson can be learned and comparing the findings with theories and general literature topic.

Establishment of the trustworthiness plays important role in validating the data in qualitative research. According to Cohen et al. (2007), the term of validity and reliability for qualitative research can be replaced as trustworthiness. To check the validity of the data, the triangulation and member checking technique were used. The different data sources such as, the data from observation, survey and interview were triangulated by examining the evidence from each sources. Besides, member checking technique was also conducted after the study was completed in order to get the accurate data. The findings obtained were shared and summarized and then questioned to the participants to get critically analyzed and commented. Thus, the final findings were the data filtered by using triangulation and member checking.

4. Findings

Through the long process from collecting into analyzing the data, we finally grouped the data into four aspects of linguistic intelligence of the learners; rhetoric, mnemonic, explanation, and metalinguistic. These aspects were elaborated in these findings by the pictures of their activities in the classroom and the examples of participants' statements.

4.1. Rhetoric

The first aspect of linguistic intelligence is rhetoric, the

ability to use language to convince others. According to the results of observation, we found a small number of the students who possess this ability. As we noticed, only 3 out of 28 students expressed their thoughts by using language fluently and effectively, however, the others did not. This case was seen when we observed them in speaking for Formal Setting class which lecturer always asked them to use language orally. The rests of them got the difficulties to use language orally, it was supported from the way they were talking about their speaking ability; they seemed nervous and made many mistakes in grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. Furthermore, this facts were confirmed by them in the interview session, almost all of them stated that they did not like to speak in front of people by reasoning nervous, afraid, bad grammar and lack of vocabulary.

Besides, based on our observation in writing class, we found that almost all of them were hard to express their thoughts in written language. As a matter of a fact, from the first minutes until the end of the time almost all of the students seemed having no idea what to be written. There was only title written on their paper. There was no even a sentence they wrote for 20 minutes. It was also supported by the data from interview and survey, almost all of them admitted that they were not good writers and uncomfortable in writing since they had no idea to be written, bad grammar and lack of vocabulary. From this facts, it can be inferred that almost all of the students got the difficulties in expressing themselves in written and did not have interest in writing.

Furthermore, we also found that there was only a small number of the students who could solve the problems in given situations and used language effectively to solve those problems. This activity was seen when we observed them in the class which demanded the students to make oral presentation. After the students made oral presentation they were asked some questions related to the material they presented by the lecturer and their friends. However, almost all of them were difficult to answer the questions given. They did not answer them directly and they did not use language effectively to solve those problems. Thus, it can be assumed that they could not find a way to deal with and end the problems given by using the correct explanation to convince others.

To sum up, based on the results of the three data collection methods, there was only a small number of the students had the ability to use language to persuade others. However, the other students did not possess this ability. It was supported by the facts faced by me during the observation that almost all of them were hard in expressing language and did not use language correctly in solving problems both orally and written. Also, they mentioned in survey and interview sessions that they did not like to speak in front of people because of their nervousness, lacking of ideas, and linguistic factors such as grammatical error, mispronunciation and lack of vocabulary. In other

words, almost all of the participants did not use language effectively to convince others.

4.2. Mnemonic

Besides rhetoric, another aspect of linguistic intelligence is mnemonic. Mnemonic is the ability to remember the information (Armstrong, 2009; Gardner, 2011). The results of mnemonic aspect were seen in the three data collection methods. The data about their ability in remembering the information gained from different sources of data collection supported each other.

Firstly, based on the results of observation, almost all of the students got the difficulties in receptive language. It was seen from the observation I did in listening and reading class. For example, in listening class before listening to the audio, judging from their expression, they seemed nervous. Moreover, when we looked at them one by one, they did not concentrate and they were quite apprehensive about the questions given by lecturer.

Moreover, there were 3 out of 28 students who memorize easily. We observed this in grammar class which lecturer gave the material first and asked the students at the end of the time. The results showed that only FR, KJN and IP who memorized easily about lecturer's explanation. However, the others seemed like "in one ear and out the other". When We interviewed them, they mentioned that they were hard to remember and easily to forget.

Also, there were only 4 out of 28 who were able to develop the information receipt. They were FR, YKB, IW, and MRD. It was seen in listening and reading class. When we noticed them in listening class, they were asked to retell the story by using their own words. However, almost all of them could not do that. It was same as the case in reading class, only FR and MRD who could retell the story and the situation that they had read clearly and the others could not retell clearly. In brief, there were only a small number of students who could develop an author's voice to what they had read and listen by using their own words.

The results from observation were supported by the answers of survey and interview. Based on the results of survey and interview, twenty of them stated that they were not good listeners, they got difficulties in listening because they did not understand about the meaning, they lacked of vocabulary, the speaker spoke too fast, could not repeat the story listened, had no well concentration, and a student explained that she had problems with hearing, "No, because my hearing are not good." (Ms. ISD, personal communication, April 4, 2018). In contrast, 8 out of 28 students considered that they were good listener because this activity only focusing to the sounds. Also, they stated that they had good concentration with the result that they could repeat the story correctly.

In order to know their ability to remember the written information, they were also asked about their reading ability, activities and interests. The results showed that

there was only one student named MIR who did not like reading because it was lazy activity. However, the rests of them liked reading and read at home. However, almost all of them admitted that they did not visit the library if the lecturer did not give them the assignments because they were lazy to go to library and the library at their campus was boring.

In summary, after exploring the mnemonic aspect the findings showed that they did not hold it fully. As a matter of facts, most of the participants were hard to receive information especially by listening. Then, they got difficulties in comprehending the oral information than written because of lack of vocabulary and having problem in hearing. Most of them felt that they were good readers than listeners. Additionally, almost all of them were not able to remember the information easily because they forgot easily. It can be assumed that most of them did not have well capacity to remember oral information than written.

4.3. Explanation

Then, the next aspect of linguistic intelligence is explanation. According to Gardner (2011) and Armstrong (2009), explanation is the ability to use language to transfer the information. Based on the results of the three data collection methods, it was found that there was only a small number of the students who could give information orally and written. The data gained from those different data sources supported each other.

Firstly, it was supported by the facts faced by me in the classroom, there was only a small number of the students who were able to make oral presentation. They were observed one by one when they were presenting the material in front of class. Almost all of them were not able to make oral presentation. It was proven based on our own judgment. They presented the material by merely reading the slides in the power points. Their slides were all text oriented rather than points oriented. Furthermore, they just read without caring the audiences if they understood what they were presenting. They were asked by lecturer to minimize Indonesian and maximized English. However, they still maximized Indonesian rather than English to present the materials. In interview session, the students agreed if this facts were appropriate with them, they stated that they did not comprehend the materials and they were difficult to deliver the information. Thus, it can be assumed that almost all of them were not able to make oral presentation.

Besides, it was found that there was no student who used figurative or descriptive language in their speaking and writing. Since I observed them in speaking and writing class for three meetings, their speaking and writing were like usual meaning. They did not use figurative language to create particular mental pictures when they were writing and speaking. It was proven when they were speaking; they

were nervous and afraid to speak up. Also, when they were writing they were seemed like had no idea to be written. It was clarified by them in interview session, almost all of the participants answered that they did not use it, but MRD mentioned that she used figurative or descriptive language in Indonesian when she was writing a poem. It can be assumed that all of them did not use figurative or descriptive language in written and oral in order to convey the information.

Another fact was that there was no student who was able to apply this intelligence to generate original work, to develop unique solutions to problems or create prototypes. These activities are such as creating a project by using linguistic intelligence to show their understanding of a book they have read. It can be a play, a song, a poem, riddles or clues about characters, a written piece or a spatial representation. However, for seventeen meetings we observed them, we did not found these activities in their classroom. We tried to make conclusion that they were not able to do this activities to explain their own previous knowledge.

In order to explore more about students' ability in explanation, the writing skill of students surveyed and interviewed. The results showed that all of the students mentioned that being good writer was important. However, almost half of the participants showed that they wrote at home and wrote stories while the others did not. Then, it was also found that two out of twenty eight participants felt that they were good writers. However, the others did not. Both people feeling and not as good writers had different argument. The first argument why they said they were good writers was because of having the ability in this skill (Ms IIN and Ms IW, personal communication, April 2, 2018). However, based on my analysis, the rests felt that they were not good writers because of producing many mistakes such as grammar and vocabulary and having no interest in it. In conclusion, they were not good writers because they could not use language correctly.

Based on our analysis of explanation aspect of linguistic intelligence data, it can be inferred that the participants did not have this aspect perfectly. Their abilities seen from their activities in the classroom in giving the information orally and written were not good. Also, they realized that they were not good writers to give information because of linguistic factors such as lack of vocabulary and making many mistakes in grammar. Besides, they also lacked of knowledge to convey the information. Therefore, it can be concluded that they could not be said having the ability to use language effectively in giving the information both orally and written.

4.4. Metalinguistic

The last aspect of linguistic intelligence is metalinguistic. Metalinguistic is the ability to learn or talk about language itself (Armstrong, 2009; Gardner, 2011). We found some

facts related to metalinguistic in the classroom activities. Those facts supported each other. Firstly, we found that most of students asked questions about words, sounds or definitions. It was proven in classes which had presentation activity. At the end of presentation, there were question and answer sessions. For example, in Morphology and reading class most of the students always asked about words or definitions that they did not know. They were active in group discussions, they asked about words, sounds or definition that they did not know each other. However, the rests of them did not appreciate everything in the class. Both of them just sat silently, played with their hand phone and discussed about other topics. This fact was confirmed it in the interview session. Most of the participants had sensitivities to the words, sounds or definition. It is proven by their responses, if they did not know about the meaning of the words, how to pronounce those words and the definition of something, they tried to ask their friends, lecturers or they found out by themselves by opening the dictionary. However, AH and FA stated that if the words, sounds or definition did not influence them in learning language, they passed it. Thus, from those statements above can be inferred that all of the participants interested to learn language; they did their own way to find the words, sounds or definitions that they did not understand.

The other activity to know their metalinguistic is whether they ask "what does this say" making the connection between meaning and written words. There was only a small number of the students who involved in asking and making a connection between meaning and the written words. Meaning that, there were only small numbers of the students who were interested to meaning of written words. It was proven in Morphology, Phonology, and Grammar class. Since these subjects demanded the students to present the material, so there was question and answer session. The results showed that only seven out of twenty eight students who always participated and were curious about the material in language learning while the others not by clarifying that they did not really interest with them. Thus, they did not care to ask about the meaning in the written word.

The next facts were adept in learning languages and having distinctive writing or speaking style. There was no students were adept in learning languages and had distinctive writing or speaking style. During our observation, there were no students who were highly skilled in learning languages. Since English is a foreign language for them, there was no one student who was expert in learning English. Also, based on our observation for seventeen meetings in some subjects, we have encountered students having style in speaking and writing that was different from others. Thus, it can be summarized that they were not expert in learning languages, especially in English and they had not their own styles in speaking and writing.

However, when we interviewed them, there were two

students told that they learned and had already been able in using other languages (FR & FA, personal communication, April 4, 2018) and the rests still wanted to improve their English skills in this year. For example, FA stated that she was adept in learning English and Arabic. Furthermore, FA mentioned that she almost could use English and Japanese effectively. In short, based on the interview section all of the participants felt that they were not adept in learning languages, however, two students could use English, Arabic and Japanese.

The last question asked about what they liked to do when they were not at campus. They answered that question unequally. Some varieties answers were found. In answering this question YKB and IE had similar answer; their answers were that they had another job besides as university students. IE mentioned that he was an announcer in a radio in Palembang while YKB as the waiter in a restaurant. Then, FR mentioned that her activities when she was not at campus were travelling and be volunteer. Not only FR, but also AH mentioned that he traveled when he was not at campus. Then, there were three participants said that they just read and learned their lesson books related to English Education Study Program, their names were MSP, FN and IA. Eight students just replied enjoying their lives at home, they were IIN, HDK, ISD, LA, MIR, ML, MM and MC. Furthermore, six of participants told that they watched movie when they were not at campus. LTM answered when she was not at home she played games, and watching the movie. FRR, IIN, LTM and LZA chose listening the music. IW, FA and MRD explained that they read many books while KA said that she do homework if she had no it she went out with her friends. In addition, MRD and KJN wrote some poetries when they were not on campus. In summary, they did some disparate activities when they were not at campus, such as having another job, learning lesson books, being a volunteer and traveler, watching movies, staying at home, listening music, reading books, hanging out, writing poetry and playing games.

To sum up, it was found that the students had interest in learning other languages while their own abilities and activities did not show it. It was supported from their answers that all of them in this year would like to improve and learn about all of English skills and competencies, such as speaking, grammar, listening and writing. Moreover, their activities when they were not at campus were having part time job, being volunteer and traveler, watching the movie, staying at home, listening to music, playing game and hanging out with friends. There were only a small number of the students who showed having interest in learning languages, such as reading lesson books and writing poems.

5. Discussions

Based on the results students' linguistic intelligence

analysis, each aspect of linguistic intelligence of the students had been explored, described, and analyzed. The findings showed that English foreign language learners did not comprise all of aspects of linguistic intelligence. However, in learning foreign language, especially English, the intelligence is involved (Armstrong, 2009; Gardner, 2011).

The first aspect of linguistic intelligence is rhetoric, the ability to use language to persuade others for specific purpose, there were some facts about students' rhetoric. Firstly, the results of students' rhetoric showed that only a small number of the students expressed language in the classroom easily. The small number of students confirmed that they only enjoyed expressing language orally because they got difficulties in writing. In line with this, Armstrong (2009) states that linguistic intelligence comprises of rhetoric aspect, it was "using language to convince others to take a specific course of action" (p. 82). It is opposite with the facts of the findings that a small number of the participants enjoyed expressing language only orally but not in written while the rests got the difficulties both oral and written.

Also, there were some students who liked speaking in public confidently. However, as we noted, they did not perform well in their speaking by making many mistakes in grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. It might be related to another part of individual differences, self-confidence, and these people might not possessed the ability to use language effectively in oral but they owned high self-confidence. There was an obvious contrast between this fact and the study conducted by Lasiyah (2017) who found that there was a significant correlation between self-confidence and speaking achievement. Moreover, this fact showed me if they did not possess dominant linguistic intelligence. Related to the students' intelligence profiles, Gardner (2011) mentions that everyone has different dominant intelligence. Thus, it can be concluded that not every learners in that class owned dominant linguistic intelligence.

In addition, most of the students did not like to speak in front of people. They reasoned that they were nervous, shy and afraid of other people that they would not grasp and they had no idea to be delivered. This fact showed that most of the students had no ability to use language to persuade other people because of their speaking anxiety and proficiency. It was supported by Juhana (2012) and Mohammadi and Mousalou (2012) who found that if the students have high speaking anxiety such as fear of making mistake, shyness, lack of confidence and lack of motivation the linguistic Intelligence be lower. Thus, since the participants had speaking anxiety, they might be did not hold the ability to use language persuade others.

Moreover, almost all of the students solved the problems given by taking long time and they solved the problems uncertainly by using Indonesian and Palembang language or by reading the books. Their behaviors made

others felt doubt and confused about the meaning conveyed because they did not master it. In line with this, Gardner (2011) believes that a scholar, a student who knows about a lot of particular subject that they have learned in detail, will be able to use language accurately to convince others that his or her interpretation is accurate and appropriate with the problems or situation given. Thus, almost all of the participants did not solve the problems and using language neither accurately nor effectively to convey the meaning.

Another aspect of linguistic intelligence was mnemonic, the ability to remember the verbal and written information. As we noticed in listening class, almost all of the students were anxious in listening class. Based on the result of interview and survey, most of the students mentioned that they were not good listeners. They said that they lacked of vocabularies, did not master the rules of grammar, had no good concentration, and because the speakers spoke to fast and they were unconfident with their own listening skill. Moreover, they could not develop the author's voice when they were asked to convey their understanding and their comprehension to what had been listened by using their own words. In contrast, Laughlin, he mentioned one of the characteristic of a person with well-developed linguistic intelligence is "listening effectively, understanding, paraphrasing, interpreting, and remembering what has been said" (as cited in Ahmadian & Hosseini, 2012, p. 6). This fact was also opposite to the result of the study conducted by Ghafarian and Amiri (2016) who found that linguistic intelligence could significantly predict the listening comprehension in EFL classroom. It can be interpreted that, most of the participants did not hold one of the characteristics of linguistic intelligence since they were not good at listening.

Furthermore, as we observed in the classroom there was a student who had problem in hearing. She did not hear clearly what had been said by her friends and lecturers. Furthermore, she did not realize if others talked to her. Moreover, she was not joining in Critical Listening class as she could not pass listening class in the previous semester. In the interview section, she clarified that she was not capable of everything about listening. Finally, she told me the truth that she had problem with her hearing. This fact was also supported by her friends. It is supported by Armstrong (2009) and Gardner (2011), biological endowment is one of factors affecting intelligence. Therefore, we tried to make conclusion that this student was unwell-developed linguistic intelligence since she had problem in receiving the information, it might be the factor influencing her listening, speaking and writing capacity, of course, linguistic intelligence.

Then, based on my observation in reading class, a lecturer gave them some plays on words such as puns, riddles and jokes and the text to be read. Almost all of them did not understand and respond those kinds of plays

and the text given. They seemed thinking too much about the sentence given. There were only two students who understood and responded them easily, whereas the other students were waiting the lecturer's clues first to make them easier understand the games and text given. Their characteristic was not appropriate with the characteristics of linguistically intelligence people, as one of them is understand and enjoy word games (Hoerr et al. 2010) and reading effectively by understanding and interpreting what has been read (Lauglin, as cited in Ahmadian and Hosseini 2012, p.6).

Another result of mnemonic aspect was memorizing easily. There were a small number of participants were able to memorize easily. As we noticed them in grammar class, the lecturer lectured them first and then gave them some questions. It was seen that almost all of them were not able to memorize the information given by the lecturer easily though they wrote down the information given in books available. In the interview section, they emphasized that they could memorize easily but forgot easily and a small number of them confirmed that they memorize easily when they were in mood. In contrast, this kind of teaching was opposite with the theory of Multiple Intelligence which says that teacher should provide teaching strategy that was linked to other intelligence in order to make them easier remembering information (Armstrong, 2009, p. 162). Then, according to Gardner (2011), those who are able to remember well are well-developed linguistic intelligence. Therefore, almost all of the participants were hard to memorize.

Besides rhetoric and mnemonic, another aspect for those who linguistically intelligent is explanation, the ability to use language to deliver the information in written and oral forms. Based on observation and interview, a small number of the students were found being able to make oral presentation. In presenting the material, as we noted, almost all of the students did not master the material presenting as they still read the presentation slides in text-oriented. This fact was confirmed by them, they felt that they did not master the material. In contrast, Gardner (2011) said that explanation was related to teaching and learning because they occur through language. In summary, they did not hold this ability to convey the information orally.

Furthermore, no one participant used figurative or descriptive language in speaking and writing. It was also confirmed by the almost all of the participants as they said that they rarely almost never used figurative or descriptive language. They emphasized as today modern era, if they want to say something just to the points. Then, in interview section there were a small number of the students who used figurative language since they were practicing poets but in Indonesian. However, Gardner (2011) explained the core operation of language, in his theory of linguistic intelligence; those who possess linguistic intelligence have the ability to make poetry in a

foreign tongue beautiful to hear. In the case of using figurative language, they had no this capacity.

In addition, explanation aspect of linguistic intelligence was also seen in the students' writing. According to the results of survey and interview, only a small number of the students felt that they were good writers because they always exercised writing. However, almost all of the participants felt that they were not good writers because they always produced ungrammatical sentences, and they did not have much vocabulary. On the contrary, Al-Mekhlafi (2015) emphasizes that "those with verbal linguistic intelligence are able to master the language and pay special attention to vocabulary and grammar" (p.2). Additionally, there was a student who did not like writing. It was also supported when I observed them in writing classes; almost all of them seemed difficult to convey their ideas down in the paper. In addition, there was a small number of the students told that they wrote at home if only the lecturer asked them to do assignments. On the contrary, Gardner (2011) mentioned that language is not only as a source of their study but also as a means for conveying their ideas. It can be inferred that, almost all of the participants did not own the ability to convey the written information.

Moreover, another facts of explanation aspect of linguistic intelligence, no students were able to apply linguistic intelligence to generate original work, to develop unique solutions to problems or create prototypes. Hoerr, et. al (2010) gives example in learning activities through multiple intelligence which purpose is demanding the students to show their understanding of a book they have read by completing a project using an intelligence of their choosing, for example, if the students use linguistic intelligence, they will rewrite the ending or add another chapter, write a book review, create a crosswords puzzle using vocabulary from the book and write riddles or clues about characters, making poetry. However, I did not find these activities in the classroom. It might be the lecturer did not facilitate the learners to make an original project which shows their linguistic intelligence.

The last aspect of linguistic intelligence was metalinguistic, the ability to use language to talk about language itself. Based on our observation it was found that most of the students asked question about words, sounds or definition in reading activity. It means that most of them interested to the phonology, semantics, syntax and pragmatics, as Gardner (2011) and Armstrong (2009) mentioned that linguistic intelligence has four sensitivities to the syntax, phonology, semantics and pragmatics. Furthermore, a small number of the students asked and made the connection between meaning and the written words, it was supported from their responses in interview that they had the curiosity to comprehend the meaning while the others did not.

Furthermore, in metalinguistic aspect, it was found that almost all of them felt that they were not adept in learning

languages. Furthermore, based on the interview, it was found that there were two students who mentioned that they were able to use foreign languages such as Arabic, English and Japanese. According to Armstrong (2009), learning to speak and read another language has been relatively easy for those who linguistically-intelligent. However, the other students felt that they were not master in learning languages, especially English. In other words, there were only a small number of the students who learned languages easily.

In addition, it was also found that the students in this year still wanted to improve and learn their language skills as they were still low on it, especially in English which is learned by them since they were in the elementary school. This fact also showed that almost all of the students were difficult to learn English as a foreign language. In contrast, two experts state that one of the characteristics of a person with well-developed linguistic intelligence is having the ability to learn other languages, especially English easily and use language skills like listening, speaking, writing and reading (Laughlin as cited in Ahmadian & Hosseini, 2012; Armstrong, 2009). In summary, almost all of the students were still difficult to learn other languages, especially English even though it was learned for several years.

As the result of difficult learning other languages, based on the results of observation and interview, the students were also having no specific style in writing and speaking. In line with this Gardner (2011) emphasizes that the humans seem unique when they can make sound distinctions and they can be understood rapidly enough. However, we did not found the students who had their own style in speaking and writing. In conclusion, the students having no well development in learning languages thus they still could not produce the specific style in speaking and writing.

Another fact of metalinguistic aspect was most of the students felt that they were good at reading than other skills, such as speaking, listening, and writing. There were only a small number of the students who mentioned that they were good at listening, writing and grammar. However, according to Hoerr et al. (2010) the characteristic of linguistically intelligent people are good at reading and writing, appreciated the grammar and meaning, easily remember written and spoken information and loves to debate issues or give persuasive speeches. Therefore, the students only felt good at reading rather than other skills meaning that they just possess one of the characteristics of linguistic intelligence people.

The last fact of metalinguistic aspect was their activities when they were not at campus. The results of survey and interview found, almost of their activities out of classroom did not show that they possess linguistic intelligence. Some of them had part time job, being volunteer and travelers, watching the movie, just staying at home, listening to music, playing games, doing homework and hanging out with friends. There were a small number of the students who learned lesson books and wrote poetry when they were

not at campus. These activities were contrast with the linguistically intelligent people activities.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the results, it can be concluded that all of the participants did not fully possess all of the aspects of linguistic intelligence. Based on the data obtained from observation, survey and interview there was only a small number of the learners used language effectively to persuade others (rhetoric). Furthermore, there was only a small number of the learners who remembered the written and spoken information easily (mnemonic). Then, there was only a small number of the learners who were able to deliver information orally and written (explanation). Lastly, it was found that there was only a small number of learners reflected language to talk about language itself (metalinguistic). Moreover, based on the data obtained from survey and semi-structured interview each aspect of linguistic intelligence mentioned above is divided into some other specific causes, such as anxiety, self-confidence, motivation, and biological endowment. Those problems are actually faced by the learners in real daily activities.

From the conclusion stated above, we would like to offer some suggestions to develop the linguistic intelligence of undergraduate EFL Learners. Firstly, the learners are hoped to explore depth information about theory of Multiple Intelligences in order to identify their own dominant intelligence. Since they will be English teachers in the future, they should encourage linguistic intelligence in order to be better in English. Secondly, the lecturers are also hoped to be aware of the learner differences. The lecturers should design and organize the learners' activities and lesson differently based on the learners' intelligence profiles. Then, managers of English education study program while planning the curriculum, it should be considered that, enough time is given for each topic for learners to discover it through their much intelligence. Also, the textbooks given should be in a way that accommodates all intelligences. Besides, they are also expected to be careful before admission for new learners. Since the new learners should master all of languages skills, they are required to undergo a medical check-up, including five-senses check-up as a condition of the admission process. It will make them difficult to continue their studies if they have problems in five-senses. Lastly, the further studies are required to explore the factors affecting linguistic intelligence of prospective English teachers and effective activities to improve it.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abdallah, M. M. S. (2008). Multiple ways to be smart: Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences and its

- educational implications in English teaching and oral communication. Retrieved from <http://www.mabdallah.bra veshot.com>
- [2] Abrar, M., Mukminin, A., Habibi, A., Asyraf, F., Makmur, M., & Marzulina, M. (2018). "If our English isn't a language, what is it? Indonesian EFL student teachers' challenges speaking English. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(1), 129-145. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol.23/iss1/9>
- [3] Ahmadian, M., & Hosseini, S. (2012). The relationship between Iranian English learners' linguistic intelligence and their writing ability, and writing assessment criteria. *Journal of Language, Culture and Translation*, 1(2), 1-22.
- [4] Alhamuddin & Bukhori. (2016). The effect of multiple intelligence based instruction on critical thinking of full-day islamic elementary schools students. *Ta'dib Journal of Islamic Education*, 21(1).
- [5] Alwasilah, A. C. (2008). *Pokoknya kualitatif. Jakarta, Indonesia: Dunia Pustaka Jaya.*
- [6] Al-Mekhlafi, M. A. A. (2015). The relationship between affixation awareness and linguistic intelligence among Yemeni EFL learners. *Abhinav National Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Arts & Education*, 4(2), 1-10.
- [7] Armstrong, T. (2009). *Multiple intelligences in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- [8] Astrid, A., Rukmini, D., Sofwan, A., Fitriati, W. S. (2011). The analysis of students' engagement to writing feedback activities viewed from students' writing anxiety. *international. Journal of English and Education*, 6(1), 86-107.
- [9] Butler, Y. G. (2012). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL? Case studies from Korea, Taiwan and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(2), 245-278. DOI: 10.2307/3588380
- [10] Campbell, L., & Campbell, B. (1999). *Multiple intelligences and student achievement: success stories from six schools.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- [11] Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research method in education* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- [12] Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- [13] Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches.* London, England: SAGE.
- [14] Darmawan, N. H. (2015). *Analisis potensi kecerdasan jamak siswa SD dan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhinya* (Master's thesis). Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia.
- [15] Desvitasari, D. (2015). *The correlation among multiple intelligences, speaking anxiety, and speaking achievement of undergraduate EFL students of Sriwijaya University* (Master's Thesis). Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia.
- [16] English First English Proficiency Index 2017. (2018). Retrieved from <http://www.ef.co.id>
- [17] Esmaeli, F., Behnam, B., & Esmaeli, K. (2014). A study of relationship between multiple intelligences and writing ability of Iranian female and male students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(20), 2039-9340.
- [18] Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- [19] Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2003). *An introduction to language* (7th ed.). Massachusetts, MA: Michael Rosenberg.
- [20] Gardner, H. (2011). *Frames of mind: the theory of multiple intelligences* (10th ed). New York, NY: Basic Books
- [21] Gewati, M. (2016, August 29). Minat baca Indonesia ada di urutan ke-60 di dunia. Kompas.com. Retrieved from <http://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2016/08/29/07175131/min at.baca.indonesia.ada.di.urutan.ke-60.dunia>
- [22] Ghafarian, S., & Amiri, B. M. (2016). The relationship between efl learners' linguistic, interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences and their listening comprehension performance. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 12(3), 2289-3245.
- [23] Hammoudi, A. (2010). *Multiple intelligences and teaching English as a foreign language, the case of second-year pupils at Malika gaid secondary school Setif* (Master's thesis). Ferhat Abbas University, Setif, Algeria.
- [24] Hardono, I. (2016, February 22). Faktanya pelajar Indonesia keteter dalam "Academic Writing"! Kompas.com, Retrieved from <http://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2016/02/22/05290021/Faktanya.Pelajar.Indonesia.Keteter.dalam.Aca demic.Writing>.
- [25] Harjanto, I. (2014). Teaching EFL academic writing through I-Search. *Language Education in Asia*, 5(1), 151-15.
- [26] Hoerr, T. R. (2000). *Becoming a multiple intelligences school.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- [27] Hoerr, T. T., Boggeman, S., Wallach, C., & the Faculty of the New City School. (2010). *Celebrating every learner: activities and strategies for creating multiple intelligences classroom; foreword by Howard Gardner.* San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [28] Husarida, H., & Dollete, R. (2019). Perceived Effectiveness on the Use of English Language in Teaching Mathematics and Science. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education [IRJE]*, 3(1), 177-198. <https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v3i1.6961>
- [29] Irvaniyah, I., & Akbar, R. O. (2014). Analisis kecerdasan logis matematis dan kecerdasan linguistik siswa berdasarkan jenis kelamin. *EduMa* 3(1), 2086- 3918.
- [30] Juhana. (2012). Psychological factors tht hinder students from speaking in English class (A case study in a senior high school in south Tangerang, Banten, Indonesia). *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(12), 100-110.
- [31] Latham, J. R. (2017). Qualitative sample size- How many participants is enough? Retrieved from <http://johnllatham.me/many-participants-enough/>
- [32] Lasiyah. (2017). *The correlation between self-confidence*

and speaking achievement of the undergraduate students of English study program of UIN Raden Fatah Palembang (Undergraduate's Thesis). State Islamic University of Raden Fatah, Palembang, Indonesia.

- [33] Lestary, A., & Hollandyah, M. (2016). The correlation between reading attitude and writing achievement of the eleventh grade students of SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Palembang. *Edukasi Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 3(1), 45-52.
- [34] Lunenburg, F. C., & Lunenburg, M. R. (2014). Applying multiple intelligences in the classroom: a fresh look at teaching writing. *International Journal of Scholarly Academic Intellectual Diversity*, 16(1).
- [35] Marzulina, L., Nova, L. P., Herizal., Holandyah, M., Erlina, D., & Lestari, I. T. (2018). Looking at the link between parents' educational backgrounds and students' English achievement. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education [IRJE]*, 3(1), 57-76. <https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v3i1.6507>
- [36] Megawati, M., Mustafa, F., Bahri, S. (2016). Listening to real English: How much do EFL students in Indonesia understand a native speaker's spoken language? Proceedings of the 1th English Education International Conference (EEIC) in conjunction with the 2nd Reciprocal Graduate Research Symposium (RGRS) of the Consortium of Asia-Pacific Education Universities (CAPEU) between Sultan Idris Education University and Syiah Kuala university (p. 350). Aceh: Indonesia.
- [37] Mukminin, A., Ali, R. M., & Ashari, M. J. (2015). Voices from within: Student teachers' experiences in English academic writing socialization at one Indonesian teacher training program. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(9), 1394-1407. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss9/2>
- [38] Mukminin, A., Haryanto, E., Sutarno., Sari, S. R., Marzulina, L., Hadiyanto., & Habibi, A. (2018) Bilingual education policy and Indonesian students' learning strategies. *Ilkögretim Online*, 17(3), 1204-1223.
- [39] Mukminin, A., Masbirotro, M., Noprival, N., Sutarno, S., Arif, N., & Maimunah, M. (2015). EFL speaking anxiety among senior high school students and policy recommendations. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 9(3), 217-225.
- [40] Mukminin, A., Habibi, A., Muhaimin, Asrial, Haryanto, E., Setiono, P., & Sofyan. (2019). Vocational technical high school teachers' beliefs towards ICT for the 21st century education: Indonesian context. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 77(1), 22-28.
- [41] Mukminin, A., & McMahon, B.J. (2013). International graduate students' cross-cultural academic engagement: Stories of Indonesian doctoral students on American campus. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(35), 1-19.
- [42] Naseri, E., & Ansari, D. N. (2013). The relationship between multiple intelligences and Iranian high school students' L2 writing achievement. *International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Research*, 2(5), 282-290.
- [43] Parsa, M., Jahandar, S., & Khodabandehlou, M. (2013). The effect of verbal intelligence on knowledge of lexicon. *International journal of Applied linguistics & English Literature*, 2(2), 2200-3452. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.2p.114>
- [44] Prasajo, L. D., Habibi, A., Yaakob, M. F. M., Mukminin, A., Haswindy, S., & Sofwan, M. (2019). An explanatory sequential study on Indonesian principals' perceptions on ICT integration barriers. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 17(1), 1-10.
- [45] Rahimi, M., Sadighi, F., & Hosseiny, Z. F. (2011). The impact of linguistic and emotional intelligence on the reading performance of Iranian EFL learners. *The Journal of Teaching language Skills (JTLS)*, 3(1), 62/4.
- [46] Rahmawaty, K. (2016). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi cerdasan linguistik. *Basic Education*, 5(3), 227-236.
- [47] Razmjoo, S. A. (2008). On the relationship between multiple intelligences and language proficiency. *The Reading Matrix*, 8(2), 155-174.
- [48] Salahzade, M., & Lasharian, A. (2015). The relationship between emotional intelligence and verbal intelligence in Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, 2(6), 2410-3446.
- [49] Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London, England: Sage Publication.
- [50] Samiyan, L. V. (2013). The relationship between linguistics intelligence and L2 learning strategies among EFL learners with intermediate level of proficiency. *Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics- An Open Access International Journal*, 1, 89-93.
- [51] Shakouri, N., Sheikhy, R. B., & Teirmourtash, M. (2016). On the relationship between linguistic intelligence and recalling lexical items in SLA. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 6(4). doi:10.5861/ijrse.2016.1644
- [52] Sofwan, M., Setiono, P., Mohamed Elsayed, A. E., & Saudagar, F. (2018). Fighting against Corruption through Character Education: The Voices of Indonesian Primary School Teachers. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education [IRJE]*, 2(2), 86-96. <https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v2i2.6092>
- [53] Wijaya, B. (2014). The correlation between undergraduate EFL students' multiple intelligences and their writing achievement. *Journal of Teaching and Education*, 3(1), 2165-6266.