Journal of English Education
Literature and Linguistics

E- ISSN, 2621-3680
P- ISSN, 2621-3672

MULTILPE INTELLIGENCE IN EFL CLASSROOM AT THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMP NEGERI 6 LUBUKLINGGAU

Merlin Juliani
STKIP PGRI Lubuklinggau
merlinjuliani23@gmail.com
Dewi Syafitri, M. Pd,
STKIP PGRI Lubuklinggau
dewisyafitristkipllg@gmail.com
Sastika Seli, S. Pd., M. A.
rshellee@yahoo.com
STKIP PGRI Lubuklinggau

Abstract

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mencari tahu (1) Jenis kecerdasan ganda di kelas EFL pada siswa kelas delapan dari SMP Negeri 6 Lubuklinggau, (2) Apa strategi yang mewakili kecerdasan ganda yang diterapkan di kelas EFL pada siswa kelas delapan dari SMP Negeri 6 Lubuklinggau. Subjek penelitian adalah 60 siswa yang dipilih oleh perwakilan data sampling peneliti menggunakan penelitian survei dan data yang dikumpulkan oleh wawancara, kuisioner, observasi. Data dinilai dengan menggunakan skala likert. Hasil penelitian adalah para siswa tertarik untuk mengembangkan kecerdasan ganda mereka. Para peneliti menemukan sejumlah kecerdasan item ini: kecerdasan linguistik (16.56%), kecerdasan logikal-matematika (9.51%), kecerdasan visual spasial (10.7%), kecerdasan kinestetik (13.37%), kecerdasan musikal (12.32%), kecerdasan interpersonal (10.66%), intrapersonal intelligence (11.7%), kecerdasan naturalis (15,18%). Dari 8 beberapa kecerdasan memiliki nilai tertinggi adalah kecerdasan linguistik (16.56%) dan skor terendah adalah kecerdasan interpersonal (9.51%). Peneliti menyimpulkan bahwa siswa tertarik pada kecerdasan linguistik di kecerdasan ganda. Strategi yang digunakan oleh guru adalah belajar melalui video dan kartu dan mengaturan huruf-huruf yang terbuang menjadi sebuah kata.

Key Word: kecerdasan ganda, kelas EFL, strategi mengajar

INTRODUCTION

Multiple intelligences (MI) on learning and teaching English is assumed that there has a relationship. According to Derakhshan and Faribi (2015) “it is shown that there is a relationship between MI and foreign language learning”.

E- ISSN, 2621-3680
P- ISSN, 2621-3672

Sadeghi and Farzizadeh (2012) also stated that students can ideally benefit from their potentials in intelligence to draw on during the act of writing in the EFL classroom. For the first time, it was Gardner (1983) who proposed Multiple Intelligence Theory (MIT) and challenged the too narrowly defined intelligence with his proposal of basic human intelligence types (linguistic, mathematical, musical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic interpersonal, and intrapersonal). In the beginning, there were seven types of intelligence and by his further research, he proposed the eighth intelligence, "naturalistic intelligence", which has been added to the list, and now there is the possibility of the ninth intelligence "emotional intelligence" (Armstrong, 2018).

Gardner (1983) explains that there are 8 types of intelligence as follows: linguistic intelligence, logical-mathematical intelligence, musical intelligence, spatial intelligence, physical kinesthetic intelligence, naturalistic intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, and intrapersonal intelligence.

Multiple intelligence is important to note that we do not have one specific type of intelligence. Everyone has all eight types of intelligence although some types may show up stronger than others. It is important not to label ourselves, or students, as one type of learner with one predominant intelligence because everyone can benefit from learning in various ways.

The researcher chose multiple intelligence research so that students know the abilities that exist in themselves and students know that within him it has the ability of more than one ability. Therefore if these students already know the capabilities that exist in themselves they will be able to explore these abilities and they can also develop the abilities that exist in them.

Teaching English as a foreign language is more complex than teaching a native language to children. Besides there are four skills that must be achieved, it is not often used in daily communication. So, it should be taught continuously. In doing so, teachers also play important roles in classroom

E- ISSN, 2621-3680
P- ISSN, 2621-3672

practices. They accommodate students' interests and attract their attention during classroom activities. They are expected to design an friendly atmosphere and enjoyable activities in which students will be interested (Ahmad et al, 2014). Enjoyable learning can also be identified by the students' motivation and participation. Researchers have been conducted regarding creating enjoyable learning in EFL classrooms. Researchers can use multiple intelligence so students can know each other's abilities and they will easily take part in Learning Activities. Therefore, all strategies applied by the teacher are strived to grow the quality of education.

Intelligence is one of the considerable factors to determine language learning success. Teachers are concerned about what strategies they will apply to benefit their students. It is not merely applying a single method of teaching by treating all students the same way. Their interest, potential, behavior, attitudes may vary. Multiple Intelligences theory views from a different perspective that every child has their characters. They have different learning styles, readiness, and cognitive levels, and learning motivation in nature (Demir, Kilinc & Dogan, 2012). It implies that everyone has at least eight intelligence and they all reflect their way of learning and their understanding (Gardner, 1983). The eight bits of intelligence include bodily-kinesthetic, intrapersonal, interpersonal, logical-mathematical, linguistic, musical, spatial, and naturalist intelligence. They represent the ability that every human has and every ability could be enhanced through the learning process with help and instruction (Gardner, 1983).

The followings are the characteristics of the eight Multiple Intelligences:

1. Linguistic intelligence: can learn and use language to accomplish certain goals; has a sensitivity to oral and written language (Gardner, 1983); thinks in words; loves reading, writing, telling stories, and playing word games (Armstrong, 2003). For example, Note-taking, listening to lectures/stories, reading books/response journals, reading with a partner, sustained silent

E- ISSN, 2621-3680
P- ISSN, 2621-3672

reading, storytelling, debates, tape recording, teacher reading to students, translating, presenting materials orally (Berman, 1998; Campbell, et al, 1996).

2. Logical-mathematical intelligence: has capabilities in analyzing problems, carrying out mathematical operations, and investigating issues scientifically; can deal with logic and numbers (Gardner, 1983); thinks by reasoning; has interests in experimenting, questioning, figuring out logical puzzles, calculating (Armstrong, 2003). For example, Crossword, ordering, matching, categorizing and classifying, science demonstration and experiments, logic puzzles and games, story problems with numbers, summarizing, analyzing grammar, creating categories for spelling/vocabulary (Berman, 1998; Campbell, et al, 1996).
3. Visual-spatial intelligence: can see and assess images; can do activities with their spatial judgment; visualizes with mind's eyes (Gardner, 1983); thinks through images and pictures; and takes interests in drawing, doodling, designing, and visualizing (Armstrong, 2003). **For example**: Using charts and grids, clusters, videos, slide, movies, using art, graphic organizers, illustrating stories, using sentence strips, using drawings to express ideas and feelings, making maps, charts, sequencing sentences to form a coherent story (Berman, 1998; Campbell, et al, 1996).
4. Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence: can use physical motions and movements to express emotion and ideas (Gardner, 1983); thinks through somatic sensation; and takes interests in running, building, dancing, jumping, touching, and gesturing (Armstrong, 2003). For example Hands-on activities, field trips, role-plays, pantomime, Total Physical Response, field experiences, creating a movement or a sequence of movements to explain, making task or puzzle cards (Berman, 1998; Campbell, et al, 1996).
5. Musical intelligence: can make a connection between sounds, rhythms, tones, and music; can appreciate, distinguish, and perform musical forms (Gardner, 1983); thinks through melodies; and takes interest s in singing, humming, tapping feet and hands, and also listening (Armstrong, 2003). **For**

E- ISSN, 2621-3680
P- ISSN, 2621-3672

example: Singing, playing recorded music, playing live music (piano, guitar), jazz chants, reciting poetry (Berman, 1998; Campbell, et al, 1996).

6. Interpersonal intelligence: can communicate with other people effectively in social and cultural settings; perceives peoples' feelings, emotions, and mood (Gardner, 1983); and takes interests in leading, organizing, and relating (Armstrong, 2003). For example Pair work or peer teaching, board games, group brainstorming, group problem solving, project work, pen-pals, writing group stories (Berman, 1998; Campbell, et al, 1996).
7. Intrapersonal intelligence: has positive self-concept; has self-reflective capacity and self-knowledge (Gardner, 1983); thinks to their needs and goals; and takes interest in dreaming and planning (Armstrong, 2003). **For example** Tasks with self-evaluation components, interest centers, options for homework, personal journal keeping, dialogue journals, learning logs, choice in assignments, describing qualities you possess (Berman, 1998; Campbell, et al, 1996).
8. Naturalistic intelligence: can understand and interact with nature and natural surroundings (Gardner, 1983); thinks through nature and natural forms; and takes interests in playing with pets, gardening, and investigating nature (Armstrong, 2003). **For example**: Creating observation notebooks, describing changes in the local or global environment, caring for pets (Berman, 1998; Campbell, et al, 1996).

1. Research Method

In this research, the researcher conducted survey research. according to Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun (2012) found the following: "There are three major characteristics that most surveys process: 1) information is collected from a group of people to describe some aspects or characteristics (such as abilities, opinion, attitude, beliefs, and knowledge) of the population of which that group is a part, 2) The main way in which the information is collected is through asking the question, 3) information is collected from a sample rather than from every member of the population".

E- ISSN, 2621-3680
P- ISSN, 2621-3672

The population is a general area that is an object or subject which has certain quality and characteristic has decided by the researcher to learn and then get the conclusion (Sugiyono, 2007). In this research, the population is all of the students of SMP Negeri 6 Lubuklinggau that consists of VII, VIII, IX class, and the total students are 561 students.

The sample is part of a totally and characteristic that own by the population sample itself (Sugiyono, 2007). In this research, the researcher representative sample. A representative sample is assuring that all significant aspects of a character and aspects of the same proportion as represented in the sample (Kumar, 2006). In this study, research was 60 students from classes VIII.1, VIII.2, and VIII.3.

In this research, the researcher used the observation, the questionnaire, and the interview schedule as an instrument (Fraenkel et al., 2012). In observation, the researcher used non-participant observation. Non-participant observation involves observing participants without actively participating. This option is used to understand a phenomenon by entering the community or social system the activities being observed. After that, The students answered the question in the questionnaire and interview about a study on multiple intelligence in EFL classroom at the eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 6 Lubuklinggau.

The questionnaire in this study contained 16 closed-ended questions on students' multiple intelligence, 16 closed-ended questions divided into three subscales, they are Skill, Knowledge, and Comprehension. The respondents are allowed to selects the answer from the number of items statements. The specification questionnaire of a survey of Multiple Intelligence (MI) can be seen in appendix A.

E- ISSN, 2621-3680
P- ISSN, 2621-3672

Table 3.2
Questionnaire Drill

No	Type of Strategies	Items Number	Total items
1	Linguistics	1 & 9	**2**
2	Logical-mathematical	2 & 10	**2**
3	Visual-spatial	3 & 11	**2**
4	Bodily-kinesthetic	4 & 12	**2**
5	Musical	5 & 13	**2**
6	Interpersonal	6 & 14	**2**
7	Intrapersonal	7 & 15	**2**
8	Naturalistic	8 & 16	**2**
Total			**16**

The steps for collecting the data are:

1. The questionnaire distributed to the class VIII SMP Negeri 6 Lubuklinggau.
2. The students were instructed to read each of the 16 statements in the questionnaires and put a tick to choose the statements that appropriate with their multiple intelligence.
3. After the students return the questionnaire, the researcher was analyzing the questionnaire.

The researcher used a Likert scale with four-level Likert items, they are 1) strongly disagree, 2) disagree, 3) agree, and 4) strongly agree. The second instrument for collecting the data is the interview schedule. The interview schedule and questionnaire are virtually identical, but the interview schedule is administered verbally by the researcher, while the questionnaire is usually self-administered by the respondent (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

To analyze the research data, the researcher used the quantitative method by using simple basic statistical techniques. According to Arikunto (2010), The statistical techniques often used are Means (M) showing average score, Median (Med) showing the middle point in the score distribution, Modes (Mo) showing a point where most scores are obtained, Standard Deviation (SD) showing the average deviation of each score from the mean. The major advantage of

E- ISSN, 2621-3680
P- ISSN, 2621-3672

quantitative statistics is that they permit researchers to give the information contained in many, many scores with just a few indices, such as the mean and median (Fraenkel et al., 2012). The formula is used by the researcher is a percentage (%). Percentage (%) showing the proportion of the group in the population. It is used to find out the proportion of the group in the population. The researcher used a formula from Ali (1992):

$$\% = \frac{n}{N} \times 100$$

Where: %: Percentage
n: Number of answer by respondents
N: Number of respondents

RESULT

In this research, each respondent was personally invited to complete a paper and pencil version of the questionnaire. All interviews were started with an introduction from the respondents, then continued to answer the questions that were given by the researcher. The questionnaire contained 7 indicators from Gardner (1983), were: 1) observation of behavior, 2) actions, 3) tendencies to act 4) prominent abilities 5) spontaneous reactions. The questionnaire consists of 16 items on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

Based on the two instruments above, the researcher found out students' perspective about a study on multiple intelligence in EFL classroom at the eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 6 Lubuklinggau that were investigated at SMP Negeri 6 in Lubuklinggau. The result of the questionnaire was shown in the analysis of students' perspectives in the general description table.
Here are general descriptions of percentage:

E- ISSN, 2621-3680
P- ISSN, 2621-3672

Table 4.1
General Descriptions Percentage

No.	Expressions	SA/4		A/3		D/2		SD/1	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Writing is a natural way for me to express myself	18	30	14	23	16	27	12	20
2	At school I was good at mathematics, physics or chemistry	15	25	18	30	17	28	10	17
3	I can easily imagine how a landscape looks from my view	17	28	19	32	9	15	15	25
4	I am good at showing how to do something in practice	19	32	18	30	15	25	8	13
5	After hearing a tune once or twice I am able to sing or whistle it quite accurately	11	18	22	37	15	25	12	20
6	Even in strange company, I easily find someone to talk to	16	27	18	30	11	18	15	25
7	I am able to analyze my own motives and ways of action	12	20	18	30	21	35	9	15
8	I enjoy the beautyand experiences related to nature	11	18	20	33	17	28	12	20
9	At school studies in native language or social studies were easier for me than mathematics, physics and chemistry	12	20	20	33	14	23	14	23
10	I am good at games and problem solving, which require logical thinking	18	30	17	28	8	13	17	28
11	When I read, I form illustrative picture or designs in my mind	13	21	23	38	18	30	6	10
12	I was good at handicrafts at school	16	27	16	27	20	33	8	13
13	When listening to music, I am able to discern instruments or recognize melodies	14	23	19	32	16	27	11	18
14	I make contact easily with other people	11	18	18	30	12	20	11	18

15	I often think about my own feelings and sentiments and seek reasons for them	18	30	21	35	15	25	6	10
16	Protecting the nature is important to me	8	13	21	35	19	32	12	20

Based on the table above, the researcher concluded that students at SMP Negeri 6 Lubuklinggau are interested in measuring the multiple intelligence that is in themselves. From the questionnaire given by students, the researcher found the highest score and lowest score. The highest score is linguistics (16.56%) and the lowest score is logical-mathematical (9,51%). The results of the questionnaire are shown in the analysis of students' perspectives in the final score.

Here is the final score of percentage:

Table 4.2
The Final Score Percentage

No.	Multiple Intelligence	Questionnaire	Score
1	Linguistics	1 & 9	16.56%
2	Logical-mathematical	2 & 10	9.51%
3	Visual-spatial	3 & 11	10.7%
4	Bodily-kinesthetic	4 & 12	13.37%
5	Musical	5 & 13	12.32%
6	Interpersonal	6& 14	10.66%
7	Intrapersonal	7 & 15	11.7%
8	Naturalistic	8 & 16	15.18%

The eight multiple intelligence included linguistics, logical-mathematical, visual-spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalistic. They represent the ability that every human has and every ability could be enhanced through the learning process with help and instruction (Gardner, 1983). Based on the table above, the scores obtained are as follows: 1. Linguistic (16.56%), 2. Logical-mathematical (9.51%), 3. Visual-spatial (10.7%), 4. Bodily-kinesthetic (13.37%), 5. Musical (12.32%), 6. Interpersonal (10.66%), 7. Intrapersonal (11.7%), 8. Naturalistic (15.18%). From the scores

E- ISSN, 2621-3680
P- ISSN, 2621-3672

obtained, the researchers found the highest score and lowest score. The highest score is linguistics intelligence (16.56%) and the lowest score logical-mathematical intelligence (9.51%). So, from the eight multiple intelligence above, the eighth students grade students of SMP Negeri 6 Lubuklinggau are interested in linguistics intelligence because students prefer to express themselves.

From the result above, it can be interpreted that the perceptions about a study on multiple intelligence in EFL classroom at the eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 6 Lubuklinggau. It was proved by the answer of the respondents in instruments used by the researcher both observation, questionnaire, and interviews with students.

Based on the 16 questionnaires the researcher gave to eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 6 Lubuklinggau, the researcher found the highest to lowest scores of 8 multiple intelligence. The scores obtained are as follows: 1. Linguistic intelligence (16.56%), 2. Logical-mathematical intelligence (9.51%), 3. Visual-spatial intelligence (10.7%), 4. Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence (13.37%), 5. Musical intelligence (12.32%), 6. Interpersonal intelligence (10.66%), 7. Intrapersonal intelligence (11.7%), 8. Naturalistic intelligence (15.18%). From the scores obtained, the researchers found the highest score and lowest score. So, the highest score is linguistics intelligence (16.56%) and the lowest score is logical-mathematical intelligence (9.51%).

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the researchers concluded that from 16 questionnaires covering 8 multiple intelligence consisting of linguistics, logical-mathematical, visual-spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalistic given by researchers for eighth-grade students at SMP Negeri 6 Lubuklinggau. From the 16 questionnaire, the researcher found the highest score to the lowest score, namely: 1) Linguistics (16.56%), 2) Naturalistic (15.18%), 3) Bodily-kinesthetic (13.37%), 4) Musical (12.32%), 5) Intrapersonal (11.7%), 6) Interpersonal (10.66%), 7) Visual-Spatial (13.37%),

E- ISSN, 2621-3680
P- ISSN, 2621-3672

8) Logical-mathematical (9.51%). So, The highest score is linguistics intelligence (16.56%) and the lowest score is interpersonal intelligence (9.51%). Researchers concluded that the students are interested in linguistics intelligence in multiple intelligence.

From the research that has been done, the researchers found the highest score of the item in each subject, they are 1) **Observation of behavior,** the respondents whose agree with the fourth statements which stated that *I am good at showing how to do something in practice* (70%), 2) **Action,** the respondents whose agree with the fifth statements which stated that *After hearing a tune once or twice I can sing or whistle it quite accurately* (63.3%), 3) **Propensity to act,** the respondents whose agree with the sixteenth statements which stated that *Protecting the nature is important to me* (60.4%), 4) **Prominent ability,** the respondents whose agree with the eleventh statements which stated that *When I read, I form illustrative picture or designs in my mind* (67,9%), 5) **Spontaneous reaction,** the respondents whose agree with the sixth statements which stated that *Even in strange company, I easily find someone to talk to* (64.5%).

There are some strategies used by the teacher that represent multiple intelligences. They are learning through video and flashcards as the representation of spatial-visual intelligence and drilling and arranging jumbled letters into a word as the representation of linguistic intelligence.

Based on the observation, questionnaire, and interviews, the researcher found that there are several reasons why the students are not interested to learn about multiple intelligence. Students at SMP Negeri 6 Lubuklinggau did not know that there are several kinds of multiple intelligence. The reasons for that issue are, (1) Students are lazy to develop multiple intelligence that exists in themselves. (2) The teacher does not know to connect the dot in developing multiple intelligence. (3) Parents do not provide student support to develop multiple intelligence at home, it is useful for students to explore more at home. (4) The environment does not support students more to develop multiple intelligence.

2. References

Armstrong, T. (2018). *Multiple intelligences in the classroom*. California: Alexandria.

Ahmad, A. R., Seman, A. A., Awang, M. M., & Sulaiman, F. (2015). Application of Multiple Intelligence Theory to Increase Student Motivation in Learning History.*Asian Culture and History*, *7*(1), 210-219.

Armstrong, T. (2003). *The Multiple Intelligences of Reading and Writing*, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria

Arikunto, S. (2010*). Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktek*. Rineka Cipta: Yogyakarta

Berman, M. (1998). *A Multiple Intelligences Road to an ELT Classroom*. UK: Crown House Publishing Limited, *4*(1), 1-135.

Campbell. L., Campbell, B., & Dickinson, D. (1996). *Teaching and Learning through Multiple Intelligences*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Demir, S., Kilinc, M. & Dogan, A. (2012). 'The effect of curriculum for developing efficient studying skills on academic achievements and studying skills of learners', *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *4*(3), 427–440.

Derakhshan, A., & Faribi, M. (2015). Multiple Intelligence: Language Learning and Teaching.*Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education*, *5*(4), 63-72.

Fraenkel et al. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (8th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Kumar, Y. S. (2006). *Fundamental of Research Methodology and Statistic*. New Delhi: New Age International Limited Publisher.

Sugiyono (2007). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta Bandung.

Sadeghi, K., & Farzizadeh, B. (2012). The Relationship betweenMultiple Intelligence and Writing Ability of Iranian EFL Learners.*Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education*, *5*(11), 136-142.