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ABSTRACT
Randra Kurniawan,(2020): The Correlation between Eighth-grade Students' Multiple Intelligence and Their Language Learning Style at State Junior High School 34 Pekanbaru correlation between eighth-grade students' multiple intelligence and their language learning style at state junior high school 34 Pekanbaru. There were two kariables used in this research. The first was variable X (Multiple Intelligence) and variable Y (Language Learning Style). The subject of this research was the eighth-grade students at state junior high school 34 Pekanbaru. whereas the object of this research was the correlation between students' multiple intelligence and their language learning style. The population of this research was 105 students. To choose the sample, the researcher used a stratified random sampling technique and got 66 students as the sample. In collecting the data, the researcher used a questionnaire for students' multiple intelligence and language learning styles. From the data analysis which had been done by using SPSS 26.0 version, it could be seen that there was a significant correlation between multiple intelligence and language learning styles. It could be shown that the probability of score sig.t is 0.010 , smaller than the significant alpha of 0.05 (sig.t < 0.05 ). It meant that H0 was rejected and Ha was accepted. In other words, there was a significant correlation between eighth-grade students' multiple intelligence and their långuage learning style at state junior high school 34 Pekanbaru.


ABSTRAK

Korelasi antara Kecerdasan Ganda Siswa Kelas
Delapan dan Gaya Belajar Bahasa Mereka di SMP
Negeri 34 Pekanbaru

Penelitian ini adalah penelitian korelasional, yang bertujuan untuk mengetahui hubungan antara kecerdasan ganda siswa kelas delapan dan gaya belajar bahasa mereka d $\ddagger$ SMP Negeri 34 Pekanbaru. Ada dua variabel yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini. Fang pertama adalah variabel X (Multiple Intelligence) dan variabel Y (Language Icearning Style). Subjek penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas VIII SMP Negeri 34 Pekanbaru. seedangkan objek penelitian ini adalah korelasi antara kecerdasan ganda siswa dan gaya belajar bahasa mereka. Populasi penelitian ini adalah 105 siswa. Untuk memilih sampel, peneliti menggunakan teknik stratified random sampling dan mendapatkan 66 siswa sēbagai sampel. Dalam mengumpulkan data, peneliti menggunakan kuesioner untuk kecerdasan ganda dan gaya belajar bahasa siswa. Dari analisis data yang telah dilakukan dengan menggunakan versi SPSS 26.0, dapat dilihat bahwa ada korelasi yang signifikan antara kecerdasan ganda dan gaya belajar bahasa. Dapat ditunjukkan bahwa probabilitas skor sig.t adalah 0,010 , lebih kecil dari alpha signifikan 0,05 (sig.t $<0,05$ ). Ini berarti bahwa H0 ditolak dan Ha diterima. Dengan kata lain, ada korelasi yang signifikan antara kecerdasan ganda siswa kelas delapan dan gaya belajar bahasa mereka di SMP Negeri 34 Pekanbaru.

Kata Kunci: Kecerdasan Ganda, Gaya Belajar Bahasa State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau UIN SUSKA RIAU
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.
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## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

## The Background of Problem

In this era, English is an important language that must be mastered by everyone from children to adults. Every student has individual intelligence, consisting of different capacities that are related to all the intelligence. This intelligence constitutes how individuals process information. Also, the Multiple Intelligence theory supports the idea of the existence of several bits of intelligence that result in a unique cognitive profile for each student.

According to Gardner (1983), intelligence is the ability to solve the problem or process to create products that are valued within one or more cultural settings. Human in this theory is born with the number of intelligence (linguistic, logical-mathematical, visual/spatial, body-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, naturalist, spiritual, and oral intelligence). Perhaps one or more intelligence will be more dominant than others in him/her self. So there are called multiple intelligence.

This extraordinary conception of individual competence has changed the face of education today. Many educators and researchers have explored the practical implications of Multiple Intelligence theory- the powerful notion that there are separate human capacities (Kumbar, 2006). According to her theory, human cognitive competence is better described in terms of a set of abilities, talents, or mental skills called intelligence. All normal individuals possess
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.
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each of these skills; individuals differ in the degree of skill. Such a theory has important educational implications.

Although all people possess all intelligence at varying levels, it is helpful for the teacher to present content material through a variety of intelligence to make the information comprehensible to all learners. It is equally important to encourage students to demonstrate their understanding of content in a format consistent with their strong intelligence, self-esteem, and motivation. Using knowledge of multiple intelligence and being flexible in planning instruction is one way of supporting students to be more successful in the classroom.

As we know, according to Gardner (2003), human potential can be formulated into 8 types of intelligence which he called multiple intelligence (multiple intelligence) also added and suggested intelligence. The eight types of intelligence (compound intelligence) according to Gardner it is very possible to be developed in the learning process if you know a variety of children's learning styles.

The language learning style has an important role in the process of learning English. it will be important for educators or teachers to know the various kind of learning styles because the information about the variation of students' learning styles can help the teacher become aware of students' differences bought to the classroom. Teachers need to accommodate students' learning styles, thus, all students can succeed in their learning process by their learning style. This condition compels every teacher must have data of their
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.
students' multiple intelligence and students' learning styles. Then every teacher has to appropriate their teaching styles with their students' learning styles during the teaching and learning process. According to Keefe (1979), learning styles are the composite of characteristic cognitive, affective, and psychological factors that serve as relatively stable indicators of how a learner perceives, interacts with, and responds to the learning environment. learning style refers to any individual learners' natural, habitual, and preferred ways of learning (Willing, 1988. p.1).

In line with the statements above, Oxford (2003) pointed out that language learning styles and strategies are among the main factors that help determine how-and how well students learn a second or foreign language. Besides, Dunn in Brown (2000) believed that the low and average achievers will get higher achievement when they are taught by using some ways that are matched with their learning style.

Learning style which is based on the sensory preferences is VAK learning styles; visual, auditory, and kinesthetic (Dornyei, 2005). By knowing students' learning styles based on their sensory preferences allows teachers to take into account aspects of several well-recognized learning-style theories by synthesizing their important characteristics into an approach that is based on behaviors and/or actions that can be easily perceived in a classroom situation.

In conclusion, every learner has their differences in the process of perceiving and understanding information based on their sensory preferences whether they are more visual, auditory, or even kinesthetic.

2013 curriculum contains the development of the dimensions of multiple intelligence which can be seen in the first three things, the development of competencies which consist of four core competencies (IC), namely spiritual attitude, social attitude, knowledge, and skills. In a group of multiple intelligence, it is included in the dimensions of existential intelligence, Interpersonal intelligence, Intrapersonal intelligence, linguistic intelligence, logical-mathematical intelligence, musical intelligence, visual/spatial intelligence, bodily-kinesthetic, and naturalist / environmental intelligence. Second is the approach used in the form of a scientific approach including; observe, ask, try, reason, and communicate highly relevant to the principles of learning in developing multiple intelligence. And third, the assessment system is carried out in the form of authentic assessments that are very relevant to the development of multiple intelligence (Machali, 2014: 43).

Based on the researcher's observation and interview with some students and teachers, the researcher found that there are some differences in multiple intelligence students and students' language learning style. For instance, some student skills listening is good, but some students are still noisy in class when the teaching and learning process takes place. so students still need to be conditioned to focus more on listening. there are some students with linguistic intelligence who prefers to learn by using video. some students are not able to show and improve their language learning style in the learning process. Then, students do not learn to learn styles that are appropriate for themselves, as a result, he has difficulty learning about difficult subjects, and
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau. students. Some students do not understand English lessons. Some students are bored and do not understand the way the teacher explains the lessons. as I can see, teachers still use the information transfer method. The opinion of the researcher, the teacher is less creative, fun, and facilitates the learning styles of all students that are tailored to their respective intelligence. so that some students cannot develop their potential to understand learning.

The last example does not understand the relationship between factors in students such as the relationship of learning styles and multiple intelligence, these two internal factors are closely related and important to improve student intelligence. Finally, based on symptoms explained by the writer above, the researcher is interested in conducting research entitled: "The Correlation between Eighth-grade Students' Multiple Intelligence and Their Language Learning Styles at State Junior High School 34 Pekanbaru".

## The Problem

## 1. The Identification of the Problem

Based on the preliminary study of the researcher at State Junior High School 34 Pekanbaru, it is clear that most of the students are still getting difficulties in learning English because they learn with different intelligence dan the same learning style even though their learning style could be a different one and another. To make the problem of this research clearer, the problem of this research will be identified as follows:
a. Why did some students have difficulty concentrating on the process of teaching and learning?
b. Why did some of the students have low scores in English subject?
c. Why did some students not focus on listening?

## 2. The Limitation of the Problem


#### Abstract

About the identification of the problem stated above, thus, the researcher needs to limit the problem of this research. The researcher limits this research on the multiple intelligence base on the students'.


Based on the limitation of the multiple intelligence above, the researcher investigated the students' multiple intelligence and whether this intelligence correlates to their language learning style.

## 3. Formulation of the Problem
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Based on the problems above, the problems of this research are formulated in the following research questions:
a. How is the eighth-grade students' multiple intelligence at SMP Negeri 34 Pekanbaru?
b. How are the eighth-grade students' language learning styles at SMP Negeri 34 Pekanbaru?
c. Is there any significant correlation between the eighth-grade students'multiple intelligence and their learning styles at SMP Negeri 34 Pekanbaru?

The Objective and Significance of the Research

## 1. The Objective of the Research

The Objectives of this research are as follow :
a. To describe the language learning styles of the eighth-grade students at SMP Negeri 34 Pekanbaru.
b. To explain what is the multiple intelligence of the eighth-grade students at SMP Negeri 34 Pekanbaru.
c. To find out the correlation between students' multiple intelligence and their language learning styles the eighth-grade students' at SMP Negeri 34 Pekanbaru.

## 2. The Significance of the Research

a. Giving input to teachers in schools where research can be used to improve students' English language learning and achievement.
b. Providing input to English teachers about how to overcome students' learning difficulties by understanding the learning styles and multiple intelligence that the students' have.

## Definition of Term

There are so many terms that are involved in this research. To avoid misunderstanding in the terms used in this research, thus, the writer defines all the terms in this research as follows;

1. Jensen (2006) defines multiple intelligence (MI)as the knowledge or ability to fashion a product or use a skill in a way that is valued by the culture in which we live. In this research, MI is defined as the kinds of students' intelligence that are gathered from the MI test and the test will show the most predominant intelligence of the individual student.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.
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3. A learning style is "an individual's natural, habitual, and preferred way(s) of absorbing, processing, and retaining new information and skills" (Reid, 1995, p. viii). Different perceptual and sociological learning styles cover visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, individual, and group learning dimensions.
4. Correlation: Correlation is a statistical test to determine the tendency or pattern for two (or more) variables or two sets of data to vary consistently. In this case of only two variables, it means that two variables share common variance, or they co-vary together (Creswell, 2008). Besides, Franked \& Wallen (2009) also pointed out that a correlational study is when two or more variables are investigated about the relationship one another without any attempt to influence them.


## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

## Theoritical Framework

## 1. Multiple Intelligence

Gardner developed his ideas on multiple intelligence (MI) to counter the standard psychological view of intellect: that an individual's intelligence was dominated by a single "general ability" (g-factor) or general intelligence (aka 'IQ'). He claimed that intelligence is more than IQ because a high IQ in the absence of productivity does not equate to intelligence (Gardner, 1999). While the Multiple Intelligence hypothesis was thought to be mostly of importance to the field of psychology, it was soon adopted by education, teaching, and training fields as well.

According to Gardner (1983), there is more than one human intelligence that is beyond the reach of standard psychometric measuring instruments such as IQ tests, because in IQ tests only measure intelligence in a narrow manner that emphasizes linguistic and mathematical-logical intelligence. Gardner (1993) proposed a view of natural human talents that is labeled the "Multiple Intelligence Model." This model is one of a variety of learning style models that have been proposed in general education and have subsequently been applied to language education (see, e.g., Christison 1998). Gardner claims that his view of intelligence(s) is culture-free and avoids the conceptual narrowness usually associated with
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traditional models of intelligence (e.g., the Intelligent Quotient [IQ] testing model).

According to Hoerr (2007), although IQ tests can be used to measure the success of children in school, but can not predict the success of someone in the real world (when he grew up and jumped into the world of work or society). Also, not all students identified as having high intelligence in standard IQ. This is reasonable, because no one in this world is truly the same in everything, even if they are twins. There is always a "difference" between them caused by genetic and environmental factors so that each student is a person and has special power in them.
"There are many different ways to define intelligence. Sometimes intelligence means that you are fast and accurate in taking tests. Sometimes intelligence is defined as being very smart in mathematics. Intelligence can also mean that you are very good at talking with people and understanding them. For many people, intelligence means the mental abilities that are measured by an IQ (intelligence quotient) test." (Brown, 2000, p. 36).

## Original Seven Intelligence

In his 1999 book, Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligence for the 21st Century, Gardner listed the eight criteria that a candidate intelligence area must fulfill in order to be identified as a true "intelligence":
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

1. Potential for brain isolation by brain damage. One intelligence can be dissociated from the others, e.g., stroke patients can be left with some forms of intelligence intact despite damage to other cognitive abilities such as speech (Gardner, 1999, p.36)
2. Place in evolutionary history. It has to have played a role in the survival of our species and our ability to adapt to the surrounding environment.
3. Presence of a core set of operations. For example, the core operations of the musical intelligence are pitch, rhythm, timbre, and harmony.
4. Susceptibility to encoding (symbolic expression). Symbols related to the intelligence can be developed in order to accurately and systematically express culturally-relevant information (e.g., language characters, musical notes, mathematical and artistic symbols, etc.)
5. Distinct developmental progression. The ability of an individual to advance their intelligence to an expert state, through studying or practicing.
6. Existence of savants, prodigies, and other exceptional people. Individuals who naturally excel at a particular intelligence, far superior to the abilities of an average individual (i.e., musical or artistic prodigies).
7. Support from experimental psychology, and
8. Support from psychometric findings. Asking someone to perform two tasks from the same intelligence area simultaneously causes interference because they rely on the same mental capacities (Gardner, 1999; Gilman, 2001).
9. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau. b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
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When Gardener's book Frames of Mind was released, he used these eight criteria to describe seven distinct intelligence:

1. Verbal-linguistic (words): Learn best through written and spoken languages and interpretation and explanation of information through language. Typical roles include writers, journalists, lawyers, English teachers, PR consultants, and TV and radio presenters.
2. Musical-rhythmic (music, sound, and rhythm): Learn best through the use of sound, and recognizing tonal and rhythmic patterns; can create a rhythm to express a mood. Often individuals with this MI demonstrate "perfect pitch." Typical roles include musicians, singers, composers, acoustic engineers, and voice coaches.
3. Logical-mathematical (numbers or logic): Learn best through reasoning and deduction, detecting patterns, performing calculations, and understanding cause-and-effect relationships. Typical roles include scientists, engineers, accountants, statisticians, negotiators, and researchers.
4. Visual-spatial (Pictures): Learn best through interpretation and creation of visual images; easily understand the relationship between images and meanings, and space and effect. Typical roles include artists, graphic designers, architects, photographers, inventors, and urban planners.
5. Bodily-kinesthetic (Physical): Learn best through manual dexterity, physical tasks, or demonstrating techniques; often have physical agility
6. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau. b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.

7. Interpersonal (Social): Learn best through relating to other people's feelings and emotional health; demonstrate high empathic proficiencies. Typical roles include therapists, psychologists, HR professionals, politicians, educators, clergy, doctors, and coaches.
8. Intrapersonal (Self): Learn best through self-reflection and understanding oneself and one's relationship to others and the world. This intelligence has no clear roles or professions but instead can be applied to any who is self-aware and actively working to change their thoughts, beliefs, or behavior in relation to their situation and/or other people. (Gardner, 1983). There is a strong relationship between the Intrapersonal intelligence and what is now referred to as "Emotional Intelligence" (aka EQ); some have referred to this as being "emotionally mature" (similar to Abraham Maslow's level of self-actualization) ("Howard Gardner's multiple intelligence", n.d.).

## Added and Suggested Intelligence

Since Frames of Mind was first released, other intelligence has been suggested based on Gardner's original eight criteria. In 1995, Gardner proposed an eighth intelligence related to the natural world:

If I were to rewrite Frames of Mind today, I would probably add an eighth intelligence-the intelligence of the naturalists. It seems to me that the individual who is able readily to recognize flora and fauna, to
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.
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make other consequential distinctions in the natural world, and to use this ability productively (in hunting, in farming, in biological sciences) is exercising an important intelligence and one that is not adequately encompassed in the current list. (Gardner, 1995, p.205). Typical roles of the naturalist intelligence include botanists, biologists, zookeepers, aquarists, hunters, fisher people, and farmers.

While he did not include it in the original book, Gardner suggested he considered a spiritual (or existential) intelligence, which he described as "capturing and pondering the fundamental questions of existence" and asking who we are and what is our purpose (Gardner, 1999, p.22). This intelligence meets all the basic criteria except support of its existence from psychometric studies (eighth criteria), arguing that the desire to understand the basic questions of life is inherent to human nature.

Additional intelligence that has been suggested, but currently not substantiated, includes teaching-pedagogical, moral-ethical, humor, cooking, and sexual intelligence (Gardner, 2016).

Armstrong (1988) defines intelligence as the ability to capture new situations and the ability to learn from past experiences, someone. Another case with Gardner (1983) who said that intelligence is a biopsychological potential which means that all beings concerned have the potential to use a set of talents possessed by the type of creature. Gardner also introduced the concept of schools that are centered on individuals and receive multidimensional views of intelligence. He uses a label "multiple" or compound
because the breadth of the meaning of intelligence is not only limited to IQ numbers alone, thus allowing the realm of intelligence to continue to grow.

Brown (2001) stated that there is seven multiple intelligence, it can be seen as follows :

Linguistic: The capacity to use words effectively, whether orally (e.g., as a storyteller, orator, or politician) or in writing (e.g., as a poet, playwright, editor, or journalist). This intelligence includes the ability to manipulate the syntax or structure of language, the phonology or sounds of language, the semantics or meanings of language, and the pragmatic dimensions or practical uses of language. Some of these uses include rhetoric (using language to convince others to take a specific course of action), mnemonics (using language to remember information), explanation (using language to inform), and metalanguage (using language to talk about itself).

Logical-mathematical: The capacity to use numbers effectively (e.g., as a mathematician, tax accountant, or statistician) and to reason well (e.g., as a scientist, computer programmer, or logician). This intelligence includes sensitivity to logical patterns and relationships, statements, and propositions (if-then, cause-effect), functions, and other related abstractions. The kinds of processes used in the service of logicalmathematical intelligence include categorization, classification, inference, generalization, calculation, and hypothesis testing.
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Spatial: The ability to perceive the visual-spatial world accurately (e.g., as a hunter, scout, or guide) and to perform transformations upon those perceptions (e.g., as an interior decorator, architect, artist, or inventor). This intelligence involves sensitivity to color, line, shape, form, space, and the relationships that exist between these elements. It includes the capacity to visualize, to graphically represent visual or spatial ideas, and to orient oneself appropriately in a spatial matrix.

Bodily-kinesthetic: Expertise in using one's whole body to express ideas and feelings (e.g., as an actor, a mime, an athlete, or a dancer) and facility in using one's hands to produce or transform things (e.g., as a craftsperson, sculptor, mechanic, or surgeon). This intelligence includes specific physical skills such as coordination, balance, dexterity, strength, flexibility, and speed, as well as proprioceptive, tactile, and haptic capacities.

Musical: The capacity to perceive (e.g., as a music aficionado), discriminate (e.g., as a music critic), transform (e.g., as a composer), and express (e.g., as a performer) musical forms. This intelligence includes sensitivity to the rhythm, pitch or melody, and timbre or tone color of a musical piece. One can have a figural or "top-down" understanding of music (global, intuitive), a formal or "bottom-up" understanding (analytic, technical), or both.

Interpersonal: The ability to perceive and make distinctions in the moods, intentions, motivations, and feelings of other people. This can
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include sensitivity to facial expressions, voice, and gestures; the capacity for discriminating among many different kinds of interpersonal cues; and the ability to respond effectively to those cues in some pragmatic way (e.g., to influence a group of people to follow a certain line of action).

Intrapersonal: Self-knowledge and the ability to act adaptively based on that knowledge. This intelligence includes having an accurate picture of oneself (one's strengths and limitations); awareness of inner moods, intentions, motivations, temperaments, and desires; and the capacity for self-discipline, self-understanding, and self-esteem.

Pertaining with all the ideas above, the researcher concluded that a person's success cannot only be measured from a high IQ but how that person can solve problems faced with the ability or intelligence they have and can apply that intelligence to produce something in real situations.

Therefore, to answer the first research question, the researcher used Brown's Learning IQ theory because the questionnaire to measure Multiple Intelligenceis provided by Brown (2001).

## 2. Language Learning Style

Learning styles are defined by some scholars in some ways, depend on their perspective. Brown (2001) defines learning styles as how someone perceives the information or knowledge in a learning situation. He further explained that learning preference as the aspect of learning style and refers to the choice of one learning situation and condition over another.

Brown (2001) classifies two types of EFL learners' learning styles, namely reflective learner and impulsive learner. He claims that one important learning style is speed, that is, how slow fast or slow the learner is. If an EFL learner prefers doing things more slowly, his/her style is reflective. If he/she likes to do things fast, his/her language learning style is impulsive.

In line with the statement above, Dunn \& Dunn in Begam (2013) also stated that learning style is how individuals begin to concentrate on, process, internalize and retain new and difficult academic information. Moreover, Honey and Mumford in Dornyei (2005) also believed that learning style is an individual preferred or habitual ways of processing and transferring knowledge.

On the other hand, Murcia (2001) defined learning style as how learner perceives, interacts with, and responds to the learning environment. In the related literature, learning style is regarded as a way of learning. Learning styles consist of strategies such as superficial or deep processing of information, holistic and serial processing of knowledge, processing knowledge in details, retention, and systematic recalling (Busato et al., in Ibrahimoglu, 2013).

About all the ideas above, the researcher concluded that learning style is the preferred way of students‘ receiving and processing knowledge. It becomes a habitual way of learning of the students.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau. b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.


## 3. Sensory Learning Style

As the researcher mentioned in the previous chapter that there are three major categories of learning styles that are widely recognized and relevant to the field of foreign language learning: sensory learning styles, cognitive learning styles, and affective/temperament learning styles (Reid, 1987). Sensory learning style is related to the physical environment in which students learn and involves using their senses to perceive data while cognitive styles relate to thinking, problem-solving abilities, and the ability to organize information. In contrast, affective learning/temperament learning style takes students‘ emotions, values, and feelings into consideration.

One of the learning styles based on sensory preferences is VAK (visual, auditory, kinesthetic) learning style. This notion believes that some students learn better through seeing, while others are better when they are listening or learning by doing.

## a. Visual Learners

Fleming(2011) claimed that students which more visual will have some characteristics such as learning best with pictures, diagrams, and charts, usually taking notes with different colors, listening to teachers who use gestures and picturesque language, watching television and videos are helping them to learn, remembering people's faces but not their names.
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In language learning, visual learners learn best in a particular subject. As Leaver (2005) pointed out that visual learners acquire new vocabulary through sight; they understand grammar better when they can read about it in a book. Also, Murcia (2001) added that visual students like to read and obtain a great deal from visual stimulation. For them, lectures, conversations, and oral instructions without any backup can be very confusing.

Gass (2008) also proposed that visual learners are those who take information visually. Blackboard use or PowerPoint presentations are preferred to straight lectures. They might rewrite lecture notes use color-coding or any other visual organizational schema.
b. Auditory Learners

Auditory learners predominantly learn from hearing words spoken and from oral explanations and other sources of auditory input such as lectures or audiotapes. They may remember information by reading aloud or by moving their lips as they read. Their learning is enhanced if they engage in discussions and group work (Dörnyei, 2005). They could also gain benefit from making tapes to listen to, by teaching other students, and by conversing with their teacher (Reid, 1987).

## c. Kinesthetic Learners

According to Brown (2000), kinesthetic learners will show a preference for demonstration and physical activity involving bodily
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movement. Learners which are more kinesthetic will learn using the practical opportunities in learning especially in those classes that have laboratories, practical sessions, clinics, tutorials, fieldwork, industry contact, case studies, and problem-solving, hear about the examples before the theory, like to move around and respond physically to music or drama, they believe _practice makes perfect ${ }^{\text {, }}$, to get a sense of something they want to see, touch, taste, kick and smell it (Fleming, 2011).

Kinesthetic learners learn best by being physically involved in classroom experiences. They remember information well when they actively participate in activities and role-playing in the classroom. A combination of stimuli (e.g., an audiotape combined with an activity) will help them understand new material better. However, they need frequent breaks; sitting motionless for hours is usually difficult for them. They often tend to walk around while, for example, trying to memorize something (Dörnyei, 2005).

It can be concluded that teachers need to help the students to be life-long learners. If the students do not know how to use their innate potential and make their styles match to their learning, they may not be able to be taught and trained in a career that they choose. Understanding students‘ learning styles especially in language learning is an important factor that contributes many advantages to the students and the teaching process. The teacher can choose and design the
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material presented that matches the students‘ learning style preference and in turn, it will make faster progress and motivate the students in learning.

## 4. Implication of Learning Styles for Language Learning

It is advantageous to teach and test students in their preferred modalities. Brown (2001) stated that learning style is one of the uniqueness owned by individuals. There are no good or bad learning styles, there can be a good or bad match between the way students learn best and the ways the course is taught. Mismatches occur between the learning styles of students in a language class and instructor's teaching styles, which, unfortunately, affects the quality of students ${ }^{6}$ learning and their attitudes toward the class and the subject. By this matter, Diaz and Cartnal (1999) said that:
"Knowledge of students learning style preferences can aid faculty in-class preparation, designing class delivery method, choosing appropriate technologies, and developing sensitivity to differing students learning preferences within the distance education department"

It can be concluded that teachers need to help the students to be life-long learners. If the students do not know how to use their innate potential and make their styles match to their learning, they may not be able to be taught and trained in a career that they choose. Understanding students‘ learning styles especially in language learning is an important factor that contributes many advantages to the students and the teaching
process. The teacher can choose and design the material presented that matches the students' learning style preference and in turn, it will make faster progress and motivate the students in learning.

## 5. Reflectivity and Impulsivity

Among different learning styles, reflectivity/impulsivity has rarely been seen on the lists of learner factors and worked on. Impulsivity and reflectivity are two learning styles in the cognitive domain. An impulsive person, as Brown (2007) states, "is a person who tends to make a quick or gambling guess at an answer to a problem and a reflective person tends to make a slower, more calculated decision"(p. 127). Like other factors, learners tend to be reflective or impulsive but these styles are not mutually exclusive, for some learners are a mixture of both.

It is common for us to show in our personalities certain tendencies toward reflectivity sometimes and impulsivity at other tunes. Psychological studies have been conducted to determine the degree to which, in the cognitive domain, a person tends to make either a quick or gambling (ImpuLsive) guess at an answer to a problem or a slower, more calculated (reflective) decision. David Ewlng (1977) referred to two styles that are closely related to the reflectivity/impulsivity ( $\mathrm{R} / \mathrm{l}$ ) dimension; systematic and intuitive styles. An intuitive style implies an approach in which a person makes some different gambles based on "hunches," with possibly several successive gambles before a solution is achieved. Systematic thinkers tend to weigh all the considerations in a problem,
work out all the loop-holes, and then, after extensive reflection, venture a solution.

The implications for language acquisition are numerous, ft has been found that conceptually reflective children tend to make fewer errors in reading than impulsive children (Kagan, 1965); however, impulsive persons are usually faster readers, and eventually master the "psycholinguistic guessing game" (Goodman, 1970) of reading so that their impulsive style of reading may not necessarily deter comprehension. In another study (Kagan, Pearson, \& Welch, 1966), inductive reasoning was found to be more effective with reflective persons, suggesting that generally reflective persons could benefit more from inductive learning situations. Virtually all research on R/l has used the Matching Familiar Figures Test (Kagan, 1965; revised by Cairns \& Cammock, 1989), in which subjects are required to find, among numerous slightly different drawings of figures (people, ships, buildings, etc.), the drawing that matches the criterion figure. And most of the research to date on this cognitive style has looked at American, monolingual, English-speaking children.

A few studies have related $\mathrm{R} / 1$ to second language learning. Doron (1993) found that among her sample of adult learners of ESL in the United States, reflective students were slower but more accurate than impulsive students in reading. In another study of adult ESL students, Abraham (1981) concluded that reflection was weakly related to performance on a
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proofreading task. Jamieson (1992) reported on yet another study of adult ESL learners. She found that "fast-accurate" learners, or good guessers, were better language learners as measured by the standardized Test of English as a Foreign Language, but warned against assuming that impulsivity always implies accuracy. Some of her subjects were fast and inaccurate.

R/l has some important considerations for classroom second language learning and teaching. Teachers tend to judge mistakes too harshly, especially in the case of a learner with an impulsive style who may be more willing than a reflective person to gamble at an answer. On the other hand, a reflective person may require patience from the teacher, who must allow more time for the student to struggle with responses. It is also conceivable that those with impulsive styles may go through some rapid transitions of semi grammatical stages of SLA, with reflective persons tending to remain longer at a particular stage with "larger" leaps from stage to stage.
6. The implications of Multiple Intelligence on Learning Strategies

Approaches, Strategies, Methods, Tactic Techniques, and Learning Approach Models: The starting point of view of the learning process. There are two types of learning approaches: The Student-Centered Approach and Teacher-Centered Approach. From the predetermined learning approach than derived into the learning strategy. Newman and

Logan (Makmun, 2003) suggest four strategic elements of each business, namely:
a. Identify and determine the specifications and qualifications of results (outputs) and targets (targets) that must be achieved, taking into account the aspirations and tastes of the people who need them.
b. Considering and choosing the most effective way to approach the target.
c. Considering and determining the steps that will be taken from the starting point to the target.
d. Consider and set benchmarks (criteria) and benchmark measures (standards) to measure and assess the level of success (achievement) of the business.

If we apply it in the context of learning, the four elements are:
a. Establish specifications and qualifications of learning objectives namely changes in behavior and personal profile of students.
b. Consider and choose a learning approach system that is seen as the most effective.
c. Consider and determine the steps or procedures, methods, and learning techniques.
d. Establish norms and minimum limits on the size of success or criteria and standard measures of success.

Meanwhile, Kemp (in Senjaya, 2008) suggested that the learning strategy is a learning activity that must be done by teachers and students so
that learning objectives can be achieved effectively and efficiently. Furthermore, by quoting David's thoughts, Senjaya (2008) states that the learning strategy contains the meaning of planning. That is, that the strategy is still conceptual about the decisions that will be taken in the implementation of learning. Judging from the strategy, learning can be grouped into two parts as well, namely: (1) exposition-discovery learning and (2) group-individual learning (Senjaya, 2008). Judging from the way it is presented and how it is processed, learning strategies can be distinguished between inductive learning strategies and deductive learning strategies. The learning strategy is still conceptual in nature and to implement it, certain learning methods are used. In other words, the strategy is "a plan of operation achieving something" while the method is "a way in achieving something" (Senjaya, 2008). So, the learning method can be interpreted as a means used to implement plans that have been prepared in the form of activities real and practical to achieve learning objectives. Several learning methods that can be used to implement learning strategies, including (1) lectures, (2) demonstrations, (3) discussions, (4) simulations, (5) laboratories, (6) field experience, (7) brainstorming, (8) debates, (9) symposiums, and so on.

Furthermore, the learning methods are translated into learning techniques and styles. Thus, learning techniques can be considered as a way for someone to implement a specific method. For example, the use of laboratory experimental methods, teachers can use work sequence
techniques that students must do so that the results of experiments can lead students to the results according to the objectives of the experiment.

While learning tactics are one's style of implementing certain learning methods or techniques, for example in laboratory experiments, it can use tactics to compare the results of controls to direct students to the results of experiments.

If between approaches, strategies, methods, techniques and even tactics of learning have been strung together as a whole, what is called the learning model is formed.

So, the learning model is a form of learning that is illustrated from beginning to end which is presented typically by the teacher. In other words, the learning model is a wrapper or frame of the application of an approach, method, and learning technique.

Based on the statement above, to answer these research questions, the researcher used Brown's language learning style theory. A questionnaire that is developed based on Brown's theory is available and it is used to measure the EFL learners' learning styles in this research.
7. The Correlation between Multiple Intelligence and Language

## Learning Style

The teaching method that the teacher has is basically a strategy for transferring information that the teacher gives to students. while the learning style is how information can be well received by students.
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[^1] تَتُتْكُرُونَ

In the Quran Surat An-Nahl Ayat 78, it is explained, And Allah took you out of your mother's stomach knowing nothing, and Allah gave you hearing, sight, and heart so that you would be grateful. The researcher concluded that human intelligence was from the ear. Good human hearing affects human intelligence. The statement above shows how humans use a method or style to become smart students.

According to Gardner (1983), the learning style of high achieving students is related to the dual intelligence of high achieving students. Based on research conducted by Gardner, it turns out student learning styles are reflected in the tendency of intelligence possessed by these students.
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Therefore, every teacher should have data about the learning styles of their students. Then, each teacher must adapt his style of teaching to the learning styles of students that are known from the results of the MIR.

Gardner's concept that a person's intelligence develops, is not static. A person's intelligence is more related to habits, which is behavior that is repeated, in this case, is the way a person captures information or learning styles.

A number of researchers have investigated the relationship between learning styles and multiple intelligences and their role in second and foreign language learning and many researchers have also worked on the role of individuals' learning styles in foreign language learning. Identifying each person's learning styles and multiple intelligence types are crucial. For the students, being aware of their learning style and multiple intelligences types may be very beneficial and useful. Exploring this learning style and multiple intelligence types will allow them to identify their personal strengths and weaknesses and learn from them.

Tekiner (2005) searched the relationship between multiple intelligences and perceptual and social learning styles of university students in the Turkish context. It was found that there were positive relations between logical-mathematical intelligence and individual learning style; intrapersonal intelligence and individual learning style; interpersonal intelligence and group learning style; linguistic intelligence and individual learning style; and interpersonal intelligence and kinesthetic
learning style. Sarıcaoğlu and Arıkan (2009) also carried out a research study with university students. They found that learners' preference for logical-mathematical intelligence was stronger. In the Iranian context, there are some similar research studies.

Ahanbor and Sadighi (2014) investigated if a combination of learning styles and multiple intelligences would enhance students' learning or not. The results showed that all participants had linguistic, logicalmathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal as well as naturalistic intelligence. A statistically significant relationship between learning styles and multiple intelligences was also determined. Similarly, in the Iranian context, Panahandeh et al. (2015) conducted a study to identify the relationship between EFL learners' multiple intelligences and their learning styles. They also focused on the most and the least dominant learning styles and investigated the difference between genders. As a result, only a significant difference was found between genders.

Luengo-Carvara (2015) examined learning styles and multiple intelligences as variables in the teaching-learning process of Spanish as a foreign language. Three moderate correlations had been found among the variables of both constructs: linguistic intelligence-reflexive style; linguistic intelligence-theoretical style; and musical intelligence-active style. As a result, students with a high preference for the reflective and theoretical style demonstrated better overall performance. In another
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context, Ali and Rajalakshmi (2016) conducted a research study with parents. They tried to find out the significance of parents' awareness of their child's multiple intelligences and learning styles. They stated that if parents were sensitive to use the Multiple Intelligence theory in children's education, then learning could be enjoyable, meaningful, and thus the outcomes would be positive for both children and their parents.

Hsu and Chen (2016) explored the relationship between tertiary level EFL college students' learning styles and learning strategies. As a result, most of the participants were balanced-type learners in all learning style dimensions.

Apart from the studies presented above, Tsai (2016) investigated the differences of multiple intelligences according to some variables such as gender, grade, and students' types in the junior school context. Results showed that depending on the average scores of multiple intelligences, seventh-grade students got the highest scores on interpersonal intelligence and got the lowest scores on natural intelligences, and general students and special needs students got the highest scores on interpersonal intelligence.

Based on the experts ${ }^{\text {® }}$ explanation above, the researcher concludes that one of the most affected factors which influence students' achievements is learning style. Because after learning the student's learning style with MIR, the teacher's teaching style adapts to the learning style, and we can be sure that there were no stupid children and no difficult lessons.

## The Relevant Research


#### Abstract

First, research was conducted by MeryemYilmaz-Soylu and BuketAkkoynulu. The design of their research was experimental research. The title of their research was "The Effect of Learning Styles on Achievement in Different Learning Environments ". The research was conducted in 2002 at the Department of Computer Education and Instructional Technology, Faculty of Education, Hacettepe University. In their research, they found that learning styles do not have effects on the achievement of students in different learning environments. At the end of his paper, he recommended that the time and place of using a certain type of media is more important than the type of media used for the design of learning environments.


Hajhashemi, (2011) "The Relationship between Iranian EFL High School Students' Multiple Intelligence Scores and their Use of Learning Strategies" The research is conducted by Hajahsemi in Islamic Azad University, Hesarak, Tehran, Iran which collects the data from the participants who are from different disciplines (17 humanities, 22 experimental sciences, 28 mathematics, and 162 others). This study focuses on the correlation between MI score and LLS (Language Learning Strategy). The instrument is used by the researcher to elicit information for this study are McKenxie's (1999) MI inventory and Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) questionnaire. The findings reveal that there is a positive correlation between MI and different types. The highest correlation is seen between metacognitive strategies and MI, followed by compensation and cognitive strategies.
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Furthermore, the findings reveal that Iranian students mostly use metacognitive strategies followed by social strategies. The strength of this research is in collecting the data which is not only from similar disciplines but also in the other disciplines. A lot of participants are quite supported by the result of the study. More participants will be more valid for research. It is almost similar with the researcher wants to do in the research, but the previous researcher focused on MI score and LLS (Language Learning Strategy), and the researcher wants to correlate students' MI and students' Proposal writing scores. Thus, the difference is from the variable and also the participants.

Akhtar, (2011) investigated "A comparative study of students learning style, socioeconomic status, and learning achievement" found that socioeconomic status has effects on the Learning Style along with the geographical location. Khansir, Jafarizadegan,\&Karampoor, (2016), investigated the relationship between socioeconomic status and motivation of learners in learning English as a Foreign Language found that most of the independent variables especially economical capital have appositive relation with motivation in EFL learning.

In this present research, the researcher tried to find out the correlation between students' multiple intelligence and their language learning style. The difference between this research and the previous researches conducted by Hajhashemi and Akhtar is on the variable x and y . The variable y of this research is language learning style, while the variable y of Hajhashemi is
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learning strategies. Variable $x$ of this research is multiple intelligence, while the variable x of Akhtar is A comparative study of students learning style.

The difference between the relevant research above and this research is that this research conducted to know whether students‘ multiple intelligence and their language learning styles have a relationship or not.

## The Operational Concept

The operational concept is derived from related theoretical concepts on all of the variables that should be practiced and empirically operated in academic writing (Syafi'i, 2016). The operational concept is a concept as guidance uses to avoid misunderstanding. It should be interpreted as particular words in order to make it easy to measure. In this operational concept, the writer would like to explain briefly about variables of the research itself. There are two variables uses. The first is about students' multiple intelligence in which is known as independent variable or variable X . The second is students' language learning style which is known as the dependent variable or variable Y.

The Indicator of Multiple Intelligence $(\mathbf{X})$ according to (Brown, 2001) Table II. 2

| Linguistic Intelligence | Speaking, using words, writing, |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | communicating in a language, solving |
| Logical-mathematical Intelligence | Using numbers, logic, calculations; |
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The Indicator of Language Learning Style(Y) according to (Brown, 2001)
3. Reflective learner (Score 30 or more)
You like to think about things before making a decision; you want to make sure you are right before speaking. The higher your score, the more reflective you are.
4. Impulsive learner (Score 29 or less) lower your score, the more impulsive you are.

## (1). Assumption and Hypothesis

## 1. Assumption

a. The students have different multiple intelligence
b. The students have a different learning style
2. Hypothesis
a. Alternative Hypothesis (Ha)

There is a significant positive correlation between multiple intelligence and language learning styles among the eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 34Pekanbaru.
b. Null Hypothesis (Ho)

There is no significant positive correlation between multiple intelligence and language learning styles among the eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 34 Pekanbaru.

## CHAPTER III

## METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

## The Research Design

The research employed correlational research. According to Gay, Airasian, \& Mills(2012, p.204), correlational research involves collecting data to determine whether, and to what degree, a relationship exists between two or more quantifiable variables. The degree of relationship is expressed as a correlation coefficient. If two variables are related, scores within a certain range on one variable are associated with scores within a certain range on the other variable.

The design of this research was an explanatory research design, which consisted of a simple association between two variables. According to Creswell (2012, p.340), an explanatory research design is a correlational design in which the researcher is interested in the extent to which two variables (or more) co-vary, that is, where changes in one variable are reflected in changes in the other. The reason why the researcher chooses this type of research was that the researcher wants to find out whether or not there is a positive correlation between students' multiple intelligence and their language learning style. The writer describes the relationship of both variables in this following scheme:

Multiple Intelligence X


## Language Learning Style
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There are two variables in this research, independent variable (X) and dependent variable (Y). Multiple intelligence as an independent variable (X) and language learning style is as dependent variable (Y). In conducting the research, the writer prepared a questionnaire to measure multiple intelligence and learning styles of the students.

## The Time and Location of The Research

This research was conducted in April 2020 of the academic year 2019/2020. It was carried out to the eighth-grade students at State Junior High School 34 Pekanbaru. It is located on Jl. Kartama No 68 Marpoyan Damai Pekanbaru.

The subject of the research is the eighth-grade students at State Junior ${ }_{\sim}^{\infty}$ High School 34 Pekanbaru. The object of this research is the correlation between the students' multiple intelligence and their language learning style.

## The Population and Sample of the Research

Arikunto (2006) said that the population is the entire research subject. In order to take the sample, the researcher used simple random sampling due to the randomization process was taken from each of these groups. When the researcher considers that participants are divided into strata or strata, then sampling can not be done randomly, strata cannot be ignored and each stratum must be represented as a sample (Arikunto, 2006, p.138). The size of the
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sample depends on the level of accuracy or error tolerance that researchers want.

However, in terms of fault tolerance in the study were $5 \%, 10 \%$, and $15 \%$, the maximum error rate taken is $5 \%(0,05)$.

One method used to determine the number of samples is using the
Slovin formula (Sevilla et. Aa., 1960:182), as follows :

$$
n=\frac{N}{1+N e^{2}}
$$

Where : $\mathrm{n}=$ number of samples

$$
\mathrm{N}=\text { total population }
$$

$\mathrm{e}=$ error tolerance limit
In this research, the researcher took an error of $10 \%(0,10)$, so the calculation uses the Slovin formula for the students is as follows :

The population of the research is the eighth-grade students at State

Table III. 1
Population of the Research

| No | Class | Male | Famale | Total/Pop <br> ulation | Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | VIII 1 | 15 | 19 | 34 | 12 |
| 2 | VIII 2 | 21 | 13 | 32 | 11 |
| 3 | VIII 3 | 14 | 20 | 32 | 11 |
| 4 | VIII 4 | 15 | 19 | 33 | 11 |
| 5 | VIII 5 | 17 | 17 | 30 | 10 |
| 6 | VIII 6 | 23 | 11 | 34 | 11 |
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|  | Total | 105 | 90 | 195 | 66 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Technique of Collecting Data

Collecting data is identifying and selecting individuals for a study, obtaining their permission to study them, and gathering information by asking people questions or observing their behaviors (Creswell, 2008). To collect data in this research, the researcher used two kinds of the instrument:

## 1. Questionnaire

Arikunto (2006) said that questionnaire is some written questions that are used to obtain information from the respondent in the sense of a report about his personality, or things he or she knows. In collecting the data, the researcher used a questionnaire to find out the information about multiple intelligence and learning styles of students.
2. Brown Multiple Intelligence Questionnaire

According to Creswell (2008), a questionnaire is a form used in survey design that participants in a study complete some questions and then return it to the researcher. Students have given a questionnaire seven kinds of intelligence adopted from Brown books. The survey had four options; 'Definitely not', 'Not really', 'Yes', and 'Definitely, very much so!'. The following table is the blueprint of the questionnaire:
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Table III. 2
Indicators of Multiple Intelligence Questionnare

| Type of Question | Question Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| Linguistic | $1+8$ |
| Logical-mathematical | $2+9$ |
| Spatial | $3+10$ |
| Bodily-kinesthetic | $4+11$ |
| Musical | $5+12$ |
| Interpersonal | $6+13$ |
| Intrapersonal | $7+14$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 4}$ |

Add the numbers you circled above pairs of items. you should get a total score between 2 and 8 for each pair.

Table III. 3
Score of Multiple Intelligence Questionnare

| Score |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $7-8$ | Very high preference |
| $5-6$ | Moderately high preference |
| $3-4$ | Moderately low preference |
| $1-2$ | Low preference |

The statement above about what score means. This questionnaire tells about the kinds of intelligence, that you prefer to use. Look at the following list of seven kinds of intelligence.

| Linguistic intelligence | Speaking, using words, writing, <br> communicating in a language, <br> solving word problems. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Logical-mathematical intelligence | Using numbers, logic, calculations; <br> learning and understanding <br> grammar rules. |
| Spatial intelligence | Drawing, painting, using-color, art, <br> graphics, pictures, maps, and so on. |
| Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence | Muscular coordination, athletic <br> skill, body language, pronouncing a <br> language. |
| Musical intelligence | Using music, tones, hearing; <br> producing the intonation and rhytim <br> of a language. |
| Interpersonal intelligence | Talking with other people, |


|  | understanding them, using language <br> to communicate well with other <br> people. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Intrapersonal intelligence | Self-knowledge, self-confidence, <br> using language to analyze yourself |

The first two, linguistic and logical-mathematical, are the types of intelligence measured on IQ tests. The other five are different kinds of intelligence, and maybe you will discover that some of them are important for learning a foreign language.

## 3. Brown Language Learning Style Questionnaire

The questionnaire also adopted from Brown. The survey had five options; 'Very fast', 'Fast', 'In-between', 'Slow', and 'Definitely, Very slow'. This questionnaire tells you if you are slow or fast when you are working on your English. Are you a slow or a fast reader? Are you usually the first or the last one to put your hand up and speak up in a classroom, or do you usually make a lot of little guesses, even though you might be wrong? One important learning style is speed, that is how slow or fast someone is. If you prefer doing this more slowly, your style is reflective. If you like to do things fast, your style is impulsive.

The reason why the researcher used two learning styles (Reflective and Impulsive) because the researcher wants to know how fast and slow the students do exercise. Especially in language learning English. besides that, a questionnaire that is developed based on Brown's theory is available and it is used to measure the EFL learners' learning styles in this research.

## Table III. 4 <br> Score of Language Learning Style Questionnare

| Score |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 30 or more | You are a revlective learner. You <br> like to think about things before <br> making a decision; you want to <br> make sure you are right before <br> speaking. The higher your score, the <br> more revlective you are. |
| 29 or less | You are impulsive. You make quick <br> decision and are willing to gamble <br> that you are right. The lower your <br> score, the more impulsive you are. |

(Brown, 2001)

## F. Validity and Reliability of Instruments

## 1. Validity of Instruments

Validity in the questionnaire is the extent to which inferences made from assessment results are appropriate, meaningful, and useful in terms of the purpose of assessment. This research focused on students' multiple intelligence and language learning styles. There are four kinds of validity for the test: content validity, criterion-related validity, construct validity, and consequential validity and they are all interrelated (Gay, 2009) In this research, the writer used content validity. Azwar $(2015,42)$ explains that "content validity is also related to items that must be relevant to the objectives to be measured, i.e. items that do not go out of the boundaries of measurement objectives". Although the contents are comprehensive, if the test also includes items that are irrelevant and are related to things outside of the measurement objectives, then the validity of the test cannot be said to meet the characteristics of actual validity. So, content validity is
measured by ensuring the indicators and the questionnaire's items alignment. Instead of validity, the concept of practicality is helpful to make sure the effectiveness of an assessment tool (Settiawan \& Hilmawan, 2016, p. 366). Therefore, in this research, how to score the questionnaire and how much time to score each item were considered in designing both instruction and scoring rubric of the questionnaire.

## 2. Reliability of Instruments

According to Sudjana $(2005,16)$, the reliability of an appraisal tool is the appropriateness or constancy of the tool in assessing what it values. That is, whenever the tool is used will give relatively the same results.

In this research, the researcher used the split-half technique to measure the questionnaires' reliability. Then, the software SPSS 26.0 version was used to calculate the reliability of the test. Here is the result of reliability for multiple intelligence questionnaire:
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 which is categorized into a highly reliable level. Then, the result of reliability for language learning style can be seen in the following table:

## Table III. 6 Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Part 1 | Value | . 709 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N of Items $5^{\text {a }}$ |  |
|  | Part 2 | Value | . 735 |
|  |  | N of Ite | $5^{\text {b }}$ |
|  | Total | of Items | 10 |
| Correlation Between Forms |  |  | . 593 |
| Spearman-Brown | Equal Length |  | . 745 |
| Coefficient | Unequal Length |  | . 745 |
| Guttman Split-Half Coefficient |  |  | . 744 |

a. The items are: Y1, Y2, Y3, Y4, Y5.
b. The items are: Y6, Y7, Y8, Y9, Y10.

The table showed that the reliability of the language learning style was 0.744 which is categorized into a highly reliable level.

## Technique of Data Analysis

To analyze the data, the writer used Pearson Product Moment Correlation on SPSS 26.0 program. According to Hartono (2008), the productmoment correlation technique is used when the two types of data correlated are interval. Besides, it is used to find out the relationship between two parametric variables and the linear correlation between students' multiple intelligence and their Language learning style. In analyzing the data of students' multiple intelligence and their Language learning style, the researcher analyzed it statically by using SPSS 26.0 program.

To know about whether there is a significant correlation between students' multiple intelligence and their language learning style or not, the data analyzed statistically by used Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient using SPSS 26.0. The statistical hypotheses were as follow:
$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ : sig. 2 tailed $\leq 0.05$
$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}$ : sig. 2 tailed $\geq 0.05$
$H_{a}$ : there is a significant correlation between the students' multiple intelligence and their language learning style.
$H_{o}$ : there is no significant correlation between the students' multiple intelligence and their language learning style.


## The Conclusion

This research was done to find out the correlation between students' multiple intelligence and their language learning style the eighth-grade
students' of SMP 34 Pekanbaru. So, the writer can conclude this research as follows:

1. The categories of students' multiple intelligence at the eighth-grade students' of SMP 34 Pekanbaru are:
a. Linguistic intelligence is low preference 3 students (1.98\%), moderately low preference 41 students (27.06\%), moderately high preference 20 students (13.2\%), and high preference 2 students (1.32\%).

## CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

b. Logical-mathematical intelligence is low preference 8 students (5.28\%), moderately low preference 34 students ( $22.44 \%$ ), moderately high preference 23 students ( $15.18 \%$ ) and high preference 1 students (0.66\%).
c. Spatial intelligence is low preference 6 students (3.96\%), moderately low preference 30 students (19.8 \%), moderately high preference 28 students (18.48\%) and high preference 2 students (1.32\%).
d. Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence is low preference 8 students (5.28\%), moderately low preference 32 students (21.12\%), moderately high preference 21 students (13.86\%) and high preference 5 students (3.3\%).
e. Musical intelligence is low preference 5 students (3.3\%), moderately low preference 20 students (13.2\%), moderately high preference 33 students ( $21.78 \%$ ) and high preference 8 students (5.28\%).
f. Interpersonal intelligence is low preference 4 students (2.64\%), moderately low preference 31 students (20.46\%), moderately high preference 29 students (19.14\%) and high preference 2 students (1.32\%).
g. Intrapersonal intelligence is low preference 5 students (3.3\%), moderately low preference 23 students (15.18\%), moderately high preference 36 students ( $23.76 \%$ ) and high preference 2 students (1.32\%).

So, the result of the students' multiple intelligence at the eighth-grade students' of SMP 34 Pekanbaru is categorized into Moderately Low preference.
2. The students' language learning style at the eighth-grade students' of SMP 34 Pekanbaru is categorized into reflective learner 37 students ( $24.42 \%$ ) and impulsive learner 29 students (19.14\%).
3. There is a significant correlation between students' multiple intelligence and their language learning style at the eighth-grade students' of SMP 34 Pekanbaru.

Based on the result of the research, the students' multiple intelligence has a correlation with their language learning style. It means the better multiple intelligence they have, the better language learning style they get.

## The Suggestion

Considering the correlation between students' multiple intelligence and their language learning style, the writer would like to give some suggestion as follows:

## 1. Suggestion for Teachers

a. It is recommended to teachers to provide lessons related to student intelligence.
b. The teacher should be creative to improve the students' language learning style by giving them more activities or exercise.

## 2. Suggestion for Students

a. The students must pay attention to the teacher's explanation to get a better language learning style.
b. The students should pay more attention to the English lessons explained by the teacher to increase knowledge of the English language lessons.

## 3. For Future Research

a. The result of this research is also expected to be used as a reference for those who want to conduct a research.
b. These research findings are also expected to inspire the other researcher to investigate the students' habits in order to give meaningful inputs for both practical and theoretical developments of TEFL and TESOL in general. 2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.
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## Multiple Intelligences Questionnaire Seven Kinds of Intelligence

Gircle the number that best describes how quickly you usually do things. Circle only one number for each item. Use the following scale :

1. Definitely, very much so!
2. Yes.
3. Not really.
4. Definitely, not!

## Example

I like to learn by watching videos
4


Number 3 has been circeled. This means that this person agree and thinks that this statement describes him or her well.

| 1. I like memorizing words | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. I like the teacher to explain grammar to me | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| $3_{6} \mathrm{I}$ I like making charts and diagrams | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. I like drama and role plays | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. I like singing songs in English | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6-I like group and pair interaction | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |
| EI like self-reflection through journal writing | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 8.i like word game and puzzles | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 9-I like problem-solving exercises | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 10. I like tolearn through movies and videos | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 19.1. I like to move arround a lot in the classroom | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 2. I like jazz chants and rhythmic activities |  |  | 2 |  |
| 囸. I like one-on-one conversation practice | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |
| [4. I I like to analyze my own performance | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |

## Appendix 2

$\pi$
$\vdots$
$\vdots$
$\vdots$
$\vdots$
3

## Language Learning Style Questionnaire Slow of Fast?

Gircle the number that best describes how quickly you usually do things. Circle only one number for each item. Use the following scale :

1. Very fast
2. Slow
3. Fast
4. In between万

## Example

How fast or slow i usually am when i . . . .
Do my homework
5. Very Slow


Number 2 has been circeled. This means that this person does homework quite fast and takes less time than most classmate.

How fast or slow I usually am when I . . . .

| 1. Read books, magazines, and newspapers in English | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2. Read textbooks, articles, and } \\ & \text { reports in English, in my } \\ & \text { academic field } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Write an essay or composition in English | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Take multiple-choice tests in English | 1 | 2 | $3$ | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Answer tests in English that ask for written sentences or paragraphs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Answer a direct question to me from the teacher, in my English class | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Raise my hand when the teacher asks a question in my English class | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Volunteer to say something in | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
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| class, when the teacher has not asked me |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9. Speak up in a small group in English, in class | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. Answer a question in English from someone outside my classroom | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

$\subset$
Feld up the numbers you circeled. You should get a total score between 10 and 50
Score: $\qquad$ _

The result of multiple intelligence questionnaire

| Linguistic Intelligence |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| StudentsNo | Score | Total | Category |  |
| Students 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 6 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 7 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 8 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 9 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 11 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 12 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 13 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Student 14 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 15 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Student 16 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 17 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 18 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 19 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 20 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 21 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 22 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 23 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 24 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 25 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 26 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 27 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 28 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 29 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 30 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 31 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 32 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |



| Logical-mathematical Intellegence |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| StudentsNo |  |  | Total | Category |
| Students 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 4 | 4 | 2 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 8 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 11 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 12 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 13 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 14 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 15 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 16 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 17 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 18 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 19 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 20 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 21 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 22 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 23 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 24 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 25 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 26 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 27 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 28 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 29 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 30 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 31 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 32 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 33 | 2 | 4 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 34 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 35 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 36 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |


| Students 37 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Students 38 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 39 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 40 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 41 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 42 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 43 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 44 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 45 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 46 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 47 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 48 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 49 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 50 | 2 | 4 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 51 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 52 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 53 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 54 | 3 | 4 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 55 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 56 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 57 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 58 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 59 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 60 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 61 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 62 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 63 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 64 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 65 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 66 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |


| Spatial Intellegence |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| StudentsNo | Sc |  | Total | Category |
| Students 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 6 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 7 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 8 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 9 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 11 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 12 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 13 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 14 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 15 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 16 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 17 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 18 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 19 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 20 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 21 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 22 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 23 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 24 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 25 | 2 | 4 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 26 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 27 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 28 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 29 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 30 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 31 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 32 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 33 | 3 | 4 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 34 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 35 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 36 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |


| Students 37 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Students 38 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 39 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 40 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 41 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 42 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 43 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 44 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 45 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 46 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 47 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 48 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 49 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 50 | 3 | 4 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 51 | 2 | 4 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 52 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 53 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 54 | 1 | 4 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 55 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 56 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 57 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 58 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 59 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 60 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 61 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 62 | 4 | 2 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 63 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 64 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 65 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 66 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |


| Bodily-kinesthetic Intellegence |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| StudentsNo |  |  | Total | Category |
| Students 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 5 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 8 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 11 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 12 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 13 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 14 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 15 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 16 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 17 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 18 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 19 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 20 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 21 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 22 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 23 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 24 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 25 | 2 | 4 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 26 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 27 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 28 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 29 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 30 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 31 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 32 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 33 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 34 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 35 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 36 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |


| Students 37 | 4 | 3 | 7 | High preference |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Students 38 | 4 | 3 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 39 | 4 | 3 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 40 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 41 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 42 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 43 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 44 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 45 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 46 | 4 | 4 | 8 | High preference |
| Students 47 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 48 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 49 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 50 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 51 | 4 | 2 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 52 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 53 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 54 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 55 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 56 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 57 | 4 | 3 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 58 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 59 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 60 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 61 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 62 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 63 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 64 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 65 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 66 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |


| Musical Intellegence |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| StudentsNo |  |  | Total | Category |
| Students 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 4 | 3 | 4 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 6 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 7 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 8 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 9 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 11 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 12 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 13 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 14 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 15 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 16 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 17 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 18 | 2 | 4 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 19 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 20 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 21 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 22 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 23 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 24 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 25 | 2 | 4 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 26 | 2 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 27 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 28 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 29 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 30 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 31 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 32 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 33 | 3 | 4 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 34 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 35 | 1 | 4 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 36 | 4 | 3 | 7 | High preference |


| Students 37 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Students 38 | 3 | 4 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 39 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 40 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 41 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 42 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 43 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 44 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 45 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 46 | 3 | 4 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 47 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 48 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 49 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 50 | 3 | 4 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 51 | 4 | 4 | 8 | High preference |
| Students 52 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 53 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 54 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 55 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 56 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 57 | 1 | 4 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 58 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 59 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 60 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 61 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 62 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 63 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 64 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 65 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 66 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |


| Interpersonal Intellegence |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| StudentsNo |  |  | Total | Category |
| Students 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 6 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 8 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 9 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 11 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 12 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 13 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 14 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 15 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 16 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 17 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 18 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 19 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 20 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 21 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 22 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 23 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 24 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 25 | 2 | 4 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 26 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 27 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 28 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 29 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 30 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 31 | 3 | 4 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 32 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 33 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 34 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 35 | 3 | 4 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 36 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |


| Students 37 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Students 38 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 39 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 40 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 41 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 42 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 43 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 44 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 45 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 46 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 47 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 48 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 49 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 50 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 51 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 52 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 53 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 54 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 55 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 56 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 57 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 58 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 59 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 60 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 61 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 62 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 63 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 64 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 65 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 66 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Intrapersonal Intellegence |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| StudentsNo | Score |  | Total | Category |
| Students 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 6 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 8 | 4 | 3 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 9 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 11 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 12 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 13 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 14 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 15 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 16 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 17 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 18 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 19 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 20 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 21 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 22 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 23 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 24 | 1 | 4 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 25 | 2 | 4 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 26 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 27 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 28 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 29 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 30 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 31 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 32 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 33 | 4 | 3 | 7 | High preference |
| Students 34 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 35 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 36 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Students 37 | 4 | 1 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Students 38 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 39 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 40 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 41 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 42 | 4 | 2 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 43 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 44 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 45 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 46 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 47 | 4 | 2 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 48 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 49 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 50 | 4 | 2 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 51 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 52 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 53 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 54 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 55 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 56 | 3 | 3 | 6 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 57 | 3 | 2 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 58 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |
| Students 59 | 2 | 2 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 60 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 61 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 62 | 2 | 3 | 5 | Moderately high preference |
| Students 63 | 2 | 1 | 3 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 64 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 65 | 3 | 1 | 4 | Moderately low preference |
| Students 66 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Low preference |



The result of Language Learning Style Questionnaire

| StudentsNo | Score | Category | StudentsNo | Score | Category |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Students1 | 33 | Reflective | Students34 | 46 | Reflective |
| Students2 | 31 | Reflective | Students35 | 39 | Reflective |
| Students3 | 36 | Reflective | Students36 | 38 | Reflective |
| Students4 | 20 | Impulsive | Students37 | 43 | Reflective |
| Students5 | 27 | Impulsive | Students38 | 33 | Reflective |
| Students6 | 23 | Impulsive | Students39 | 18 | Impulsive |
| Students7 | 22 | Impulsive | Students40 | 30 | Reflective |
| Students8 | 26 | Impulsive | Students41 | 26 | Impulsive |
| Students9 | 33 | Reflective | Students42 | 19 | Impulsive |
| Students10 | 21 | Impulsive | Students43 | 14 | Impulsive |
| Students11 | 36 | Reflective | Students44 | 22 | Impulsive |
| Students12 | 38 | Reflective | Students45 | 27 | Impulsive |
| Students13 | 37 | Reflective | Students46 | 24 | Impulsive |
| Students14 | 26 | Impulsive | Students47 | 23 | Impulsive |
| Students15 | 24 | Impulsive | Students48 | 37 | Reflective |
| Students16 | 30 | Reflective | Students49 | 23 | Impulsive |
| Students17 | 32 | Reflective | Students50 | 39 | Reflective |
| Students18 | 35 | Reflective | Students51 | 32 | Reflective |
| Students19 | 30 | Reflective | Students52 | 29 | Impulsive |
| Students20 | 30 | Reflective | Students53 | 13 | Impulsive |
| Students21 | 31 | Reflective | Students54 | 44 | Reflective |
| Students22 | 30 | Reflective | Students55 | 27 | Impulsive |
| Students23 | 30 | Reflective | Students56 | 18 | Impulsive |
| Students24 | 40 | Reflective | Students57 | 23 | Impulsive |
| Students25 | 32 | Reflective | Students58 | 42 | Reflective |
| Students26 | 36 | Reflective | Students59 | 38 | Reflective |
| Students27 | 26 | Impulsive | Students60 | 25 | Impulsive |
| Students28 | 17 | Impulsive | Students61 | 32 | Reflective |
| Students29 | 39 | Reflective | Students62 | 34 | Reflective |
| Students30 | 27 | Impulsive | Students63 | 35 | Reflective |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.


ne!yexsns NIn y!l!mełd!う yeH ()

| Students31 | 43 | Reflective | Students64 | 20 | Impulsive |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Students32 | 31 | Reflective | Students65 | 24 | Impulsive |  |
| Students33 | 27 | Impulsive | Students66 | 30 | Reflective |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 9 6 6}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Level of <br> category | Range of <br> scores | Total of the <br> students |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Reflective | $>30$ |  | 37 |
| Impulsive | $<30$ |  | 29 |
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