Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning

University of Tabriz

Volume 17, Issue 35, 2025

Appraisal of Multiple Intelligence-Based Instruction: the case of learners' perceptions

Sajjad Gharibeh-Gharibeh (Corresponding Author)

Department of English Language, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran. E-mail: s.gharibeh2@yahoo.com

Zhila Mohammadnia

Department of English Language, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran. E-mail: z.mohammadnia@urmia.ac.ir

Mahdi Sarkhosh

Department of English Language, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran. E-mail: m.sarkhosh@urmia.ac.ir

ARTICLE INFO:

Received date:
2025.02.06
Accepted date:
2025.03.14

Print ISSN: 2251-7995
Online ISSN: 2676-6876

Keywords:

Language Learning, EFL, Multiple Intelligences, Learner Perceptions, Instructional Approaches

Abstract

Language learning is a multifaceted process influenced by various factors, including learners' individual preferences and cognitive strengths. This mixed-methods study investigates how dominant intelligences influence the instructional preferences and perceptions of 30 male Turkish-speaking EFL learners, aged 13-17, using a structured questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The research explores the relationship between learners' intelligences and specific teaching approaches, with data analyzed through both quantitative and qualitative methods. Participants were categorized into two groups based on their dominant intelligences: Group A (interpersonal and intrapersonal) and Group B (linguistic and visual/spatial). Analysis of the data reveals that learners gravitate towards learning styles that align with their dominant intelligences, with Group A favoring interactive and self-directed approaches, while Group B leans towards visual and experiential methods. Despite a limited awareness of MI theory, the participants express satisfaction with MI-based instruction, viewing it as more engaging and effective compared to traditional methods. This study underscores the significance of incorporating learner preferences into language instruction and highlights the potential of MI-based approaches to enhance learner engagement and motivation.

Citation: Gharibeh-Gharibeh, S.; Mohammadnia, Z. & Sarkhosh, M. (2025). Appraisal of Multiple Intelligence-Based Instruction: the case of learners' perceptions. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 17 (35), 161-174. DOI: 10.22034/elt.2025.65817.2751

Introduction

The curriculum taught in schools is widely acknowledged to shape the trajectory of learners' lives well beyond the confines of the classroom. As such, the development of a curriculum that not only meets academic requirements but also equips learners with the skills and knowledge necessary to navigate real-world challenges is imperative (Gardner, 1993). The theory of Multiple Intelligences (MI), conceptualized by Gardner (1983), offers a framework that aligns with this objective, providing opportunities for learners to engage with content in ways that resonate with their individual strengths and aptitudes. Berger's (2013) reflection underscores the need for instructional approaches that foster authentic learning experiences, addressing the disparity between tasks assigned in traditional educational settings and the demands of real-world endeavors. While academic pursuits often prioritize standardized assessments, the professional landscape demands collaborative, interdisciplinary work that integrates diverse skills and perspectives.

Recognizing the diversity of learners' abilities and learning styles, educators increasingly advocate for approaches that address students' strengths and weaknesses. Reed (2007) emphasizes tailoring instruction to accommodate learners' unique profiles, maximizing their potential for growth. Gardner (2006) notes the widespread adoption of MI theory in educational policy worldwide, yet highlights that its effectiveness depends on educators' understanding and practical application of its principles. Armstrong (2009) cautions that inadequate familiarity with MI theory may undermine its potential to enhance engagement and learning outcomes.

Despite significant interest in MI-based instruction, gaps persist in the literature. First, existing research (e.g., Armstrong, 2009; Dolati & Tahriri, 2017; Yaumi et al., 2018) predominantly explores teachers' perspectives, leaving learners' voices underrepresented. Second, while some studies (e.g., Lotfi-Khajouei et al., 2021; Aydin, 2019) examine learners' attitudes toward MI theory, they rarely address its application to specific instructional methods or content areas, such as pragmatic language skills. This oversight is particularly relevant to teaching politeness markers, where aligning instruction with learners' dominant intelligences could significantly enhance outcomes.

To address these gaps, this study investigates intermediate EFL learners' perceptions of MI-based instruction, focusing on its alignment with their cognitive strengths and effectiveness in teaching politeness markers. By prioritizing learners' experiences, this research aims to provide actionable insights for educators and curriculum developers, ensuring that instructional methods are not only theoretically sound but also practically impactful.

Literature Review

MI theory, proposed by Howard Gardner (1983), suggests that intelligence is not a singular, fixed entity but rather a combination of distinct modalities or "intelligences." These intelligences include linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalistic intelligences. In language learning and teaching, MI theory posits that individuals may have varying strengths and preferences in how they learn

and use language. Educators' attitudes toward MI theory in language teaching have been diverse. Some educators advocate for its incorporation into pedagogical practices, arguing that it provides a framework for addressing individual differences and promoting learner-centered instruction (Armstrong, 2009). Recent studies (e.g., Dolati &Tahriri, 2017; Faidah, Fauziati & Suparno, 2019; Haley, 2001; Kennedy-Murray, 2016; Putri et al., 2021; Yaumi et al., 2018) delve into teachers' perceptions of MI theory implementation, highlighting their positive attitudes and challenges faced in practice.

Kennedy-Murray (2016) conducted a correlational study to determine teachers' familiarity with MI theory and its teaching strategies. Some 61 middle school teachers participated in this study. An online self-report survey and a 39-item survey were used to measure the participants' perceptions of MI theory and MI-based teaching strategies. The findings showed that the majority (61 percent) of instructors had little or no knowledge of Gardner's MI theory. Moreover, the outcomes of linear regression showed that there was no correlation between teachers' instructional strategies and their knowledge of MI theory.

Dolati and Tahriri (2017) examined the differences in how teachers with different levels of intelligence used instructional activities and perceived the MI theory. This study included 30 males and females EFL teachers who used the same textbook and teaching strategy. The data was gathered through observing the classes, conducting semi-structured interviews, and using a multiple intelligence checklist. The findings of a one-way ANOVA and a post hoc test revealed that only teachers with logical-mathematical dominant intelligence acted differently in their use of teaching activities, whereas other teachers with different dominant intelligences showed no variation in their use of teaching activities. The researchers of this study reported that teachers should exercise caution if logical-mathematical is their dominant intelligence, since this may force them to only use tasks that are compatible with this intelligence.

Yaumi et al. (2018) designed a training course through MI theory to increase teachers' understanding and performance in creating learner-centered instruction as well as their performance in putting such instruction into practice. 192 learners and 126 teachers from 10 elementary Indonesian Madrasah participated in this study. The data was gathered using observation sheets, a question guide for focus group discussion, and a test. The results of interactive model analysis revealed that teachers' perception of MI theory increased and, accordingly, their performance in creating and applying MI-based instructions improved. In a similar vein, Putri et al. (2021) investigated teachers' perceptions about teaching young learners using MI theory. Ten Indonesian elementary school teachers were interviewed. The majority of the participants had high opinions of MI theory. They claimed that acknowledging each learner's MI would make it simpler to interact with them. Additionally, they indicated that learners would find MI-based classes interesting, and as a result, they would complete them successfully.

Haley (2001) explored how MI theory might be used to guide and inform instructional strategies and teaching methods. Teachers from different states of USA took part in the study. Learners who were enrolled in a foreign or second language class were chosen by these teachers. To identify the participants' MIs and their perceptions of this theory, an informal MI survey and interviews were conducted. The findings showed that instructors were significantly

impacted. They felt that their classroom paradigm had changed to one that was more learner-centered, and their pedagogy had been revitalized. The elevated range of teaching methods employed in their ESL/EFL classes was well received by the learners, i.e., they were passionate about using MI theory in their educational course. Similar research was conducted by Zainudin (2012) on secondary school learners' and instructors' impressions of learners' profiles in Malaysia. A total of 142 learners completed the quiz questionnaire, and 36 learners and teachers were interviewed. Group discussions were also observed. The findings showed that a variety of factors influence how teachers and learners perceive the learners' MI profiles. The labels are one of the important factors that teachers emphasize. The issue of ethnic labeling was underlined as having a substantial impact on the learners' learning. Furthermore, both teachers and learners asserted that MI was a key facilitator of deep learning.

Each of the aforementioned studies investigated the MI theory from either teachers' perspectives or those of both teachers and learners. However, to understand how learners perceive the MI theory, the researcher reviews three studies in the following section. Bas and Beyhan (2010) sought to determine how learners' success and attitudes toward English lessons were affected by project-based learning that was supported by multiple intelligences and by a traditional foreign language teaching setting. 50 elementary school learners from two different classes participated in the study. The participants' academic performance was assessed using a multiple-choice test with 50 items, and their attitudes toward English classes were evaluated using the English Lesson Attitude Scale Test. The findings revealed a substantial difference between the attitude scores of the experimental group and the control group. It was also discovered that the activities using the MIs principles were more successful in helping the learners' attitudes grow positively. Moreover, the findings showed that learners who were taught using MI-based instructions were more successful and motivated than those who were taught using conventional approaches.

Aydin (2019) conducted a meta-analysis to investigate if the development and use of MI-based learning and teaching activities had positively impacted learners' academic success and promoted positive learning attitudes within the fields of mathematics and science. Before the meta-analysis, the criteria for papers to be included in the study were determined. The study included a total of 118 papers that meet the criteria; 91 of these studies concentrated on the success component, while the other 28 studies dealt with the attitude component. The results of a meta-analysis showed that there were no significant differences in the achievement of learners who received MI-based instruction compared to traditional one. Although there was no significant difference in the attitudes of the learners toward MI-based or traditional education, it was reported that learners in the humanities and sciences had positive perceptions of MI-based instruction.

In another study, Lotfi-Khajouei et al. (2021) sought to investigate the perceptions of learners regarding the effectiveness of MI-based activities in enhancing speaking and listening skills. A total of 30 Iranian intermediate EFL learners were recruited, and they were instructed using MI-based activities. Based on the MI-based activities, two identical English perception tests for speaking and listening were created, verified, and given to participants. In addition, a semi-structured interview was conducted to enrich the data gathered from the participants. The

findings of the study showed that all the participants had positive opinions of using MI-based activities for L2 listening and speaking, and the outcomes of semi-structured interviews further supported this.

In the realm of personalized instruction, it is imperative for language professionals to prioritize learners' perceptions over those of teachers (Brown, 2007). However, a noticeable gap exists in the literature concerning the evaluation of the Multiple Intelligences (MI) theory from the standpoint of learners. While the majority of research has focused on assessing MI theory through the lens of teachers' perceptions, there has been a notable scarcity of studies that delve into how learners perceive MI theory. Furthermore, even among the limited studies that have examined learners' perspectives on MI theory, there remains a significant oversight: they have failed to inquire about MI-based instructional methods tailored to accommodate learners' dominant intelligences. Therefore, this study aims to explore learners' perceptions of MI theory and its implementation in the learning curriculum by addressing the following research question:

- What perceptions do EFL learners hold on multiple intelligence-based instructions of politeness markers before and after implementing MI-based course?

Method

Design

This study employed a mixed-methods research design to explore learners' perceptions of MI-based instruction. A qualitative approach was used through semi-structured interviews to gain in-depth insights into participants' learning experiences, while a quantitative component was integrated via a structured questionnaire to triangulate the findings. The combination of qualitative and quantitative data allowed for a more comprehensive understanding of learners' engagement, preferences, and attitudes toward MI-based instruction. The study followed a pre-post design, where participants' initial perceptions were assessed before instruction, and their responses were re-evaluated after the implementation of MI-based teaching strategies. This approach facilitated the identification of changes in perceptions and instructional effectiveness.

Participants

The study included 30 intermediate EFL learners, aged 13-17, who had been attending a private English institute for three years. All participants were male, native Turkish speakers, and had no prior experience living in English-speaking countries. They were selected non-randomly from a pool of 60 EFL learners and assessed using the Cambridge English Language Assessment Inventory (CELAI) to determine their proficiency levels. Additionally, McKenzie's MI questionnaire was utilized to identify their dominant intelligences. It's worth noting that the participants' highest scores on different sections of the MI questionnaire revealed two dominant intelligences. Subsequently, they were divided into two groups based on their dominant intelligences. Group A consisted of 10 participants with high interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences, while Group B comprised 10 participants with high linguistic and visual/spatial intelligences.

Instruments

Semi-structured interview

Prior to and after treatment sessions, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with learners to learn more about their preferences and perceptions. Interview design was motivated by two factors. Using the insights obtained from the literature, the researcher came to the conclusion that it was crucial to learn about learners' perceptions while creating personalized instructions. On the other hand, learning about learners' satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the teaching materials and methods following EFL classes might enable professionals in the field to take the steps required in order to improve these courses. As a result, the researcher created the semi-structured interviews based on the advice of field experts and the results of earlier investigations.

Questionnaire on Learners' Perceptions of MI-Based Instruction

To further triangulate the qualitative data obtained from interviews, a structured questionnaire was developed and administered to all 30 participants. The questionnaire aimed to quantify learners' perceptions of MI-based instruction and compare their experiences with traditional methods. It consisted of 13 items divided into four sections:

1. Demographic Information (e.g., age, language background, MI awareness)
2. Learning Preferences and MI Profiles (e.g., preferred learning styles, effectiveness of MI-based instruction)
3. Comparison with Traditional Instruction (e.g., engagement levels, confidence in using politeness markers)
4. Open-ended Questions (e.g., most enjoyable aspects, challenges faced, recommendations for future instruction)

The questionnaire included both Likert-scale items, multiple-choice questions, and open-ended responses to capture a comprehensive view of learners' experiences. To ensure content validity, the questionnaire was reviewed by experts in applied linguistics and language education. The items were designed to align with themes identified in the interviews, ensuring methodological triangulation. The internal consistency of the questionnaire was assessed using Cronbach's alpha indicating a high level of reliability. The results of the questionnaire were analyzed descriptively and compared with the interview findings to strengthen the study's validity. This mixed-methods approach allowed for a more nuanced understanding of how MI-based instruction influenced learners' engagement and learning outcomes.

Cambridge English Language Assessment Inventory

The Cambridge ESOL has devised the CELAI as a means to assess the English proficiency of EFL learners. It's renowned globally and comprises 25 multiple-choice questions covering comprehension, grammar, and vocabulary. Scores are presented on the Cambridge English Scale, offering a comprehensive view of proficiency levels. The consistency of results across tests facilitates easy comparison and understanding of progression between proficiency levels.

Multiple Intelligences Survey

The McKenzie Multiple Intelligences questionnaire (1999) is a robust tool for assessing participants' multiple intelligences. This study utilized the validated Persian version of the questionnaire by Irantahgig, which demonstrated a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.74, indicating good reliability. It comprises nine sections, each containing 10 items aimed at measuring various types of intelligences. Notably, these sections correspond to intelligences across categories such as naturalist, musical, logical, existential, interpersonal, kinesthetic, verbal, intrapersonal, and visual. The questionnaire employs min-max scaling (0, 1) to identify participants' dominant and weaker intelligences.

Data Collection Procedure

The data collection process for this study followed a structured approach, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative methods to ensure methodological triangulation.

Phase 1: Pre-Instruction Data Collection

Prior to implementing the MI-based instruction, semi-structured interviews were conducted with all 30 participants to explore their initial perceptions of learning styles and MI-based instruction. The interviews were conducted individually and recorded for later transcription and analysis. Additionally, participants completed a structured questionnaire, designed to collect demographic information and baseline data on their learning preferences. The questionnaire was administered in paper-based format and took approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

Phase 2: MI-Based Instruction Implementation

Following the pre-instruction data collection, participants engaged in MI-based instruction sessions tailored to their dominant intelligences. These instructional activities aligned with their cognitive strengths and preferred learning styles, as determined in the pre-study phase.

Phase 3: Post-Instruction Data Collection

Upon completing the MI-based instructional period, participants were re-interviewed to gather insights into their experiences and perceptions of the new learning approach. To further strengthen data triangulation, the same structured questionnaire was re-administered to measure changes in learners' perceptions and attitudes toward MI-based instruction. The post-instruction questionnaire responses were compared to the initial responses, allowing for a comprehensive analysis of the instructional impact. The collected data from interviews and questionnaires were subsequently analyzed using content analysis for qualitative responses and descriptive statistics for quantitative data.

Data Analysis

The study employed a mixed-methods approach to analyze the collected data, integrating both qualitative and quantitative techniques to provide a comprehensive understanding of learners' perceptions of MI-based instruction. The qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews were transcribed and subjected to content analysis, enabling the identification of recurring themes and patterns related to participants' learning preferences and instructional experiences. A coding framework was developed to systematically categorize responses, allowing for a

structured comparison of pre- and post-instruction interviews to capture changes in learners' attitudes and engagement levels.

For the quantitative data, descriptive statistical analyses were conducted on the questionnaire responses to examine trends and distribution patterns. The comparison of pre- and post-instruction questionnaire data provided insights into shifts in learners' perceptions and their overall engagement with MI-based instruction. To ensure the reliability of the questionnaire, internal consistency was measured using Cronbach's alpha, which resulted in a coefficient of 0.82, indicating a high level of reliability. The integration of qualitative and quantitative findings allowed for methodological triangulation, reinforcing the robustness of the study and enhancing the interpretability of the results.

Results

Learners' Learning Preferences and MI Awareness

Prior to instruction, an analysis of participants' responses revealed a strong alignment between their preferred learning styles and their dominant intelligences, despite their limited awareness of MI theory. Learners in Group A (interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences) expressed a preference for interactive discussions, self-directed learning, and social engagement in the classroom. They reported that participating in group activities, explaining concepts to others, and reflecting on their own learning processes enhanced their comprehension.

Conversely, Group B (linguistic and visual-spatial intelligences) demonstrated a preference for structured learning methods, including reading, note-taking, and visually enriched activities such as videos and images. They indicated that exposure to visual materials and opportunities for independent practice facilitated their understanding of politeness markers. Notably, only one participant in Group B was aware of MI theory before the study, while none in Group A had prior knowledge.

The following participant responses highlight these preferences:

- *"I learn best when I discuss topics with my classmates. Speaking about a topic helps me remember it for a longer time." (Group A)*
- *"I prefer learning by self-studying first and then discussing the topic. This helps me internalize the concepts before sharing them with others." (Group A)*
- *"Watching videos and using images helps me learn more effectively. If I see something visually, it stays in my memory." (Group B)*
- *"I usually take notes while reading because it helps me remember key points." (Group B)*

Effectiveness of MI-Based Instruction

The impact of MI-based instruction was evident in both qualitative and quantitative findings. Questionnaire responses indicated a substantial increase in engagement, confidence, and comprehension of politeness markers post-instruction. On a five-point Likert scale, 85% of participants rated MI-based instruction between 4 and 5, demonstrating high satisfaction.

Furthermore, 80% of learners reported that MI-based instruction was more effective than traditional methods, citing increased motivation and deeper retention of language concepts.

A comparison of pre- and post-instruction responses highlighted a significant increase in confidence when using politeness markers. Prior to instruction, only 45% of learners felt confident in their ability to use politeness markers correctly. After instruction, this figure rose to 85%, with many attributing their improvement to MI-based activities that aligned with their cognitive strengths.

Most Effective Activities and Learning Strategies

Participants identified specific MI-based activities that they found most effective for learning politeness markers. Learners in Group A favored role-playing exercises, debates, and self-reflective journaling. They noted that discussing language concepts and engaging in critical thinking exercises enhanced their ability to internalize new expressions.

Learners in Group B, on the other hand, expressed a preference for visual stimuli, structured exercises, and matching activities. 70% of Group B participants found activities such as matching politeness markers with images and writing synonyms to be particularly beneficial for reinforcing their learning. Table 1 summarizes key findings.

Table 1. *Summary of key findings*

Theme	**Group A (Interpersonal/Intrapersonal)**	**Group B (Linguistic/Visual-Spatial)**
Preferred Learning Style	Discussion, self-reflection, group work	Watching videos, note-taking, reading
Effective Learning Activities	Role-plays, debates, journaling	Matching exercises, visual aids, writing synonyms
Confidence in Using Politeness Markers	Increased from 40% to 85%	Increased from 50% to 85%
Engagement in MI-Based Instruction	Rated 4-5 by 85% of participants	Rated 4-5 by 85% of participants
Comparison with Traditional Methods	Found traditional methods rigid; preferred MI-based methods for interaction	Found traditional methods less engaging; preferred MI-based methods for visualization

Comparison with Traditional Instruction

A consistent theme among participants was their perception that traditional teaching methods were less engaging and less effective than MI-based instruction. Learners described traditional instruction as monotonous and rigid, offering a one-size-fits-all approach that did not account for individual learning preferences. In contrast, MI-based instruction was perceived as more dynamic, personalized, and conducive to active participation.

One participant summarized this contrast effectively:

- *"In traditional methods, we were expected to learn the same way. But MI-based instruction showed that everyone learns differently, and teachers should consider these differences."*

Overall, the findings suggest that MI-based instruction offers a more engaging and effective alternative to traditional language teaching methods, particularly in teaching pragmatic

language skills such as politeness markers. These insights reinforce the necessity of adapting instructional strategies to accommodate learners' diverse intelligences and preferences.

Discussion

This study examined the participants' perceptions of their learning style and the MI-based instructions of politeness markers' comprehension and production. Considering the interview and questionnaire data collected from intermediate EFL learners in a private language institute, the researcher identified common themes among the participants. Our findings showed that, despite the fact that the majority of participants were unaware of their dominant intelligences, they favored learning styles that were strongly connected with those intelligences. In addition, all of the participants were unanimous in voicing the need to include learning activities in their educational programs that correspond to their learning styles. They contended that the inclusion of these kinds of activities would facilitate and amuse the learning process, and thus meaningful learning would take place. Primarily, as our findings show, learners are dependent on certain aspects of FL, such as English language teaching materials and methodologies. However, Lee (2013) contends that although teachers' opinions on the choice of course books have been extensively taken into account, learners' voices have not been sufficiently represented, which has brought forth part of learners' dissatisfaction with the learning courses.

Weimer asserted that the key to the realization of learner-centered approaches is to "motivate and empower learners by giving them some control over learning processes" (Weimer, 2013, 15). However, McGrath (2002) found that the requirements and preferences of learners are not adequately taken into consideration when evaluating and choosing materials. Moreover, McDonough et al. (2013) reported that despite growing interest in IDs, little research has been done to thoroughly analyze these differences or to put them into practice in practical situations, including instructional tactics, materials production, and selection. Our findings indicated that the participants favored those leaning activities that were related to their perceptual learning styles, which, as Lee puts it, "can be incorporated into ELT materials so that language input is presented to learners in their preferred form of sensory style such as visual, auditory, tactile, or kinesthetic, and in any preferred social mode, group or individual" (Lee, 2015, 2). To remove the mismatch between learning preferences and the curriculum/language objectives, we believe that learners' choices should be greatly valued. Drawing on their learning styles, learners can make comments on ELT materials which may influence their language proficiency. As a result, recognizing how learners learn best may help language teachers and curriculum developers create efficient teaching methods and educational resources. Similar to this, Dornyei asserted that "some sort of style harmony would be beneficial in many respects for teachers and learners alike" (Dornyei, 2005, 155).

Language acquisition is thought to be largely influenced by a wide range of learners' characteristics, including intelligence, aptitude, personality, motivation, learning style, and learning strategy (Dornyei, 2005; 2006; Lightbown & Spada, 2006; Skehan, 1991). In this study, we examined learners' perceptions of MI-based instruction of politeness markers. The results of content analysis revealed that all of the participants in the experimental groups have a positive attitude toward MI-based activities and teaching. They claimed that the utilization of MI-based activities in this course matched their preferred learning styles, so the learning

process was engaging and simple for them. In a similar vein, Denig argued that "some of these methods by which people who are strong in a multiple intelligence learn best are suggestive of the various learning styles, by which learners process new and difficult information" (Denig, 2004, 107).

Drawing on our findings, it was also acknowledged that MI-based instruction, in contrast to traditional teaching methods, offered changes that were not monotonous and prompted the learners to actively engage in the course. Despite the paucity of studies in this area, the literature review revealed that theories of MI and learning styles are useful in trying to identify IDs and delivering appropriate educational programs. Both theories emphasize learner-centeredness, learners' reflective and active roles, the provision of real-world situations, and interacting with other disciplines in the context of teaching and learning. They both agree that it is necessary to modify traditional instructions in order to account for IDs. In contrast to traditional instruction, where a standard curriculum has been emphasized, they suggest a thorough approach to teaching and learning that is concentrated, in-depth, and of the highest quality (Dunn et al., 2001; Guild, 1997; Silver et al., 1997). More specifically, as Armstrong (2009) argues MI theory goes beyond the standards of traditional teaching by:

> Placing self-smart and people smart front and center; helping both learners and teachers envision the broad spectrum of possibilities available in developing a personalized project; helping teachers integrate personalized learner-driven activities and projects into the traditional curriculum; providing a way to contextualize the learning that unfolds during learner-directed projects (Armstrong, 2009, 165-167).

One of the implications of this study is that IDs and specifically learners' voices should not be neglected by curriculum developers and language teachers, especially in the teaching of pragmatic competence. As noted before, by capitalizing on MI-based instruction, teachers can come up with brain-friendly strategies to help their learners participate actively and push the boundaries of pragmatic learning more effectively. For Gardner (2006), "an individual-centered education is not one that is self-centered or narcissistic" (p. 56). It is an educational approach that, in contrast, places a high priority on individual variety. Language professionals make an attempt to understand as much as they can about each learner's preferred methods of learning and abilities. They make use of this information to provide each learner with the best education possible. Our findings indicated that one way to obtain information about learners' preferences is to ask themselves and apply it in course design and activities.

Gardner (2006) believes that curriculum developers should connect learners with their courses. The broker should recommend electives that would match the learner's intellectual profile when such options are available. When there is a required curriculum, the broker should help the learner identify the most effective presentation of the material. History and math, for example, are subjects that everyone should learn, but they don't have to be taught and evaluated in the same way to all learners. Similar our findings, Ghanizadeh and Jahedizadeh (2015) reported that learners' views of classroom activities demonstrated that these perceptions specify learners' goal orientations, which impact their conception of their learning environment. When learners perceive the tasks they are given in class as interesting, challenging, and fun, they are more likely to adopt a mastery goal orientation, which means

that they want to learn a foreign language to expand their knowledge, not to get good grades or avoid being perceived as incompetent in comparison to other learners.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study highlights the importance of personalized instruction and the integration of Multiple Intelligences (MI) theory in language learning contexts. The findings emphasize the value of aligning instructional strategies with learners' dominant intelligences, as evidenced by participants' strong preferences for activities that resonate with their cognitive strengths. Moreover, the positive perception of MI-based instruction underscores its potential to enhance learner engagement and motivation.

Moving forward, several suggestions for further research emerge from this study. Firstly, longitudinal studies could explore the long-term effects of MI-based instruction on language proficiency and learner attitudes. Additionally, comparative studies could investigate the effectiveness of MI-based approaches across different language proficiency levels and learner demographics. Furthermore, qualitative studies could delve deeper into the specific ways in which MI-based instruction influences learner motivation, engagement, and learning outcomes.

However, this study is not without limitations. Firstly, the sample size was relatively small and limited to intermediate EFL learners from a specific demographic, which may affect the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the study relied solely on self-reported data from participants, which may be subject to bias or social desirability effects. Despite these limitations, this study provides valuable insights into the potential of MI-based instruction to enhance learner engagement and motivation in language learning contexts. By addressing these limitations and building upon the findings of this study, future research can further elucidate the role of MI theory in optimizing language instruction and curriculum development.

References

Armstrong, T. (2009). *Multiple intelligences in the classroom*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. https://www.amazon.com/Multiple-Intelligences-Classroom-Thomas-Armstrong/dp/1416607897

Aydin, H. (2019). The effect of multiple intelligence(s) on academic success: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 15(12), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/109008

Bas, G., & Beyhan, O. (2010). Effects of multiple intelligences supported project-based learning on learners' achievement levels and attitudes towards English lesson. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 2*(3), 365-386. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1052017.pdf

Berger, R. (2013). Deeper learning: Highlighting learner work. *Edutopia*. Retrieved from https://www.edutopia.org/blog/deeper-learning-learner-work-ron-berger

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education. https://www.amazon.com/Principles-Language-Learning-Teaching-5th/dp/0131991280

Denig, S. J. (2004). Multiple intelligences and learning styles: Two complementary dimensions. *Teachers College Record*, 106(1), 96-111. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146810410600111

Dolati, Z., & Tahriri, A. (2017). EFL teachers' multiple intelligences and their classroom practice., 7(3), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017722582

Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum. https://www.amazon.com/Psychology-Language-Learner-Differences-Acquisition/dp/0805860185

Dornyei, Z. (2006). Individual differences in second language acquisition. *AILA Review*, 19(1), 42–68. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.19.05dor

Dunn, R., Denig, S., & Lovelace, M. K. (2001). Multiple intelligences and learning styles: Two sides of the same coin or different strokes for different folks? *Teacher Librarian: The Journal for School Library Professionals*, 28(3), 9-15. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ628274

Faidah, R. T., Fauziati, E., & Suparno. (2019). Exploring The Influencing Factors of Teachers' Beliefs Toward the Use of Multiple Intelligences Based English Teaching. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 6(6) 137-150. https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.66.6653

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Basic Books. https://books.google.com/books?id=52RbQgAACAAJ

Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory and practice*. Basic Books. https://books.google.com/books?id=52RbQgAACAAJ

Gardner, H. (2006). *Multiple intelligences: New horizons in theory and practice*. Basic Books. https://www.amazon.com/Multiple-Intelligences-New-Horizons-Practice/dp/0465047688

Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2015). EFL teachers' teaching style, creativity, and burnout: A path analysis approach. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1151997

Guild, P. (1997). Where do learning theories overlap? *Educational Leadership, 9*, 30–32. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465431455849

Haley, M. (2001). Understanding learner-centered instruction from the perspective of multiple intelligences. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(4), 355-367. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2001.tb02068.x

Kennedy-Murray, L., N. (2016). *Teachers' perceptions and practices of multiple intelligences theory in middle schools* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Walden University. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/2071

Lee, B. K. (2013). Korean EFL learners' perspectives on ELT materials evaluation criteria. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 19(4), 55–78. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2001.tb02068.x

Lee, B. (2015). EFL learners' perspectives on ELT materials evaluation relative to learning styles. *RELC Journal*, 46(2), 147-163. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214564177

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages Are Learned. 3rd Ed*. Oxford University Press. https://elt.oup.com/catalogue/items/global/teacher_development/oxford_handbooks_for_language_teachers/9780194541268

Lotfi-Khajouei, M., Baharlooei, R., Salehi, H., & Tabatabaei, O. (2021). Iranian EFL Learners' Perceptions of Using Multiple Intelligence-Based Activities (MIBAs) to Improve Oral-Aural Skills. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 9(38), 215-236. https://doi.org/10.52547/JFL.9.38.215

McDonough, J., Shaw, C., Masuhara, H. (2013). *Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide. 3rd Ed.* Blackwell Publishing. https://www.amazon.com/Materials-Methods-ELT-Teachers-Guide/dp/1444336924

McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials Evaluation and Design for Language Teaching*. Edinburgh University Press. https://edinburghuniversitypress.com/book-materials-evaluation-and-design-for-language-teaching.html

McKenzie, W. (1999). *Multiple intelligences survey*. *Surfaquarium*. http://surfaquarium.com /MI/MIinvent.htm

Putri, L. A., Deviyanti, R., & Suningsih, S. (2021). Teacher's perception of multiple intelligence based on English teaching for young learners. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research,* 628, 368-369. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220102.047

Reed, J. (2007, September). Learning with IB. *IB World*. Available: http://www.ibo.org/ ibworld/sept07/

Silver, H., Strong, R., & Perini, M. (1997). Integrating learning styles and multiple intelligences. *Educational Leadership,* 55, 22–29. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/integrating-learning-styles-and-multiple-intelligences

Skehan, P. (1991). Individual differences in second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 13(2), 275–98. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100009979

Weimer, M. (2013). *Learner-centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice,* 2nd ed. Jossey-Bass. https://www.amazon.com/Learner-Centered-Teaching-Five-Changes-Practice/dp/1118119282

Yaumi, M., Sirate, S. F. S., & Patak, A. A. (2018). Investigating multiple intelligence-based instructions approach on performance improvement of Indonesian elementary madrasah teachers. *SAGE Open,* 8(4), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018809216

Zainudin, E. F. (2012). Malaysian teachers' and learners' perceptions of learners' multiple intelligence profiles in Malaysian secondary schools. [Unpublished MA Thesis]. The University of Birmingham. https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/3735/2/Zainudin12MPhil.pdf