



The Profile of Students' English Linguistic Intelligence: A Case Study at SMP Islam De Green Camp Tanjungpinang

¹Lisa Anriani, ²Dewi Nopita, ³Dewi Murni

¹English Language Education Study Program, Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji, Tanjungpinang, Indonesia

²English Language Education Study Program, Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji, Tanjungpinang, Indonesia

³English Language Education Study Program, Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji, Tanjungpinang, Indonesia

Corresponding email: lisaanriani36@gmail.com, dewinopita@umrah.ac.id, salimahzulfah@yahoo.com

Received August 23, 2021; Revised September 2, 2021; Published September 13, 2021

<https://doi.org/10.31629/juliet.v2i2.3620>

Abstract

This study aimed to describe how the profile of students' English linguistic intelligence of rhetoric at SMP Islam De Green Camp Tanjungpinang was. The subject in this research was the eighth-grade consisting of 21 female students. This study was based on Gardner's theory (1998). The research design in this study was descriptive qualitative research. The setting of place in this research was SMP Islam De Green Camp Tanjungpinang. The instruments in collecting the data were interviews and speaking tests. Based on the data obtained from the instruments used in this study, the researcher, then, analyzed the data, namely the result from the speaking test by using a rubric assessing the grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. The result showed that the total score was 61.9 and from the criteria of the rhetoric on speaking, the students' English linguistic intelligence of rhetoric at SMP Islam De Green Camp Tanjungpinang was good.

Keywords: English Linguistic Intelligence, Rhetoric, Rhetoric of Speaking

I INTRODUCTION

Intelligence is an individual difference influencing an individual ability. Intelligence could be interpreted as the ability to solve a problem. According to Gardner (1983), intelligence is divided into a dimension, it is known as Multiple Intelligences (MI). Later, he defines that humans have several bits of intelligence which are conceptualized as a personal characteristic. There are eight bits of intelligence on Gardner's theory, namely linguistic intelligence, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalist intelligence.

Linguistic intelligence that children have since birth need to be developed, especially in learning English. Along with the development of this era which increasingly spread the international world, it is not enough if students are only equipped with minimal language knowledge. Therefore, students' linguistic intelligences need to be developed so they could keep up with the time that was increasingly advanced at the International level. In learning English, each student has his or her characteristic when understanding the learning material. This is because English requires several skills such as writing, speaking, listening, and reading. Moreover, all of the skills desperately need an explanation, memory, the ability to convey something, and being able to study the language itself.

Based on the Ministry of Education and Culture (2017), learning English focused on improving students' competencies to be able to use the language in achieving communication goals in the various context in spoken. However, in term of English proficiency among Indonesians was still low. Indonesia was ranked 74th out of 100 Countries in the world in 2019 (English First-English Proficiency Index, 2020). Therefore, from the low-level English proficiency, Indonesians who had poor performance in reading, speaking, listening, and writing, while these skills are a must-have ability to encourage linguistic intelligence. Linguistic intelligence is needed in learning activities so that students could carry out the learning activities well.

Linguistic intelligence is a significant part of a person's life. Everyone have different level of intelligence. Linguistic intelligence plays an important role in the effectiveness of language learning (Erlina et al., 2019). Linguistic intelligence refers to composing and be competently express thoughts. Fortuna (2019) conducted a research entitled "Student Linguistic Intelligence and English Mastery at Eighth – Grade Students of State Islamic Junior High School 1 Gambut". The conclusion of her research was the student linguistic intelligence in Islamic junior high school was fair. Moreover, her research showed that the test scores of students' mastery of English in grade VIII were quite good.

Moreover, Pradana (2018) did a research entitled "English Learning Based on Multiple Intelligence in Type of Linguistic Intelligence". This research used a descriptive study that aimed to describe the application of English language learning based on Multiple Intelligence's theory on the type of linguistic intelligence. The result of this study was overall students showed a positive response in learning activities, many students liked English subjects and active in the learning process.

Vincey (2016) had a research entitled "A Study of Linguistic Intelligence and Academic Achievement of Students". The conclusion of this research was there was no difference between female and male students at the level of linguistic intelligence. Based on the reality that the researcher found when doing teaching practice as teacher training at SMP Islam De Green Camp Tanjungpinang, students were very enthusiastic when participating in learning. Even though, currently the learning process was still online and offline because of Covid-19, the researcher could see that students were very excited. This could be proven by the presence of students in the online class, filling the absence on time, and active during the teaching and learning process.

After that, based on previous study, the difference between those researches and this research was this study focuses on the profile of Students' English Linguistic Intelligence at SMP Islam De Green Camp Tanjungpinang. While the previous study such as from Fortuna (2019) only focused on students' linguistic intelligence, not on English linguistic intelligence. The second study was conducted from Pradana (2018) that only focused on English learning in the type of linguistic intelligence but did not specifically mention the linguistic indicators. The last study was conducted by Vincey (2016) that only focused on Linguistic intelligence and Students' Academic Achievement. The last one was from Rahmawati et al. (2020) this research

only focused on the Multiple Intelligence profile of EFL Learners. Based on the explanation above, the purpose of this research was to describe students' English linguistic intelligence of rhetoric at the level of lower secondary education school.

II METHOD

In this study, the researcher used descriptive qualitative research. Descriptive qualitative is a research method that requires an explanation in the form of written words. The descriptive qualitative method describes and elaborates various information (Sugiyono, 2010). In this research, the researcher collected the data by asking the students with some questions. While the students were answering the researcher's question, the researcher recorded the students' answers. After the interview, the researcher gave the students a speaking test. Similar with the interview before, the researcher recorded the student's answers.

Miles and Huberman (1994) speculates that the qualitative data analysis process began by examining all available data from various sources. In this research, the researcher used descriptive qualitative analysis which was taken by the proportion of the number of questions done and divided by the total number of questions. According to Brown (2001), there are five important parts to see students' speaking skill such as grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, comprehension and, fluency. Their speaking ability was measured by five components having criteria 1-5 with different scores from the lowest to the highest.

The setting of this research conducted at SMP Islam De Green Camp which was located at Jl. Taman Siswa Number 1 Tanjungpinang. The research subject in this research was the eighth grade of Junior High School at SMP Islam De Green Camp academic year 2020-2021 which consisted of 21 female students.

III RESULT

The result of this study was students' English Linguistic intelligence of rhetoric was good based on the instruments. According to Brown (2001), there are five important parts to see students' speaking skill such as grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, comprehension and, fluency. Their speaking ability was measured by five components having criteria 1-5 with different scores from the lowest to the highest.

In this study, the researcher aimed to know student's speaking skill and their ideas in developing their speaking

4.1 Interview Result

Name	G	V	P	F	C	Total	Score	Categorize
S1	4	4	4	5	5	22	88	Excellent
S2	4	4	3	4	5	20	80	Good
S3	2	2	2	2	3	11	44	Average
S4	3	3	2	2	3	13	52	Average
S5	3	4	3	3	3	16	64	Good
S6	4	4	4	4	5	21	84	Excellent
S7	2	3	2	3	3	13	52	Average
S8	3	3	3	2	3	14	56	Average
S9	3	3	3	3	5	17	68	Good
S10	4	5	5	3	4	21	84	Excellent
S11	2	2	2	3	5	14	56	Average
S12	2	2	2	2	3	11	44	Average
S13	3	2	2	3	3	13	52	Average
S14	3	3	2	2	3	13	52	Average
S15	2	2	2	2	3	11	44	Average
S16	3	3	3	3	4	16	64	Good
S17	2	2	2	2	3	11	44	Average
S18	3	3	2	2	3	13	52	Average
S19	3	3	3	2	3	14	56	Average
S20	2	2	2	2	3	11	44	Average
S21	3	4	3	3	5	18	72	Good
Total							1252	-
Mean score							59.61	Average

Name	G	V	P	F	C	Total	Score	Categorize
S1	5	4	4	5	5	23	92	Excellent
S2	5	4	4	4	5	22	88	Excellent
S3	3	3	3	2	3	14	56	Average
S4	3	3	3	2	3	14	56	Average
S5	4	4	3	3	4	18	72	Good
S6	4	4	3	4	5	20	80	Good
S7	3	3	2	3	3	14	56	Average
S8	3	3	3	2	3	14	56	Average
S9	3	3	3	2	3	14	56	Average
S10	5	5	5	4	4	23	92	Excellent
S11	3	3	2	3	3	14	56	Average
S12	3	3	2	2	3	13	52	Average
S13	3	3	2	3	3	14	56	Average
S14	3	3	2	2	3	13	52	Average
S15	3	3	2	2	3	13	52	Average
S16	4	3	3	3	4	17	68	Good
S17	3	3	2	2	3	13	52	Average
S18	4	3	3	3	4	17	68	Good
S19	4	4	3	3	4	18	72	Good

4.2 Speaking Test Result

S20	3	3	2	2	3	13	52	Average
S21	3	3	3	3	4	16	64	Average
Total							1348	-
Mean score							64.19	Good

$$\text{Score} = \frac{\text{The Total of the score}}{\text{Total Instrument}} \times 100$$

Table 4.3 Criteria Score (Sugiyono, 2012)

Criteria	Score
Excellent	81 - 100
Good	61 - 80
Average	41 - 60
Poor	21 - 40
Inadequate	0 - 20

$$\text{score} = \frac{123.8}{2} \times 100 = 61.9$$

123.8 = Total of score

2 = Total instrument

100 = Average

61.9 = The result of the data analysis

1. Grammar

Grammar means the rules that shows how words are combined, changed or, arranged to indicate a certain meaning. Based on the interview, the researcher found that students have different scores in grammar. There were good, average, and poor. Students with good scores sometimes made grammatical mistake but it did not affect meaning. The example was “I will be a good listener, try to give her a good solution and if I ever have in the same problem or experience, I will share my experiences to her”. The meaning of this sentence was correct and people still could understand what the meaning was, but there was still a grammatical error.

2. Vocabulary

Vocabulary means a set or combination of words used in communication with others. In this research, the researcher found that students had good, average, and poor scores. Based on the interview, students with good scores sometimes using imprecise vocabulary. The researcher found that sometimes students still used imprecise words. The example was “I much do like listening conversation in English language or listening someone speech with the English language and I have an application, the name is U-Dictionary so I try to speak in English and the Application will correct it”. In this sentence, there was still an incorrect word like the use of “much”. Students could use a lot of, became “I do a lot of listening conversation in English language or listening someone speech with the English language and I have an application, the name is U-Dictionary so I try to speak in English and the Application will correct it”.

3. Pronunciation

Pronunciation is the basis for communication in English. Pronunciation can be described as how to produce a word. In this research, the student said some words and had some results such as excellent, good, average, and poor. For excellent scores, the student could speak like native pronunciation, with no trace of foreign accent. An example was when the student said “breath”. The student was able to pronounce it very well.

4. Fluency

Fluency meant the students could speak the word fluently. Based on the interview, the researcher found that only 1 student could speak fluently and got an excellent score. Other students got good, average, and poor scores. Students with excellent scores spoke smoothly like a native speaker and no repetition here.

5. Comprehension

Comprehension means the ability to understand, to know, or get the speaker’s point. In this research, the researcher found that some students could understand the researcher’s point and some of them could not. Based on in, the researcher had given scores such as excellent, good, average, and poor. For the student who got an excellent score, they could understand everything in English and respond to it immediately. The example was when the researcher asked a question, the student’s response was very fast and with the correct sentence.

IV DISCUSSION

1. Grammar

Pernanda (2009) reveals that grammar is the rule that had meaningful parts of a language to communicate and convey the message that could be understood. The grammar contains set of logical and structural rules that govern the composition of sentences, phrases, and so on. In this study, after completing all of the data, the researcher found that student's grammar at Eighth grade of SMP Islam De Green Camp is good. Students could arrange the sentence but sometimes occurred the grammar mistakes that affected the meaning.

Moreover, using grammar make people see the true meaning of the sentence (Hornby, 1995). The students must learn more about the structure of grammar. Having a good grammar make the student easy to convey their thought. Furthermore, the student could speak structurally based on their knowledge.

2. Vocabulary

Vocabulary is all the words in a particular language that a person knows or uses to communicate effectively. Dash (2013) states that vocabulary involved word meaning and guessing the meaning of unknown word structure and context. In the learning process, teachers ensure that the students could be understood when they wanted to speak. Pronunciation refers to the ability to produce easy-to-understand articulations

Furthermore, vocabulary is one of the important aspects of speaking skill. However, based on the result that the researcher found, the student's vocabulary was good. It meant that sometimes they chose imprecise vocabulary, the conversation became limited. Students were a little difficult to elaborate their sentences.

3. Pronunciation

According to Hornby (2008) states pronunciation is the way people made the sound of a word that is very important to learn. Pronunciation is the way of produce the word. In the learning process, teachers ensure that the students could be understood when they want to speak.

Pronunciation refers to the ability to produce easy-to-understand articulations. In this study, the researcher found that student's pronunciation was good. It meant that the pronunciation was easy to understand even with a certain accent but the researcher must concentrate to listen to what the student meant to avoid misunderstanding meanings competency and the score was 4 that means of this indicator was achieved.

4. Fluency

In the fluency aspect, Harris (1987) reveals that fluency refers to the smoothness of flow in which sound, word, sentence, and so on are joined together when speaking. Fluency combines sounds, syllables, phrases, and so on.

Based on it, the researcher found that student's fluency at eighth grade of SMP Islam De Green Camp was good. It meant that when student conveyed their thought, speech was occasionally hesitantly caused by rephrasing and grouping of words the sentence. Moreover, sometimes the student's sentence was uncompleted. This made an effect on vagueness during speaking such as "aaa", "eee" "mmm" and so on.

5. Comprehension

Comprehension is when students could understand the meaning conveyed by others. In the comprehension aspect, Pernanda (2009) states that comprehension is students' competency

to understand all of the speakers say to them. Moreover, according to Heaton (1991) comprehension is the ability to understand the speakers' intention and general meaning.

Comprehensibility focus on student's response to other. In fact, the researcher found the students were still difficult to understand what the researcher meant. This gave an impact on what they answered in the interview and the speaking test. Based on it, the student's comprehension was good. It meant that students understood almost everything, although there was repetition in a certain part.

In short, based on the result of students' English linguistic intelligence of rhetoric on speaking at SMP Islam De Green Camp based on all the aspects above was good.

V CONCLUSION

Based on the result of findings and discussion about students' English linguistic intelligence of rhetoric at SMP Islam De Green Camp Tanjungpinang, it could be concluded that the students' English linguistic intelligence of rhetoric was good based on five aspects of speaking such as grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, comprehension and fluency. It meant that the students had to study more to develop their rhetoric on speaking. Moreover, for other researchers could conduct a study about students' English linguistic intelligence on rhetoric, and also add more explanation in speaking skill that could make the students gain more success in learning English.

REFERENCES

- Brown. (2001). In *Teaching by Principles An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*: Longman.
- Dash. (2013). *Language skills: A Study of Improving English Speaking Skill Through English Reading Skills*. India: Collage of Engineering and Technology.
- Effendi, A. (2005). *Revolusi Kecerdasan Abad-21*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Erlina, D., Marzulina, L., Astrid, A., Desvitasari, D., Sapriati, R. S., Amrina, R. D., Mukminin, A., & Habibi, A. (2019). *Linguistic intelligence of undergraduate EFL learners in higher education: A case study*. Universal Journal of Educational Research,
- Fortuna, K. S. D. D. (2019). *Students' Written Linguistic Intelligence And English Mastery At Eighth Grade Students Of State Islamic Junior High School 1 Gambut*.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Howar d Frames of Mind*. New york: Longman.
- Hardani, S.Pd., M. S., Nur Hikmatul Auliya, G. C. B., Helmina Andriani, M. S., Roushandy Asri Fardani, S.Si., M. P., Jumari Ustiawaty, S.Si., M. S., Evi Fatmi Utami, M.Farm., A., Dhika Juliana Sukmana, S.Si., M. S., & Ria Rahmatul Istiqomah, M. I. K. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif & Kuantitatif*. In *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* (Vol. 53, Issue 9).
- Harris. (1987). *Testing English as Second Language*. New York: Longman.
- Heaton. (1991). *Writing English Language Testing*. New York: Longman.
- Hornby. (1995). *Definition of Speaking Skill*. New York: Longman.
- Hornby. (2008). *Oxford Advanced Learner Dictionary*. New York: Longman.
- Miles and Huberman. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis (Terjemahan)*. United States America: Sage Publication.
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia*. (2017). Jakarta.

- Pernanda. (2009). *The Effectiveness of Group Work Technique In Increasing the Second Year Students of SMPN 1 Muara Lembu*. UIN Suksa Riau.
- Pradana, A. B. A. (2018). English Learning Based on Multiple Intelligence in Type of Linguistic Intelligence. *Didaktika Tauhidi: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, 5(1), 41.
- Sugiyono, & Republik Indonesia. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif & kualitatif*. In *Journal of Experimental Psychology*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif & kualitatif*. In *Journal of Experimental Psychology*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Vincey. (2016). *A study of linguistic intellgence and academic acheivement*. 3(4), 78–84.