Hien Thanh

By qnujs

Hồ sơ Đa trí tuệ của sinh viên năm nhất không chuyên ngữ tại Trường Đại học Quy Nhơn

TÓM TẮT

Thuyết Đa trí tuệ của Howard Gardner đã khẳng định mỗi người đều sở hữu một vài kiểu trí tuệ riêng biệt. Dựa trên khung lý thuyết này, nghiên cứu tiến hành khảo sát hồ sơ Đa trí tuệ của 203 sinh viên năm nhất không chuyên ngữ tại Trường Đại học Quy Nhơn trong năm học 2024-2025. Dữ liệu được thu thập thông qua bảng hỏi theo thang đo Likert 5 mức và được phân tích bằng thống kê mô tả và kiểm định *t* cho hai mẫu độc lập. Kết quả cho thấy cả tám loại hình trí tuệ đều hiện diện ở sinh viên tham gia khảo sát. Trí tuệ Nội tâm, trí tuệ Không gian - thị giác và trí tuệ Vận động - cơ thể là những loại hình nổi trội nhất, trong khi trí tuệ Ngôn ngữ và trí tuệ Logic- toán học có mức độ thể hiện thấp nhất. Nghiên cứu cũng chỉ ra sự khác biệt về giới tính ở các loại hình trí tuệ Ngôn ngữ, Âm nhạc và Nội tâm, tuy nhiên yếu tố độ tuổi không tạo ra sự khác biệt. Những kết quả này nhấn mạnh giá trị sư phạm của việc tích hợp hồ sơ đa trí tuệ cá nhân của người học vào hoạt động giảng dạy trên lớp, đồng thời ủng hộ việc vận dụng lý thuyết Đa trí tuệ như một khung lý thuyết nhằm nâng cao hiệu quả dạy và học ở bậc giáo dục đại học.

Từ khóa: *Thuyết Đa trí tuệ, hồ sơ Đa trí tuệ, sinh viên năm nhất*

Multiple intelligences profiles of first-year non-English majors at Quy Nhon University

ABSTRACT

Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligences (MI) theory posits that individuals possess distinct profiles of intellectual strengths. Building on this framework, this study investigates the MI profiles of 203 first-year non-English majors at Quy Nhon University during the academic year 2024-2025. Data were collected using a five-point Likert scale MI questionnaire and analyzed via descriptive statistics and independent samples t-tests. The findings indicated that all eight intelligence types were represented among students. The most dominant intelligences were Intrapersonal, Visual/Spatial, and Bodily-Kinesthetic, while Verbal/Linguistic and Logical-Mathematical intelligences were the least prominent. Gender differences were observed in Verbal/Linguistic, Musical, and Intrapersonal domains, but no significant differences were found regarding age. The findings underscore the pedagogical value of incorporating learners' individual MI profiles into classroom instructions and support the application of MI theory as a framework for enhancing teaching and learning in higher education.

Keywords: *Multiple Intelligences Theory, Multiple Intelligences (MI) Profiles, first-year students*

1. INTRODUCTION

The field of English Language Teaching (ELT) has witnessed a profound transition from teacher-centered approaches to student-centered pedagogies recently. While the former prioritized content delivery and the teacher's instructions, the latter emphasizes addressing the unique needs and learning styles of individual learners. As a result of this shift in teaching and learning paradigms, the concept of individual differentiation has emerged as a novel topic of discussion in ELT.

Various categorizations have been proposed to highlight the prominence of different types of intelligence in different individuals, among which is the Theory of Multiple Intelligences (MI) by Howard Gardner. First introduced in 1983, Gardner[1] proposed that there are several independent ability areas, and individual differences reflect multiple intelligences of human beings. In other words, everyone possesses a unique intelligence profile that distinguishes them from others. Moreover, what the Multiple Intelligences theory offers is not only significant from a theoretical perspective, but it also has important practical implications for teaching practice in language teaching.

Leveraging MI Theory principles allows educators to provide personalized instruction. By identifying students' strong and weak intelligences, they can individualize the learning process to activate less developed domains[2]. Some researchers such as Altan[3] and Christison[4] indicated in their studies that Gardner's theory offered a wide variety of practical applications to teachers and educators so that they can improve language classroom practices and match intellectual profiles with educational opportunities.

Concerning the education context in Vietnam, the application of Multiple Intelligences theory in ELT has received increasing attention from educators and researchers recently. Do[5] conducted research aiming to investigate the effect of using an MI-based training program on developing English-speaking skills for university students. In Hanh and Tien's[6] study, the researchers discovered the correlation between

students' multiple intelligences and their vocabulary learning strategy use and concluded that different intelligences correlated with different types of vocabulary learning strategy use.

Previous studies have primarily focused on the application of the Multiple Intelligences theory within the ELT field locally and internationally; however, they only investigated its relationship with language skills and other language areas, with little attention paid to EFL learners' profiles at the tertiary level. Hence, there is a limited body

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. The Multiple Intelligences Theory by Howard Gardner

IQ (Intelligence Quotient) has long been used as a standard measure to assess a person's intellectual ability. However, the introduction of Multiple Intelligences Theory challenges the notion that IQ scores are the only way to measure human ability to reason and solve problems. When Gardner published the book entitled *"Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences"* in 1983, he argued that humans possess several distinct intelligences beyond verbal and logical abilities, which manifest in various skills and abilities. Gardner initially proposed seven profiles, namely Verbal/Linguistic, Logical-Mathematical, Visual/Spatial, Bodily-Kinesthetic, Musical, Interpersonal and Intrapersonal, and later he added Naturalistic intelligence. He also suggested an Existential intelligence might exist but dismissed the hypothesis of a Spiritual intelligence. Considering MI theory, the IQ test, therefore, only measures Verbal/Linguistic and Logical-Mathematical intelligence.[7] To validate his theory, Gardner[8] claims that human cognitive competence is better described in terms of a set of abilities, talents, or mental skills which is referred

of research in the Vietnam context that specifically examines the distribution of multiple intelligences among tertiary students in the context of English language learning. Understanding the distribution of students' MI profiles is crucial as it can inform instructional practices and curriculum development, allowing educators to create more effective and engaging learning experiences for their students. Therefore, this study aims to explore and describe in detail the MI profiles of non-English major EFL learners at a tertiary institution in Vietnam. to as intelligence. All normal individuals possess each of the skills to some extent; however, individuals differ in the degree of skill and their combinations.

Specifically, Gardner[9] carefully defines the theory by providing explanations of the eight "intelligence" profiles, as mentioned earlier, and the learning skills associated with them.

2.1.1. *Verbal/Linguistic Intelligence*

This intelligence explains the ability to use words and language skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking. People who possess this type of intelligence are generally good at writing and oration. In learning, this person enjoys reading, writing, speaking, as well as poetry and playing word games.

2.1.2. *Logical-Mathematical Intelligence*

Individuals with highly developed logical-mathematical thinking tend to explore patterns and their relationships, besides conducting experiments for their understanding. These individuals also like to estimate or predict, ask questions and enjoy well-ordered tasks. The logical-mathematical student typically likes puzzles, mysteries, and problem-solving activities.

2.1.3. *Visual/Spatial Intelligence*

Individuals with this intelligence have the wisdom to create internal images and pictures in their minds and tend to like designing things. In the classroom, these individuals might enjoy learning by watching videos, drawing and doodling, and navigating and understanding graphical presentations.

2.1.4. Musical Intelligence

Musical Intelligence refers to the ability to recognize tonal patterns and sounds. They are people who have high sensitivity to rhythm, pitch, beats and stress patterns in a melody. Students with high levels of musical intelligence may be fond of melodies and harmonies and may compose music and stand out in playing a musical instrument or in writing music and lyrics

2.1.5. Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence

This intelligence refers to the capacity to use one's own body skillfully as a means of expression or to work with one's body to create or manipulate objects. In terms of the learning activity, they are students who prefer hands-on learning and physical activities as their study style.

2.1.6. Interpersonal Intelligence

Individuals who are highly developed in this intelligence have many friends and enjoy engaging in social activities. They generally have a genuine empathy for the feelings of others and may be good leaders. These individuals' learning style is through participating and sharing in a cooperative team environment.

2.1.7. Intrapersonal Intelligence

This intelligence relates to self-awareness. A person with high intrapersonal intelligence is in touch with their own feelings and may value solitude. A highly developed intrapersonal individual has a creative and reflective mind and responds to strong opinions and controversial issues diligently. In the classroom, these individuals are those who learn by undertaking independent study projects and self-reflection.

2.1.8. Naturalistic Intelligence

This intelligence involves the ability to be in touch with nature and the outdoors. It is endowed in individuals who reflect a tendency to sense natural patterns and who are good at finding relationships between living organisms. These individuals learn by studying natural phenomena and how things work.

2.2. Applications of MI theory in ELT

As mentioned in the previous part, the implementation of MI theory could be seen in some aspects of ELT such as teaching practices and curriculum design. Chen, Moran, and Gardner[10] support this view by asserting that MI Theory can serve as a valuable tool for expanding the scope of education by incorporating subjects that address diverse intelligences and modes of thinking, as well as teaching techniques that cater to individual differences, and assessments that move beyond conventional language-and-logic-based instruments.

Concerning teaching practices, Haley[11] conducted a study aiming to analyze applications of MI Theory to create and update teaching practices and instructional strategies. The findings revealed that there was a significant change in terms of pedagogy, teaching, students' and teachers' attitudes, classroom and instruction. Specifically, the application of MI Theory promoted learner-centeredness, student involvement and interest in the lessons and teacher eagerness in teaching. In the same vein, Kong[12] also reported the positive outcomes of applying MI Theory in ELT. He claimed that MI Theory allows English language teachers to recognize that students bring their distinct

strengths and learning potentials with them, and they should teach in multiple ways to cater to the needs of different students.

With a view to curriculum design, MI theory has been incorporated into the curriculum at different levels, ranging from kindergarten to tertiary levels (Botelho[13]; Snider[14]). Weiner[15] also claims that many educational institutions began to center curricula on the theory of MI after its introduction in 1983. Recently, in a study carried out at the kindergarten level, Murad et al.[16] evaluated the effectiveness of an educational program based on MI theory in enhancing communication skills and learning retention in kindergarten children. The findings revealed that the suggested educational program was effective in improving communication skills and learning retention.

2.3. Previous related studies on EFL learners' MI profiles

Research on students' MI profiles has attracted the attention of educators and researchers to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Emmiyati et al.[17] identified the Multiple Intelligences profiles of junior secondary school students in Indonesia, using the Multiple Intelligences Inventory. The findings revealed the presence of all nine intelligence domains among students. Differences in MI profiles were found between male and female groups, regarding Logical-Mathematical, Bodily-Kinesthetic, Musical, Interpersonal, Intrapersonal and Existential domains.

A descriptive quantitative study conducted by Tawalbeh[18] aimed to investigate EFL learners' MI profiles in the Saudi Arab context, and to

3. METHODOLOGY

provide suggestions for EFL instructors to integrate MI in their lesson plans for instructional use in the classroom. From the findings, it is suggested that students do not tend to have interests in Musical and Naturalistic intelligences. The researcher also synthesized literature and suggested several techniques and activities to help instructors integrate MI into their plans.

Abdelkarim[19] investigated the differences in MI profiles among students at a university in Oman according to gender and the field of specialization and explored the possible application of MI theory to students' choice for their university program. The results indicated that Intrapersonal intelligence ranked first among MI domains and MI profiles of students from certain specializations aligned with the MI profiles required by their specialization.

In Vietnam's education context, Phan[20] studied the MI profiles of EFL students at a Vietnamese university. The researcher also analyzed MI manifested in activities in the *Life* textbook currently used in English courses for university students to determine how well they align with the students' profiles. The findings revealed a mismatch between the informants' MI profiles and the MI intelligences manifested in the textbook. The study found that Intrapersonal intelligence was those informants' strongest intelligence, followed by Logical-mathematical and Naturalistic intelligences. However, the *Life* textbook heavily focuses on Verbal/Linguistic intelligence, followed by Logical-mathematical and Intrapersonal intelligences.

3.1. Setting and participants

The research was conducted at Quy Nhon University, Vietnam, in the second semester of the academic year 2024 - 2025. As per the official curriculum for first-year students, all non-English majors are required to enroll in two English courses, namely English 1 and English 2. The language proficiency level input ranges from A1 to A2, and the expected outcome for students upon completion of the two courses is to reach a A2 - B1 level of English according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). In addition, for some majors, the English courses serve as a foundation to enter the English for Special Purposes courses in the next academic year.

Two hundred and three first-year non-English majors, selected from four English 2 classes under the instruction of the researcher in the second semester of the academic year 2024 - 2025, responded to the MI questionnaire. The respondents were selected for the two following reasons: (a) they had at least 5 to 10 years of studying English as a mandatory subject at primary and secondary education and passed the National Entrance Exam to get accepted to university; thus, they were expected to possess the similar language proficiency (b) the students had finished the course English 1 in the first semester of the academic year 2024 - 2025. Therefore, they were presumed to be familiar with the learning and teaching styles at Quy Nhon University.

Regarding gender distribution, the number of male students participating in the study was 77, accounting for 37.9%, whereas female students comprised 62.1% with 126 respondents. Most respondents were aged 18 - 20 (90.2%), while only 9.8% were between 21 and 23 years old. In terms of academic affiliation, students from the Faculty of Education accounted for the largest group (56.1%, N = 114), followed by the Department of Political Education and State Management (27.1%) and the Department of Information Technology (16.8%).

3.2. Data collection instrument

The instrument employed in the research was the MI questionnaire adapted from that of McKenzie[21] and Tirri and Nokelainen[22]. All the items were translated into Vietnamese to make the questionnaire more user-friendly. Part 1 included 3 items related to participants' background information, namely their gender, their age and their department/faculty at Quy Nhon University. Part 2, the adapted MI Inventory, contained 40 items including items representing eight intelligence types based on Gardner's MI theory. The respondents were asked to complete the survey by putting a check next to each statement that accurately described them. This was made possible through using a 5-Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5: "1 = Strongly Disagree", "2 = Disagree", "3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree", "4 = Agree", and "5 = Strongly Agree".

The statements were categorized into eight subparts, each part having 5 items. The following items in the questionnaire are categorized into the eight intelligences.

1. Verbal/Linguistic: Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
2. Logical/Mathematical: Items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
3. Visual/Spatial: Items 11, 12, 13, 14, 15
4. Bodily/Kinesthetic: Items 16, 17, 18, 19, 20

5.Music: Items 21, 22, 23, 24, 25

6.Interpersonal: Items 26, 27, 28, 29, 30

7. Intrapersonal: Items 31, 32, 33, 34, 35

8.Naturalistic: Items 36, 37, 38, 39, 40

3.3. Data analysis

Upon the completion of quantitative data collection, the data analysis process commenced. All students' responses were categorized, coded, and then analyzed quantitatively by the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) software Version 25. To determine the participants' different MI profiles, the researcher used the mean scores and the standard deviations obtained from their responses to the questionnaire

statements. The interval mean scores were interpreted as 1 - 1.80: Strongly Disagree; 1.82 - 2.60: Disagree; 2.61 - 3.40: Neutral; 3.41 - 4.20: Agree, and 4.21 - 5.00: Strongly Agree.

4. FINDINGS

4.1. Overview of MI profiles among first-year non-English majors at Quy Nhon University

The 40 items in the MI questionnaire were employed in the present study to identify students' MI profiles. After data analysis and interpretation, the findings are presented and discussed in the form of descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviations).

Table 1. Students' MI profiles.

MI Type	N	Min	Max	Mean	St. Deviation	% of M
Intrapersonal	203	2.00	5.00	4.22	.598	84
Visual/Spatial	203	2.00	5.00	4.01	.657	80.2
Bodily-Kinesthetic	203	1.60	5.00	3.89	.722	77.8
Musical	203	1.00	5.00	3.75	.718	75
Interpersonal	203	1.00	5.00	3.61	.732	72.2
Naturalistic	203	1.40	5.00	3.45	.903	69
Verbal/Linguistic	203	1.00	5.00	3.27	.735	65.4
Logical-Mathematical	203	1.60	5.00	3.06	.666	61.2

As can be seen from Table 1, the mean scores for the eight intelligence domains varied from 3.06 to 4.22, revealing that there is a relatively balanced presence of eight MI types among students. Particularly, Intrapersonal Intelligence emerges as the most popular MI profile, attaining the highest mean score (M = 4.22). Following closely

behind, Visual/Spatial Intelligence secures the second position among dominant intelligence types, with a mean score of 4.01. Ranking third, with a mean score of 3.89, is Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence, succeeded by Musical Intelligence and Interpersonal Intelligence, which attain mean scores of 3.75 and 3.61, respectively. Naturalistic

Intelligence takes the sixth position, obtaining a mean score of 3.45. On the other hand, Verbal/Linguistic and Logical-Mathematical Intelligence types are found to be the least dominant, having mean scores of 3.27 and 3.06, respectively.

Overall, the findings from Table 1 provide deeper insights into the MI profiles of the participating students. Intrapersonal Intelligence and Visual/Spatial Intelligence emerge as the highest-ranking intelligence types, whereas Logical-Mathematical Intelligence shows the lowest mean score.

4.2. Differences in multiple intelligences between male and female groups

The descriptive quantitative data highlighted the discrepancies in the distribution of Multiple Intelligence (MI) between the two gender groups. The results of data analysis and interpretation across eight intelligence domains are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Gender representation regarding students' MI profiles.

MI type	Gender	N	Mean	St. Deviation	T-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
Verbal/Linguistic	Male	77	3.10	.833	-2.62	.003
	Female	126	3.48	.650		
Logical-Mathematical	Male	77	3.59	.661	.597	.551
	Female	126	3.53	.671		
Visual/Spatial	Male	77	3.78	.642	-.463	.644
	Female	126	3.82	.668		
Musical	Male	77	3.55	.773	-3.105	.002
	Female	126	3.87	.658		
Bodily-kinesthetic	Male	77	3.76	.660	-.388	.698
	Female	126	3.80	.760		
Interpersonal	Male	77	3.63	.773	-1.302	.195
	Female	126	3.77	.704		

Intrapersonal	Male	77	3.88	.628	-2.461	.004
	Female	126	4.35	.567		
Naturalistic	Male	77	3.65	.887	.041	.968
	Female	126	3.64	.916		

The findings presented in Table 2 give an in-depth understanding of the gender disparities in eight distinct intelligences among male and female students. To explore any possible difference between students' MI profiles and their gender, an independent samples t-test was employed. In this analysis, the significance level (p-value) was set at 0.05 to determine whether there were statistically significant differences between the groups. A p-value of less than 0.05 indicates a significant difference between dependent variables and independent variables, while a p-value greater than 0.05 suggests no significant difference.

What stands out from the results is that female students exhibited higher levels of Linguistic Intelligence, Musical Intelligence, and Intrapersonal Intelligence in comparison to their male counterparts. As the p-value for all three intelligences was .003, .002, and .004 respectively, it can be interpreted that there was a significant divergence between students' MI profiles and their gender. However, the descriptive analysis did not reveal any statistically significant differences in mean scores between males and females for Logical-Mathematical Intelligence, Visual/Spatial Intelligence, Bodily-kinesthetic Intelligence, Interpersonal Intelligence, and Naturalistic Intelligence, as their p-values were all greater than 0.05 (Sig. = .551, .644, .698, .195, .968 respectively).

4.3. Differences in multiple intelligences between age groups

The descriptive quantitative data findings investigated the possible differences in the distribution of Multiple Intelligences (MI) between the two age groups. The results of data analysis and interpretation across eight intelligence domains are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Age representation regarding students' MI profiles.

MI type	Age	N	Mean	St. Deviation	T-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
Verbal/Linguistic	18 - 20	173	3.36	.719	-.351	.726

	Age	N	Mean	SD	t	p
	21 - 23	30	3.42	.836		
Logical-Mathematical	18 - 20	173	3.08	.659	1.321	.188
	21 - 23	30	2.91	.700		
Visual/Spatial	18 - 20	173	3.91	.641	.347	.729
	21 - 23	30	4.07	.755		
Musical	18 - 20	173	3.75	.733	.121	.904
	21 - 23	30	3.74	.639		
Bodily-Kinesthetic	18 - 20	173	3.89	.726	.006	.995
	21 - 23	30	3.89	.715		
Interpersonal	18 - 20	173	3.63	.726	.911	.363
	21 - 23	30	3.60	.769		
Intrapersonal	18 - 20	173	4.21	.579	-.328	.743
	21 - 23	30	4.35	.709		
Naturalistic	18 - 20	173	3.44	.917	-.057	.954
	21 - 23	30	3.46	.834		

Following the independent sample t-test for differences in students' MI profiles and their gender, a t-test was carried out to examine if there was any relationship between students' eight intelligence domains and their age. The age of the participants consists of two groups: 18 to 20 years old and 21 to 23 years old. As Table 3 shows, there is no statistically significant difference between the two age groups regarding their MI profiles. The p-values associated with the eight domains were all found to be greater than 0.05, indicating a lack of statistical significance. Particularly, the results for the different intelligence domains were as follows: Verbal/Linguistic Intelligence (t = -.351, p = .726), Logical-Mathematical Intelligence (t =

1.321, p =.188), Visual/Spatial Intelligence (t =.347, p = .729), Musical Intelligence (t = .121, p = .904), Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence (t = .006, p = .995), Interpersonal Intelligence (t = .911, p = .363), Intrapersonal Intelligence (t = -3.28, p = .743) and Naturalistic Intelligence (t = -.057, t = .954). Together, these results suggest that age does not play a significant role in influencing the students' MI profiles across the eight domains.

5. DISCUSSION

The 40 items in the MI questionnaire were employed in the current research to investigate students' MI profiles. The results obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed and students' MI profiles were identified. Intrapersonal Intelligence was the most dominant intelligence among the eight intelligence profiles, with a mean score of 4.22. Regarding gender differences, female students exhibit a higher level of Intrapersonal intelligence compared to their male counterparts (Sig = 0.004).

The findings for Intrapersonal Intelligence of the current study are in alignment with those of Ibragimova[23], who investigated the application of MI theory in intermediate language classes at a university in Cyprus. The findings of this study revealed that Intrapersonal Intelligence accounts for 73.4%, being the most dominant intelligence type among participants. Similarly, Adbelkarim[24] conducted a study to identify first-year students' MI profiles regarding gender and specialization. Intrapersonal Intelligence ranked first in both gender and specialization categories. The possible explanations can be attributed to the fact that the educational system in Vietnam, greatly

influenced by Confucian values, emphasizes individual learning and self-reflection. This may contribute to the development and prominence of Intrapersonal intelligence among students. Moreover, this gender disparity may reflect sociocultural conditioning in Vietnam, where females are typically afforded more opportunities to cultivate emotional literacy and engage in self-reflective practices regarding their experiences and aspirations.

Most surprisingly, Verbal/Linguistic and Logical-Mathematical types ranked the lowest among the eight intelligence types, at 65.4% and 61.2% respectively. The notably low mean for Verbal/Linguistic intelligence (M = 3.27) is concerning, as it suggests a potential mismatch between students' natural inclinations and the demands of their language courses. Following closely behind was Logical-Mathematical Intelligence, with 61.2% of the students displaying logical, mathematical, and scientific abilities. These findings stand in contrast to the study conducted by Saricaoglu and Arikan[25] and that of Wilinski and Velanki[26], where Logical-Mathematical intelligence was found to be the predominant type among participants. In the case of Verbal/Linguistic Intelligence, despite its lowest ranking in the present study, research by Abdelkarima, Hassana, and Abuiyadaa[27], who analyzed the MI profiles of law students, indicates that Verbal/Linguistic Intelligence occupies the second position in terms of prevalence. The possible justification for this contrast might lie in the difference in students' backgrounds. The present research was conducted at a multidisciplinary university, with

the participation of first-year students from different departments. In contrast, the previous studies focused solely on one particular major (i.e., Linguistics, Law). Therefore, the disparities in Verbal/Linguistic and Logical/Mathematical Intelligence rankings are understandable.

6. CONCLUSION

The present research aimed to investigate the Multiple Intelligence (MI) profiles of EFL learners in a tertiary setting in Vietnam. The findings of the MI questionnaire revealed interesting findings regarding the distribution and dominance of different intelligence types among the participants. It can be concluded that there was a relatively balanced distribution of eight intelligence types among students. Particularly, Intrapersonal Intelligence ranks first among students' MI profiles. Following closely behind, Visual/Spatial Intelligence secures the second position among dominant intelligence types. Ranking third is Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence, followed by Musical Intelligence and Interpersonal Intelligence. Naturalistic Intelligence occupies the sixth position. Surprisingly, Verbal/Linguistic and Logical-Mathematical Intelligence types are the least dominant intelligence types among students' MI profiles. Furthermore, gender differences were observed in Verbal/Linguistic, Musical, and Intrapersonal domains, but no significant differences were found concerning age.

This research provides noteworthy insights into the MI profiles of first-year non-English majors at Quy Nhon University. To improve teaching and learning outcomes, lecturers of English 1 and English 2 at Quy Nhon University should utilize these findings to better understand their students' learning preferences. Specifically, given the dominance of Intrapersonal, Visual/Spatial, and Bodily-Kinesthetic intelligences, instructors should reduce reliance on solely verbal lectures and instead integrate more self-reflective journals, visual aids, and interactive role-plays into their classroom. This multimodal approach not only fosters a more inclusive classroom environment but also scaffolds learning for students with lower Verbal/Linguistic profiles. Additionally, helping students acknowledge their own MI profiles fosters self-awareness regarding their strengths, allowing them to recognize their unique potential and build greater academic confidence.

Despite its contributions, this study is subject to two primary limitations. First, the sample size of 203 participants is relatively small compared to the total population of first-year non-English majors at Quy Nhon University. Consequently, the findings could not fully indicate the MI profiles of the entire student cohort. Second, the study did not investigate the variance in MI profiles across different faculties. The lack of a balanced distribution of participants from all departments prevented a detailed analysis of how students' majors might correlate with their dominant intelligences.

Hien Thanh

11 avrotor.blogspot.com
Internet
30 words — 1%

12 sdh.hueuni.edu.vn
Internet
24 words — 1%

13 Sadeghi, Karim, and Bahareh Farzizadeh. "The Relationship between Multiple Intelligences and Writing Ability of Iranian EFL Learners", English Language Teaching, 2012.
Crossref
23 words — < 1%

14 mjltm.org
Internet
22 words — < 1%

15 zdocs.mx
Internet
22 words — < 1%

16 dthujs.vn
Internet
20 words — < 1%

17 bcsdjournals.com
Internet
19 words — < 1%

18 files.eric.ed.gov
Internet
18 words — < 1%

19 Hanoi Pedagogycal University 2
Publications
16 words — < 1%

20 Yu Lu. "Application of Multiple Intelligences Theory in Primary School English Teaching: A Comparative Study in Renqiu City", Transformative Pedagogies, 2025
Crossref
16 words — < 1%

21 en.ulis.vnu.edu.vn
Internet
16 words — < 1%

22	issuu.com Internet	14 words — < 1%
23	Rahmi Amtha, Ferry Sandra, Rosalina Tjandrawinata, Indrayadi Gunardi, Anggraeny Putri Sekar Palupi. "Current Research and Trends in Dental and Medical Technology", CRC Press, 2025 Publications	13 words — < 1%
24	stratfordjournals.org Internet	13 words — < 1%
25	Hanoi National University of Education Publications	12 words — < 1%
26	www.asianonlinejournals.com Internet	12 words — < 1%
27	philarchive.org Internet	11 words — < 1%
28	www.psychopediajournals.com Internet	11 words — < 1%
29	www.yourbrainonporn.com Internet	11 words — < 1%
30	vjol.info.vn Internet	10 words — < 1%
31	worldwidescience.org Internet	10 words — < 1%
32	Ton Duc Thang University Publications	9 words — < 1%
33	community.theasianparent.com Internet	9 words — < 1%

34	dokumen.pub Internet	9 words — < 1%
35	ir.uiowa.edu Internet	9 words — < 1%
36	laura22multipleintelligences.blogspot.com Internet	9 words — < 1%
37	repository.ju.edu.et Internet	9 words — < 1%
38	repository.ung.ac.id Internet	9 words — < 1%
39	scholar.ucu.ac.ug Internet	9 words — < 1%
40	tailieumienphi.vn Internet	9 words — < 1%
41	www.eric.ed.gov Internet	9 words — < 1%
42	www.researchgate.net Internet	9 words — < 1%
43	Levent Bayram, Ozge Deniz Yuceloglu Keskin. "A Review of the Multiple-Intelligence Domains of Physically Handicapped Individuals in Terms of Certain Demographic Attributes", Journal of Education and Learning, 2019 Crossref	8 words — < 1%
44	cris.vub.be Internet	8 words — < 1%
45	psasir.upm.edu.my Internet	8 words — < 1%

46	sojournerschoolcommunity.com Internet	8 words — < 1%
47	tailieutuoi.com Internet	8 words — < 1%
48	tapchicongthuong.vn Internet	8 words — < 1%
49	www.tailieudaihoc.com Internet	8 words — < 1%
50	www.yumpu.com Internet	8 words — < 1%
51	ojs.unm.ac.id Internet	6 words — < 1%

EXCLUDE QUOTES   OFF   EXCLUDE SOURCES   OFF
EXCLUDE BIBLIOGRAPHY   OFF   EXCLUDE MATCHES   OFF