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. Kết quả nghiên cứu gợi ý việc tăng cường tích hợp hồ sơ Đa trí tuệ 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. The findings suggest a further application of incorporating learners' MI profiles into classroom instructions and application of the 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 Multiple Intelligences (MI) Theory 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 MI 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 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.

Regarding the education context in Vietnam, the application of MI theory in ELT has received increasing attention from educators and researchers recently. Don[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 MI theory in 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. Moreover, there is a limited body of research in the Vietnam context that specifically examines the distribution of MI 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.

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 MI 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 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 domain encompasses the capacity to manipulate syntax, phonology, and semantics effectively. Individuals with strong linguistic intelligence are sensitive to the meaning and order of words, excelling in rhetoric, explanation, and written expression. Pedagogically, these learners thrive in environments that prioritize reading, textual analysis, and verbal debate.

2.1.2. Logical-Mathematical Intelligence

Characterized by the ability to utilize inductive and deductive reasoning, this intelligence involves detecting patterns, logical chains, and cause-and-effect relationships. Learners with this profile are often drawn to abstract problem-solving, hypothesis testing, and quantitative analysis, preferring tasks that require critical thinking and systematic categorization.

2.1.3. Visual/Spatial Intelligence

Visual/Spatial intelligence involves the ability to form mental images and visualize spatial relationships. Learners with this intelligence are often creative and enjoy designing or interpreting visual information. In educational settings, they may prefer learning through diagrams, videos, drawings, and graphic representations.

2.1.4. Musical Intelligence

Musical intelligence is characterized by sensitivity to rhythm, pitch, melody, and sound patterns. Individuals strong in this area often enjoy listening to and creating music, composing songs, and playing musical instruments. They tend to respond well to melodies and rhythmic structures in learning contexts.

2.1.5. Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence

Bodily-Kinesthetic intelligence refers to the ability to use the body skillfully for expression or to manipulate objects. Learners with this intelligence prefer hands-on experiences and physical activities. They often learn best through movement, role-play, and practical tasks.

2.1.6. Interpersonal Intelligence

Interpersonal intelligence involves the capacity to understand and interact effectively with others. Individuals strong in this domain are socially active, empathetic, and often demonstrate leadership qualities. Their learning is enhanced through collaboration, group discussions, and cooperative activities.

2.1.7. Intrapersonal Intelligence

Intrapersonal intelligence relates to self-awareness and reflective thinking. Individuals

with a dominant intrapersonal profile are highly aware of their internal states and prefer to work at their own pace. They tend to be deep thinkers who benefit from quiet time, journaling, and independent research projects.

2.1.8. Naturalistic Intelligence

Naturalistic intelligence refers to an individual's ability to recognize and categorize elements in the natural environment. Those who possess this intelligence are often interested in nature, wildlife, and environmental patterns. They learn effectively through observing natural phenomena and exploring relationships among living organisms.

2.2. Applications of MI theory in ELT

As mentioned in the previous part, the implementation of MI theory could be seen in different aspects of ELT such as teaching practices, curriculum design and classroom instructions. Chen, Moran, and Gardner[10] support this view by asserting that MI theory facilitates a necessary expansion of the educational landscape. By integrating subjects and teaching methods that cater to a wider spectrum of intelligences, they suggest that educators can extend beyond conventional linguistic and logical assessments to address the unique profiles of all learners.

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. Similarly, 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.

Regarding EFL vocabulary instruction, Nguyen and Nguyen[17] investigated the practical application of MI theory to accommodate diverse learner needs at a high school in Vietnam. Utilizing a pre-test and post-test design, the study demonstrated that these tailored activities had a distinctly positive impact on students' English vocabulary acquisition, specifically in terms of retention and practical use. Furthermore, post-intervention questionnaires revealed strong participant support for MI-driven lesson designs. Based on these findings, the authors recommended the broader integration of MI theory in language teaching to maximize individual learner potential and boost academic achievement

In exploring the theoretical foundations of language instruction, Nguyen[18] examined the application of MI Theory to enhance foreign language proficiency. The study elucidated fundamental MI concepts and proposed specific instructional strategies tailored to the intellectual traits of individual students. Ultimately, the author argued that to improve the effectiveness of specialized English education, teachers must actively adapt their pedagogical approaches and diversify classroom activities to accommodate the intellectual variety of their learners.

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.[19] identified the MI profiles of junior secondary school students in Indonesia, using the MI 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[20] aimed to investigate EFL learners' MI profiles in the Saudi Arab context, and to 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[21] 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[22] explored the MI profiles of Vietnamese university EFL learners and evaluates the extent to which the activities in the *Life* textbook reflect these profiles. Findings revealed a notable mismatch between students' dominant intelligences and those predominantly targeted by the textbook. Specifically, Intrapersonal intelligence emerged as the most prominent among learners, followed by Logical-Mathematical and Naturalistic intelligences. In contrast, the *Life* textbook was found to place primary emphasis on Verbal-linguistic intelligence, with secondary focus on Logical-Mathematical and Intrapersonal domains.

3. METHODOLOGY

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 respondents participating in the study was 77, accounting for 37.9%, whereas female counterparts 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 Tirri and Nokelainen[23]. 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.

3.4. Research reliability and validity

To measure the internal consistency of the items in the questionnaire, the researcher used Cronbach's Alpha in SPSS program to obtain reliability coefficient.

Table 1. Reliability of the MI questionnaire

Types of Intelligence	**Reliability Coefficient**	
	No of Items	**Cronbach's Alpha**
Verbal/Linguistic	5	.811
Logical-Mathematical	5	.786
Visual/Spatial	5	.760
Musical	5	.775
Bodily-Kinesthetic	5	.768
Interpersonal	5	.757
Intrapersonal	5	.775
Naturalistic	5	.871
All items	40	.911

The Cronbach's Alpha value for each type of intelligence is shown in Table 1. Overall, the MI questionnaire has an excellent internal consistency, with the value of .911 for 40 items. Moreover, all the intelligence domains have value ranging from .760 to .871, which are above the good internal consistency reliability.

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).

trình bày bảng nối liền nhau

Table 2. 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

sai số

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 participants. 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.

In terms of standard deviation (SD), Naturalistic Intelligence exhibited the highest variance (SD = 0.903), indicating the widest spread in students' responses. Conversely, Intrapersonal Intelligence recorded the lowest standard deviation (SD = 0.598), suggesting a strong consensus among the participants. The remaining intelligence domains demonstrated a moderate level of variance, ranging from 0.657 (Visual/Spatial) to 0.735 (Verbal/Linguistic).

Overall, the findings from Table 1 provide deeper insights into the MI profiles of the participants. 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 MI 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 3. 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		

sai số

The findings presented in Table 2 give an in-depth understanding of the gender disparities in eight distinct intelligences among male and female participants. 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 participants 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 participants' 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).

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[24], 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[25] 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[26] and that of Wilinski and Velanki[27], 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[28], 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 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 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.

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 three primary limitations. First, the sample size of 203 participants is relatively modest compared to the total population of first-year non-English majors at Quy Nhon University, potentially limiting the generalizability of the findings to the entire cohort. Second, due to logistical

constraints, the study could not achieve a balanced distribution of participants across all faculties, which prevented a detailed comparative analysis of how students' majors might correlate with their dominant intelligences. Finally, the research relied exclusively on a self-report questionnaire. To mitigate the subjectivity inherent in self-assessment, future studies should employ additional evaluative instruments, such as qualitative interviews, teacher observations, or performance-based tasks, to triangulate the data and provide a more holistic assessment of students' MI profiles.

REFERENCES

1. H. Gardner. *Frames of Mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*, New York, Basic Books, 1983.
2. C. Chapman. *If the shoe fits… How to develop intelligences in the classroom,* Glenview, Pearson, 1993.
3. M. Z. Altan. The theory of multiple intelligences: What does it offer EFL Teachers? *MET,* **2001***, 10*(1), 52-56.
4. M. A. Christison. Teaching and Learning Languages through Multiple Intelligences. *TESOL Journal,* **1996***, 6*(1), 10-14.
5. C. Don. *Integrating multiple intelligences activities in developing English speaking skills for English major students at Phu Yen University*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Foreign Languages, Hue University, 2015.
6. L. T. Hanh, T. B. Tien. Multiple Intelligences-Based Homework and EFL students' vocabulary learning. *International Journal of English Linguistics,* **2017***, 7*(6), 73.
7. H. Gardner, T. Hatch. Multiple Intelligences go to school. *Educational Researcher,* **1989***, 18*(8), 4-10.
8. H. Gardner. *Frames of Mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*, New York, Basic Books, 1983.
9. H. Gardner. *Intelligence Reframed Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*, New York, Basic Books, 1999.
10. J. Chen, S. Moran, H. Gardner. *Multiple Intelligences around the World*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2009.
11. M. Haley. Understanding Learner-Centered Instruction from the Perspective of Multiple Intelligences. *Foreign Language Annuals,* **2001***, 34*(4), 355-367.
12. Y. Kong. A study on multiple intelligences theory and English Language Teaching. *International Education Studies,* **2009***, 2*(1), 133-138.
13. M. R. Botelho. *Multiple Intelligences Theory in English Teaching. An Analysis of Current Textbooks, Materials and Teachers' Perceptions,* Unpublished Thesis, Ohio University, 2003.
14. D. P. Snider. *Multiple Intelligences Theory and Foreign Language Teaching,* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 2001.
15. B. Weiner. Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Theories of Motivation from an Attributional Perspective. *Educational Psychology Review,* **2001**, *12*, 1-14.
16. O. S. Murad, R. A. Al-Kriemeen, W. M. Al-Shatarat. Suggested Educational Program based on the Multiple Intelligences Theory and its Influence in the Development of Communication Skills and Retention of Learning Influence in Kindergartens (KG2). *Multicultural Education,* **2021**, *7*(7), 278–286.
17. T. H. M. Nguyen, T. M. T. Nguyen. Applying Multiple Intelligences Theory in Designing English Vocabulary Activities for High School Students, *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, **2023**, *13*(4), 339.
18. H. T. T. Nguyen. Diversifying Foreign Language Teaching Activities Through the Application of Multiple Intelligences Theory, *International Journal of Human Research and Social Science Studies*, **2025**, *2*(12), 1041-1046.
19. N. Emmiyati, M. A. Rasyid, M. A. Rahman, A. Arsyad, G. D. Dirawan. Multiple intelligences profiles of junior secondary school students in Indonesia. *International Education Studies,* **2014**, *7*(11).
20. T. I. Tawalbeh. Investigating EFL learners' multiple intelligences in the preparatory year at TAIF University. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, **2016**, *6*(7), 1347.
21. R. Abdelkarim. Matching Students' Dominant Intelligences with Their Fields of Specialization: Did Students Select the Right Specialization?. *Zarqa Journal for Research and Studies in Humanities,* **2020**, *20*(3), 519-531.

22. T. H. V. Phan. Alignment Between '*Life'* textbook Activities and Multiple Intelligence Profiles of Vietnamese University Students. *Tạp Chí Khoa Học Ngôn Ngữ Và Văn Hóa*, **2023**, *7*(1), 108-122.
23. K. Tirri, P. Nokelainen. *Multiple Intelligences Profiling questionnaire,* In SensePublishers eBooks, 2011.
24. N. Ibragimova. *Multiple intelligences theory in action in EFL classes: A case study*, Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU), 2011.
25. R. Abdelkarim. Intelligences Profiles of the Students of the College of Arts and Applied Sciences in terms of Gender and Specializations. *American International Journal of Social Science,* **2018***, 7*(3).
26. A. Saricaoglu, A. Arikan. A study of multiple intelligences, foreign language success and some selected variables. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, **2009**, *5*(2), 110-122.
27. B. Wilinski, V. Vellanki. A comparative case study of public Pre-K teachers' enactment of parent involvement policy. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, **2020**, *51*(3), 359–375.
28. R. Abdelkarim, K. A. Hassan, R. Abuiyada. How students' multiple intelligences differ in terms of college and gender. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, **2018**, *9*(5).