

UNIVERSITAS
LAMBUNG MANGKURAT

Atiek Winarti <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

[jotse] Editor Decision

Journal of Technology and Science Education <info@jotse.org>

Fri, Mar 2, 2018 at 2:19 AM

Reply-To: "Dr. Francisco Rejón-Guardia" <f.rejon@uib.es>

To: "Mrs. Atiek Winarti" <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

Cc: Leny Yuanita <Yuanita@unesa.com>, "Moh. Nur" <psmsunesa@yahoo.com>

Mrs. Atiek Winarti:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Journal of Technology and Science Education, "The Effectiveness of Multiple Intelligences Based Teaching Strategy in Enhancing the Multiple Intelligences and Science Process Skills of Junior High School Students".

Our decision is to: Resubmit for review

When you revise your manuscript please highlight the changes you make in the manuscript by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer and revise your manuscript within 15 days to avoid any further delay in publishing your article. If we do not received your response in this deadline, your paper will be archived.

To submit the revision, log into [http:// www.jotse.org](http://www.jotse.org). Go to the section "USER HOME" and then to the sub-section AUTHOR". There, you will find all your manuscripts. Select the manuscript that you want to upload.

Please, do not hesitate to ask if you have any questions or suggestions.

Dr. Francisco Rejón-Guardia
University of Balearic Islands

f.rejon@uib.es

#=====

Ph.D. Francisco Rejón-Guardia
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
University of Balearic Islands (Spain)

Dep. Business and Economics|| Office DB021

Email: f.rejon@uib.es || franrejon@gmail.com

Twitter: @franrejon

Web: www.franrejon.com

#=====

Reviewer B:

CONTENT (e.g.: Clarity of objective; basis of theory; conclusions drawn; understanding of subject, contribution to technology and Science education.)

Score (out of 20)

Comments

:

10/20

The theory of Gardner was used as a basis in corroborating the results of

the study. The author may use **Stenberg's** as an additional theory to further explain the results.

The title calls for valid evidences on the effectiveness of the treatment condition. However, the author failed to present a dogmatic explanation of the treatment and valid statistical evidence to prove its effectiveness. Using Wilcoxon and ANOVA place the paper into a misshapen condition confronted with some statistical issues. also, these tests failed to prove causal effects. The use of effect size is wanting. Should the author continue to believe that ANOVA is suited in the paper, a post hoc test is wanting as the result is significant.

The study used quasi-experimental design; however, the author used two different schools and different teachers. This posts a great threat to the DV as the teacher factor is made highly significant. Secondly, the use of incomparable subjects (highly and lowly able) posts another great threat. These are incomparable results. Thirdly, the use of random design. Experimental designs use no randomization.

The study made use of different research instruments: standardized and non-standardized. The author may consider to validate the latter as these are used as evidences in concluding the effectiveness of the treatment variable

The conclusion may be refocused in such a way that it will center to the main thesis of the study.

The author may present a thematic analysis on the literature presented to better explain the phenomenon.

DEGREE OF NOVELTY OR ORIGINALITY (e.g.: presence of new ideas; elsewhere)

Score (out of 10)

Comments

:

7/10

The topic is interesting; however, the author may consider restating some claims which can be falsified, i.e., intelligence diversity has not received much attention (line 32).

STRUCTURE OF PAPER (e.g.: general layout; use and number of figures/diagrams, etc.)

Score (out of 10)

Comments

:

8/10

the author may consider restructuring the SPSS generated tables and present only what is essential to the data to be presented.

QUALITY OF TEXT (e.g.: Clarity of expression; consistency; readability; number of quotations, quality and quantity of references)

Score (out of 10)

Comments

:

7/10

some of the cited literature (in-text) are not listed in the Reference list.

The author may consider using thematic analysis to further present a better analysis to presented in the introduction. You may combine authors with similar claims so the paper may not look like a professional technical paper.

some technical considerations may be observed so as to present the paper better, i.e., the use of 'and' and &, the use of tenses, acronyms, etc.

REVIEWER'S GENERAL OPINION AND COMMENTS (e.g.: correctness of the text; applicability of the items included; quality of the manuscript; scope covered)

Score (out of 50)

Comments

:

25/50

one of the claims is falsified. this needs to be rectified (line 32).

Conditions of be observed in employing the Quasi-experimental design are not observed. This post a great threat in the results.

results on scientific process skills may be further corroborated using the scientific learning motivation vis-à-vis the MI theory and Stember's theory.

The author may also review his assumptions on the use of the Parametric and Non-parametric tests. at the onset, it was assumed that the data (from a Likert scale) are fitted to a non-parametric leading to use the Wilcoxon's test, and in the end, scientific process skills (also from a Likert scale (I supposed as it was not disclosed in the paper) were treated using ANOVA. The author may mend these issues.

Reviewer B:

CONTENT (e.g.: Clarity of objective; basis of theory; conclusions drawn; understanding of subject, contribution to technology and Science education.)

Score (out of 20)

Comments

:

10/20

The theory of Gardner was used as a basis in corroborating the results of the study. The author may use Sternberg's as an additional theory to further explain the results.

The title calls for valid evidences on the effectiveness of the treatment condition. However, the author failed to present a dogmatic explanation of the treatment and valid statistical evidence to prove its effectiveness. Using Wilcoxon and ANOVA place the paper into a misshapen condition confronted with some statistical issues. also, these tests failed to prove causal effects. The use of effect size is wanting. Should the author continue to believe that ANOVA is suited in the paper, a post hoc test is wanting as the result is significant.

The study used quasi-experimental design; however, the author used two different schools and different teachers. This posts a great threat to the DV as the teacher factor is made highly significant. Secondly, the use of incomparable subjects (highly and lowly able) posts another great threat. These are incomparable results. Thirdly, the use of random design. Experimental designs use no randomization.

The study made use of different research instruments: standardized and non-standardized. The author may consider to validate the latter as these are used as evidences in concluding the effectiveness of the treatment variable

The conclusion may be refocused in such a way that it will center to the main thesis of the study.

The author may present a thematic analysis on the literature presented to better explain the phenomenon.

DEGREE OF NOVELTY OR ORIGINALITY (e.g.: presence of new ideas; elsewhere)

Score (out of 10)

Comments

:

7/10

The topic is interesting; however, the author may consider restating some claims which can be falsified, i.e., intelligence diversity has not received much attention (line 32).

STRUCTURE OF PAPER (e.g.: general layout; use and number of figures/diagrams, etc.)

Score (out of 10)

Comments

:

8/10

the author may consider restructuring the SPSS generated tables and present only what is essential to the data to be presented.

QUALITY OF TEXT (e.g.: Clarity of expression; consistency; readability; number of quotations, quality and quantity of references)

Score (out of 10)

Comments

7/10

some of the cited literature (in-text) are not listed in the Reference list.

The author may consider using thematic analysis to further present a better analysis to presented in the introduction. You may combine authors with similar claims so the paper may not look like a professional technical paper.

some technical considerations may be observed so as to present the paper better, i.e., the use of 'and' and &, the use of tenses, acronyms, etc.

REVIEWER'S GENERAL OPINION AND COMMENTS (e.g.: correctness of the text; applicability of the items included; quality of the manuscript; scope covered)

Score (out of 50)

Comments

25/50

one of the claims is falsified. this needs to be rectified (line 32).

Conditions of be observed in employing the Quasi-experimental design are not observed. This post a great threat in the results.

results on scientific process skills may be further corroborated using the scientific learning motivation vis-à-vis the MI theory and Sternber's theory.

The author may also review his assumptions on the use of the Parametric and Non-parametric tests. at the onset, it was assumed that the data (from a Likert scale) are fitted to a non-parametric leading to use the Wilcoxon's test, and in the end, scientific process skills (also from a Likert scale (I supposed as it was not disclosed in the paper) were treated using ANOVA. The author may mend these issues.

Reviewer B:

CONTENT (e.g.: Clarity of objective; basis of theory; conclusions drawn; understanding of subject, contribution to technology and Science education.)

Score (out of 20)

Comments

:

10/20

The theory of Gardner was used as a basis in corroborating the results of the study. The author may use Sternberg's as an additional theory to further explain the results.

The title calls for valid evidences on the effectiveness of the treatment condition. However, the author failed to present a dogmatic explanation of the treatment and valid statistical evidence to prove its effectiveness. Using Wilcoxon and ANOVA place the paper into a misshapen condition confronted with some statistical issues. also, these tests failed to prove causal effects. The use of effect size is wanting. Should the author continue to believe that ANOVA is suited in the paper, a post hoc test is wanting as the result is significant.

The study used quasi-experimental design; however, the author used two different schools and different teachers. This posts a great threat to the DV as the teacher factor is made highly significant. Secondly, the use of incomparable subjects (highly and lowly able) posts another great threat. These are incomparable results. Thirdly, the use of random design. Experimental designs use no randomization.

The study made use of different research instruments: standardized and non-standardized. The author may consider to validate the latter as these are used as evidences in concluding the effectiveness of the treatment variable

The conclusion may be refocused in such a way that it will center to the main thesis of the study.

The author may present a thematic analysis on the literature presented to better explain the phenomenon.

DEGREE OF NOVELTY OR ORIGINALITY (e.g.: presence of new ideas; elsewhere)

Score (out of 10)

Comments

:

7/10

The topic is interesting; however, the author may consider restating some claims which can be falsified, i.e., intelligence diversity has not received much attention (line 32).

STRUCTURE OF PAPER (e.g.: general layout; use and number of figures/diagrams, etc.)

Score (out of 10)

Comments

:

8/10

the author may consider restructuring the SPSS generated tables and present only what is essential to the data to be presented.

QUALITY OF TEXT (e.g.: Clarity of expression; consistency; readability; number of quotations, quality and quantity of references)

Score (out of 10)

Comments

:

7/10

some of the cited literature (in-text) are not listed in the Reference list.

The author may consider using thematic analysis to further present a better analysis to presented in the introduction. You may combine authors with similar claims so the paper may not look like a professional technical paper.

some technical considerations may be observed so as to present the paper better, i.e., the use of 'and' and '&', the use of tenses, acronyms, etc.

REVIEWER'S GENERAL OPINION AND COMMENTS (e.g.: correctness of the text; applicability of the items included; quality of the manuscript; scope covered)

Score (out of 50)

Comments

:

25/50

one of the claims is falsified. this needs to be rectified (line 32).

Conditions of be observed in employing the Quasi-experimental design are not observed. This post a great threat in the results.

results on scientific process skills may be further corroborated using the scientific learning motivation vis-à-vis the MI theory and Stember's theory.

The author may also review his assumptions on the use of the Parametric and Non-parametric tests. at the onset, it was assumed that the data (from a Likert scale) are fitted to a non-parametric leading to use the Wilcoxon's test, and in the end, scientific process skills (also from a Likert scale (I supposed as it was not disclosed in the paper) were treated using ANOVA. The author may mend these issues.



UNIVERSITAS
LAMBUNG MANGKURAT

Atiek Winarti <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

[jotse] Editor Decision

Atiek Winarti <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

Thu, Mar 8, 2018 at 7:21 PM

To: "Dr. Francisco Rejón-Guardia" <f.rejon@uib.es>

Dear Editor of JOTSE,

Thank you for the review results. Now, I am revising my manuscript based on the review results.

After I checked it all, I found the review results of reviewer B has the same content to reviewer A. Is it correct?

If it should be different, could you send me the results from reviewer B?

Or if it is the correct results, I will continue to revise my article.

Please kindly inform me about it.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.


Sincerely

Atiek Winarti
Lambung Mangkurat University



Virus-free. www.avast.com

[Quoted text hidden]

UNIVERSITAS
LAMBUNG MANGKURAT

Atiek Winarti <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

[jotse] Editor Decision

FranRejón <franrejon@gmail.com>
To: Atiek Winarti <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

Sat, Mar 10, 2018 at 1:04 AM

Dear Atiek Winarti,

Indeed, you have received a single review.
Please make any corrections you consider.
We carefully consider your changes.

Thank you very much for considering JOTSE.

Sincerely

Francisco Rejón-Guardia
University of the Balearic Islands (Spain)

2018-03-08 12:21 GMT+01:00 Atiek Winarti <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>:

>
> Dear Editor of JOTSE,
>
> Thank you for the review results. Now, I am revising my manuscript based on the review results.
>
> After I checked it all, I found the review results of reviewer B has the same content to reviewer A. Is it correct?
> If it should be different, could you send me the results from reviewer B?
> Or if it is the correct results, I will continue to revise my article.
> Please kindly inform me about it.
>
> Thank you very much for your cooperation.
>
> Sincerely
>
> Atiek Winarti
> Lambung Mangkurat University
>

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Francisco Rejón-Guardia Phd.
Investigador - Docente
Universitat de les Illes Balears
Dpto. Economía de la Empresa (UIB)
f.rejon@uib.eu - franrejon@gmail.com
www.franrejon.com
@franrejon



Atiek Winarti <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

[jotse] Editor Decision

Atiek Winarti <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>
To: FranRejón <franrejon@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 5:10 PM

Dear Editor of JOTSE, Mr. Fransisco Rejon-Guardia

I send my revised article entitled:
The Effectiveness of Multiple Intelligences Based Teaching Strategy in Enhancing the Multiple Intelligences and Science Process Skill of Junior High School Students.
I hope my revision meet the reviewer's suggestions.
I also uploaded it to my account in JOTSE.

I will wait for your further information. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Atiek Winarti
Lambung Mangkurat University




Virus-free. www.avast.com

[Quoted text hidden]



Atiek_Winarti_Revision.doc
325K



Atiek Winarti <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

[jotse] Editor Decision

FranRejón <franrejon@gmail.com>

Thu, Apr 5, 2018 at 4:42 PM

To: Atiek Winarti <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

Dear Atiek Winarti,

Your work continues in the revision process.
We will keep you informed about it.
Thank you for considering JOTSE for publication.

Kind Regards.

[Quoted text hidden]



[jotse] Editor Decision

Journal of Technology and Science Education <info@jotse.org>

Sat, May 5, 2018 at 7:54 PM

Reply-To: "Dr. Francisco Rejón-Guardia" <f.rejon@uib.es>

To: "Mrs. Atiek Winarti" <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

Cc: Leny Yuanita <Yuanita@unesa.com>, "Moh. Nur" <psmsunesa@yahoo.com>

Mrs. Atiek Winarti:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Journal of Technology and Science Education, "The Effectiveness of Multiple Intelligences Based Teaching Strategy in Enhancing the Multiple Intelligences and Science Process Skills of Junior High School Students".

Our decision is to: Revision required.

We enclose reviewers comments. Please, consider this suggestion.

When you revise your manuscript please highlight the changes you make in the manuscript by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer and revise your manuscript within 15 days to avoid any further delay in publishing your article. If we do not received your response in this deadline, your paper will be archived.

To submit the revision, log into [http:// www.jotse.org](http://www.jotse.org). Go to the section "USER HOME" and then to the sub-section "AUTHOR". There, you will find all your manuscripts. Select the manuscript that you want to upload.

Please, do not hesitate to ask if you have any questions or suggestions.

#=====#
Ph.D. Francisco Rejón-Guardia
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
University of Balearic Islands (Spain)
Dep. Business and Economics|| Office DB021
Email: f.rejon@uib.es || franrejon@gmail.com
Twitter: @franrejon
Web: www.franrejon.com

#=====#

Reviewer A:

CONTENT (e.g.: Clarity of objective; basis of theory; conclusions drawn; understanding of subject, contribution to technology and Science education.)

Score (out of 20)

Comments

:

12

Comments

:
17

DEGREE OF NOVELTY OR ORIGINALITY (e.g.: presence of new ideas; elsewhere)

Score (out of 10)

Comments

:
8

STRUCTURE OF PAPER (e.g.: general layout; use and number of figures/diagrams, etc.)

Score (out of 10)

Comments

:
9

QUALITY OF TEXT (e.g.: Clarity of expression; consistency; readability; number of quotations, quality and quantity of references)

Score (out of 10)

Comments

:
8

REVIEWER'S GENERAL OPINION AND COMMENTS (e.g.: correctness of the text; applicability of the items included; quality of the manuscript; scope covered)

Score (out of 50)

Comments

:
45

UNIVERSITAS
LAMBUNG MANGKURAT

Atiek Winarti <atiekwin_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

[jotse] Editor Decision

Atiek Winarti <atiekwin_kimia@ulm.ac.id>
To: "Dr. Francisco Rejón-Guardia" <f.rejon@uib.es>

Wed, Jun 6, 2018 at 4:20 PM

Dear JOTSE Editor, Dr. Francisco Rejon-Guardia

Here I would like to inform you that I already submitted my manuscript revision to JOTSE website. Based on the reviewer comments, I made a major revision in my manuscript. Beside the revision, I made a rebuttal for reviewer comments to explain my revision as well. Because the rebuttal could not be sent on the website, I attach the rebuttal and the manuscript revision in this email.

Thank you very much for your kind attention. I am looking forward to hearing the good decision from you soon.


Sincerely

Atiek Winarti


Virus-free. www.avast.com

[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

 **jotse 404-2098-1-RV (4) revision 290518.doc**
350K

 **REBUTTAL FOR REVIEWER COMMENTS of JOTSE.docx**
25K



Atiek Winarti <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

[jotse] Editor Decision

Journal of Technology and Science Education <info@jotse.org>

Tue, Jun 12, 2018 at 3:07 AM

Reply-To: "Dr. Francisco Rejón-Guardia" <f.rejon@uib.es>

To: "Mrs. Atiek Winarti" <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

Cc: Leny Yuanita <Yuanita@unesa.com>, "Moh. Nur" <psmsunesa@yahoo.com>

Mrs Atiek Winarti:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Journal of Technology and Science Education, "The Effectiveness of Multiple Intelligences Based Teaching Strategy in Enhancing the Multiple Intelligences and Science Process Skills of Junior High School Students".

We decide to reject the manuscript in its current state. In particular, we consider that there are essential deficiencies for the publication of the study at the current form.

First, we consider that the abstract must be rewritten. No mention should be made of acronyms or numerical data.

Individually, it must respond to:

(concise - 150-250 words - to explain paper): roughly one sentence each:

- What is the problem?
- Why does it matter?
- How do you address the problem?
- What did you find?
- How does this change practice (what people in business do), and how does it change research (existing or future)?

The introduction also does not respond to:

- What is the problem and why does it matter? Moreover, what have others done to try to address this problem, and why have their efforts been insufficient (i.e., what is the gap in the literature)? (1-2 paragraphs)
- What is your DV (s) and what is the context you are studying it in? Also briefly define the DV (s). (1-2 paragraphs)
- One sentence about the sample (e.g., "377 undergraduate university students using Excel").
- How does studying this DV (s) in this context adequately address the problem? (1-2 paragraphs)
- What existing theory/theories do you leverage, if any, to pursue this study, and why are these appropriate? (1-2 paragraphs)
- Who else has pursued this research question (or something related), and why were they insufficient? (see section above about "how to start every research project") (1-2 paragraphs)
- Briefly discuss the primary contributions of this study in general terms without discussing specific findings (i.e., no p-values here).
- How is the rest of the paper organised? (1 paragraph)

In third place, there is no review section of the literature that we believe is necessary to talk about aspects related to multiple intelligences.

Finally, the conclusion of the work must respond to:

- Summarize the insights gained from this study and how they address existing gaps or problems.
- Explain the primary contribution of the study.
- Express your vision for moving forward or how do you hope this work will affect the world.

When you revise your manuscript, please highlight the changes you make in the manuscript by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. To expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer and revise your manuscript within 15 days to avoid any further delay in publishing your article. If we do not receive your response in this deadline, your paper will be archived.

To submit the revision, log into [HTTP:// www.jotse.org](http://www.jotse.org). Go to the section "USER HOME" and then to the sub-section "AUTHOR". There, you will find all your manuscripts. Select the manuscript that you want to upload.

Please, do not hesitate to ask if you have any questions or suggestions. Thank you for considering JOTSE to publish your manuscript

#=====#

Ph.D. Francisco Rejón-Guardia
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
University of Balearic Islands (Spain)
Dep. Business and Economics|| Office DB021
Email: f.rejon@uib.es || franrejon@gmail.com
Twitter: [@franrejon](https://twitter.com/franrejon)
Web: www.franrejon.com

#=====#

Journal of Technology and Science Education
<http://www.jotse.org>



[jotse] Editor Decision

Atiek Winarti <atiekwinn_kimia@ulm.ac.id>
To: "Dr. Francisco Rejón-Guardia" <f.rejon@uib.es>

Mon, Jun 25, 2018 at 5:18 PM

Dear Dr. Francisco Rejón-Guardia

Thank you for your information.

I have submitted the revision of my article to the JOTSE web. Please find the attached file in this email as well.

Thank you very much for your kind attention.

I am looking forward for your next information.

Sincerely

Atiek Winarti



Virus-free. www.avast.com

[Quoted text hidden]



jotse 404-2098-1-Revision.doc

359K



UNIVERSITAS
LAMBUNG MANGKURAT

Atiek Winarti <atiekwin_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

[jotse] Editor Decision

Atiek Winarti <atiekwin_kimia@ulm.ac.id>
To: "Dr. Francisco Rejón-Guardia" <f.rejon@uib.es>

Thu, Aug 2, 2018 at 12:17 AM

Dear JOTSE Editor,
Dr. Francisco Rejon-Guardia


Here I would like to inform you that I submitted my manuscript revision to JOTSE website. .
Beside the revision, I made a rebuttal for reviewer comments to explain my revision as well.
I attach the rebuttal and the manuscript revision in this email.

Thank you very much for your kind attention. I am looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely

Atiek Winarti
[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

 **Jotse revisi ASL Atiek 1 agt.doc**
389K

 **REBUTTAL FOR REVIEWEER COMMENTS 1 Agt.docx**
20K

[jotse] Editor Decision

Journal of Technology and Science Education <info@jotse.org>

Tue, Aug 14, 2018 at 6:24 PM

Reply-To: "Dr. Francisco Rejón-Guardia" <f.rejon@uib.es>

To: "Mrs. Atiek Winarti" <atiekwin_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

Cc: Leny Yuanita <Yuanita@unesa.com>, "Moh. Nur" <psmsunesa@yahoo.com>

Mrs Atiek Winarti:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to the Journal of Technology and Science Education.

It's my pleasure to inform you that, after the peer review, your paper:
"The Effectiveness of Multiple Intelligences Based Teaching Strategy in Enhancing the Multiple Intelligences and Science Process Skills of Junior High School Students".

has been ACCEPTED to publish in the Journal of Technology and Science Education.

Again, thank you for working with JOTSE and for making the journal a vehicle for your research interests.


Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Francisco Rejón-Guardia
August 14, 2018

#=====#
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
University of Balearic Islands (Spain)
Dep. Business and Economics|| Office DB021
Email: f.rejon@uib.es || franrejon@gmail.com
Twitter: @franrejon
Web: www.franrejon.com
#=====#

Journal of Technology and Science Education
<http://www.jotse.org>



Atiek Winarti <atiekwin_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

[jotse] Editor Decision

FranRejón <franrejon@gmail.com>
To: Atiek Winarti <atiekwin_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

Mon, Aug 20, 2018 at 4:32 PM

Dear Atiek Winarti,

I am glad to contact you again.


You should wait for the editors-in-chief to contact you and provide you with further information.
I kindly beg you for a little patience.

A cordial greeting.

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Francisco Rejón-Guardia Phd.
Investigador - Docente
Universitat de les Illes Balears
[Dpto. Economía de la Empresa \(UIB\)](mailto:f.rejon@uib.eu)
f.rejon@uib.eu - franrejon@gmail.com
www.franrejon.com
[@franrejon](#)



Atiek Winarti <atiekwin_kimia@ulm.ac.id>

Request for a payment for your paper JOTSE404

Irene Trullas (OmniaScience) <irene.trullas@omniascience.com>
To: atiekwin_kimia@ulm.ac.id

Wed, Oct 24, 2018 at 11:18 PM

Dear author,

We contact with you in order to inform that your paper will be published in the next regular issue of JOTSE.

According to the journal's guidelines, the papers received since April 1, 2016 the publication fee is 195€/article.

Please fill in [this form](#) in order to get your invoice's data.

Best regards,

Irene Trullas, PhD
JOTSE - OmniaScience
www.omniascience.com
@OmniaScience

Este mensaje de correo electrónico puede contener información confidencial y/o privilegiada. Si usted no es su destinatario, o está autorizado para recibir este mensaje, no debe usar, copiar, divulgar o tomar cualquier acción basada en este correo electrónico o cualquier información contenida en el mensaje. Si usted ha recibido este material por error, por favor avise inmediatamente al remitente y elimine este mensaje.

Data protection: Responsible: Omnia Publisher SL, Purpose: Manage the sending of information and commercial prospecting, Legitimation: With the consent of the interested party, Recipients: Personal data will not be passed on to third parties unless statutory provisions, Rights: Access, rectify and delete the data concerning you.



Remitente notificado con
Mailtrack

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES BASED TEACHING STRATEGY IN ENHANCING THE MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES AND SCIENCE PROCESS SKILLS OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Atiek Winarti¹, Leny Yuanita², Moh. Nur²

¹Universitas Lambung Mangkurat (Indonesia)

²Universitas Negeri Surabaya (Indonesia)

atiekwin_kimia@ulm.ac.id, Yuanita@unesa.com, psmsunesa@yahoo.com

Received February 2018

Accepted August 2018

Abstract

This study is based on the low attention of teachers on students' potential compared to academic ability. Teachers' focus on academic ability as the sole determinant of successful learning causes learning to be incapable of developing the students' potential called Multiple Intelligences (MI), whereas they can be applied to make students enjoy learning as well as develop the potential and thinking skills of students. To overcome this problem, a teaching strategy based on Multiple Intelligences was developed in science lesson. The effectiveness of the teaching strategy was evaluated by pretest-posttest-control-group design. The samples consisted of 124 of junior high school students. Data were obtained from Multiple intelligences test, Science Process Skills (SPS) test, and observation sheets. The hypotheses were tested using t-test, simple linear regression, and one-way ANOVA. The study revealed that Multiple Intelligences strategy has an effect on and can be a significant predictor of the development of students' Multiple intelligences. This study showed an improvement of the SPS, specifically in the questioning ability. The results of this study will change the teaching strategy in the future, from academic ability oriented to be multiple intelligences oriented and focus on the potential of each student.

Keywords – Teaching strategy, Multiple Intelligences, Science Process Skills.

To cite this article:

Winarti, A., Yuanita, L., & Nur, M. (2019). The effectiveness of multiple intelligences based teaching strategy in enhancing the multiple intelligences and Science Process Skills of junior high school students. *Journal of Technology and Science Education*, 9(2), 122-135. <https://doi.org/10.3926/jotse.404>

1. Introduction

Human intelligence is often defined narrowly as IQ (Intelligence Quotient). Even, IQ is considered as a critical indicator of one's success, whereas the intelligence measured in IQ tests only includes language intelligence and mathematical logic. Intelligence is actually more than just language and logic intelligences. Gardner (1993) defines intelligence as the human ability to create problems and solve them. Hence, the kind of human intelligence will appear when a person faces a problem and solves it. Gardner (1993) and Armstrong (2004) stated that every human being has eight types of intelligences at different capacity.

Identifying students' dominant types of intelligences before they start studying is important to assist teachers design appropriate strategies (Griggs, Barney, Brown-Sederberg, Collins, Keith & Iannacci, 2009: page 55).

Since Gardner's publication of the Multiple Intelligences (MI) theory, several studies have investigated the implications of the theory to be applied in teaching and learning activities in various subjects, including language, psychology and science. Some studies conducted by Pociask and Settles (2007), Owolabi and Okebukola (2009), Chuang, Tsu and Tsao (2010), Abdi, Laei and Ahmadyan (2013), and Nurulwahida, Yaacob and Shaik-Abdullah (2014), suggest that multiple intelligence theory need to be applied in classrooms through various ways such as implementing brain-based learning strategy, study group method, video games, and modules. Furthermore, Yurt and Polat (2015), Madkour and Mohammed (2016) and Sánchez-Martín, Álvarez-Gragera, Dávila-Acedo and Mellado (2017) found that adjusting learning strategies with students' intelligence has improved learning motivation and emotional intelligence to positively impact student achievement. However, these previous studies tend to be more focus on the impact of learning strategies on learning achievements (Pociask & Settles, 2007; Owolabi & Okebukola, 2009; Othman, 2013; Abdi et al., 2013; Widiani & Jampel, 2016). Only few studies have applied the theory of MI to enhance students' MI and Science Process Skills (SPS). Chuang et al. (2010) examines the efforts of increasing MI through video game applications and found that the use of video game puzzles can strengthen multiple intelligences of students.

This study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of MI-based learning strategies in enhancing the multiple intelligences and SPS of students. 124 junior high school students included as the samples. The development of MI-based learning strategy has not been reported in the previous studies. The characteristics of MI-based teaching strategy developed in this study can be seen from several aspects as follows:

- (1) The learning strategy is designed to be relatively easier to apply than the MI-based strategy developed in the previous study. If the strategies developed in the previous researches are more complex and require considerable time, then the developed strategy is simpler without having to change the school's learning program. This simplification is expected to enable teachers to implement learning strategy without changing the school's system. In other words, this strategy can be applied by all teachers on all subjects according to the applicable curriculum.
- (2) This strategy integrates interests and talents in formal learning to achieve mastery of sciences concepts and develop students' dominant intelligence. So far, interests and talents are not developed in a classroom, but in non-formal activities. Learning that integrates children's interest in the arts or sport to learn formal learning materials such as science in school is something new.

In this study, learning strategy is designed based on MI theory to improve not only students' achievement, but also multiple intelligence and SPS of students. Determination of MI and SPS as dependent variables due to these two variables are very important for students. A learning process which is designed in accordance with students' dominant types of intelligence will be more enjoyable for students (Yurt & Polat, 2015; Madkour & Mohammed, 2016)

The SPS are the unique skills resulted from science lesson. Padilla (1990) stated that students cannot be expected to excel at the skills if they have not experienced or been allowed to practice. Instead students need to be given opportunities to work with these skills in different content areas and contexts. By giving students repetitive exercises to train science process skill, they will be trained and mastered it.

The results of this study will change teaching strategies in the future from academic ability to MI oriented and focus on the potential of each student. It is expected to contribute to the improvement of the quality of science lesson, thus the science lessons will no longer aims to merely improve academic ability, but also develop students' thinking skills and potentials.

2. Basic Theories of the Developed Learning Strategy

This learning strategy was developed based on Gardner theory of Multiple Intelligence (MI), Cognitive Developmental theory by Piaget, and Constructivism theory by Vygotsky. According to Gardner's theory (1993), intelligence is the human ability to create problems and solve them. The key of MI theory is that all human beings have eight intelligences that are independent each other with varying degrees. Based on the assumption that each individual's intelligence profile is not the same, then the learning can be developed by evaluating the students' intelligence profile and designing the learning activity based on the level of the intelligence. According to MI theory, the dominant intelligence of a child is generally relevant to the child's interest (Armstrong, 2004). Through this learning strategy, interests and talents serve as a means to learn the subject matter. Therefore, in application of this learning strategy, any type of student's dominant intelligence that may arise will be facilitated to evolve through appropriate activities, such as making songs for musical intelligence, writing poetry related to the subject matter for verbal linguistic intelligence, designing games or performing role playing for kinesthetic intelligence.

Piaget's cognitive development theory, one of these strategic bases, deals with several important concepts in the development of human cognitive levels such as intelligence, schemata, assimilation and accommodation and equilibrium (Santrock, 2004; Slavin, 2006; Hergenhahn & Olson, 2009). Piaget defines intelligent action as an action leading to an optimal condition for the survival of the organism (Hergenhahn & Olson, 2009: page 313). Furthermore, Vygotsky's theory (Slavin, 2006) believes that intellectuals develop when one faces a new experience with curiosity. In an effort to understand the new experience, individuals associate new knowledge with prior knowledge and build new meaning. Vygotsky believes that cognitive ability comes from social relations and is influenced by socio-cultural backgrounds. According to Vygotsky social interactions with others sparked the emergence of new ideas and enrich the intellectual development of students. This idea is the basis of collaborative learning, applied in this research with appropriate challenges and assistance from more capable teachers or peers, students move forward in their nearest development zone, where new learning takes place.

Application of MI theory in classroom activities has been reported by the other studies such as Owolabi and Okebokula (2009), Hanafin (2014), Ghamrawi (2014), Madkour and Mohammed (2016) and Shánchez-Martín et al. (2017). Those researches indicated that the implementation of MI-based learning strategies in schools not only improves learning outcomes but also students' interest, motivation, and emotional intelligence. Students' retention increases as the improvement of their self-esteem. Research conducted by Ghamrawi (2014) on the child's ability to learn vocabulary proved that the application of MI theory does not make children learn words faster, but improves children's retention in learning. However, the previous researches on multiple intelligences were more focused on the impact of the learning method toward students' interest, motivation, self esteem, and learning outcomes. There were only small amount researches on multiple intelligences that try to improve the multiple intelligences themselves. Researches by Chuang et al. (2010), Talib and Bini-Kailani (2014) tried to increase students' multiple intelligences, but they were only focus on one or two types of intelligences.

This article describes the results of experiment on the development of MI based teaching strategy implemented in science lesson. In the introduction section, the background of the research and the theoretical basic of the developed strategy are explained. The methodology describes about the research method, the sample, the research instrument, and the data analysis, while in the result and discussion, the dependent variables of the research, namely students' MI and SPS, will be discussed.

3. Methodology

This study employed quasi experimental research design. By using stratified random sampling, two schools were selected, the Public Junior High School (JHS) 1 representing high academic achievers and the Public JHS 24 representing low academic achievers based on the national exam score. In each school, 2 (two) classes were selected, 1 (one) control class was taught using traditional strategies such as lectures, demonstrations and group discussions, and 1 (one) experimental class was taught using strategies based on

applied MI theory (strategy). The samples were 124 students selected from both schools. The experimental group and control group consisted of 63 and 61 students respectively as illustrated in Table 1. To avoid the bias, the control and experimental classes were taught by the same teachers. The teachers are those who used to teach in the schools.

The MI-strategy developed in this study was designed based on a series of instructional events by Gagne (1977). The MI-strategy consists of six stages namely (1) Self-reflection, where students tell about themselves, their study habits and hobbies, etc., (2) Introduction of concept by teachers, using activities which involve all aspects of MI, (3) Formulation of questions about the subject matter by the students, (4) Deepening the concept through SPS practices which involve all aspects of MI, (5) Expressing understanding on the concepts through activities which are appropriate with students' dominant types of intelligence, and (6) Concluding the lessons. The activities at stage (1) to (4) were carried out in a group with various dominant types of intelligence while activities at stage (5) were carried out in a group of students who have similar dominant intelligence. Then, activities at stage (6) were carried out individually. The characteristic of this learning strategy lies in step (5), in which students were grouped based on the dominant type of intelligence. In the group, they were asked to express their understanding on the subject matter in a way which they like most and appropriate to their dominant types of intelligence, such as designing games for students with linguistic and kinesthetic intelligence, composing music for students with musical intelligence, painting for students with visual-spatial intelligence, drawing a simple bouquet for students with intrapersonal intelligence, or planning a further study for students with logical-mathematical intelligence.

The traditional strategies applied in control class consisted of lecture, discussion, and demonstration method. The lesson began with teacher's questions. Then after explaining the lesson objective, the teacher explained the subject matter by using lecture and demonstration method. The students then worked together on the worksheet, discussed, and present it in the class. The lesson ended with formulating conclusions by the students under the teacher guidance.

The teaching and learning process was conducted for 12 weeks involving one teacher and five observers. The teacher taught using the specified teaching strategy, while the observers made observation of the teaching and learning process.

The Multiple Intelligences (MI) test developed by Gardner (1993), Armstrong (2004), McClellan and Conti (2008) was used to collect the data on students' MI. The instrument consists of 56 questions which are divided into 8 parts based on types of MI as follows, linguistic, kinesthetic, musical, visual-spatial, intrapersonal, interpersonal, logical-mathematical, and naturalist. The instrument applied Likert Scale, which each part contained 7 questions that have to be answered by selecting 4 options, namely; absolutely agree (score 4), agree (score 3), disagree (score 2), and absolutely disagree (score 1).

Data of students' SPS were collected by standard assessment test and observation sheets. In SPS test, students were tested by conducting 5 skills as follows: questioning, predicting, data analyzing, classifying, and concluding. The quality of these skills was assessed by a rubric. Science process skills were evaluated 3 times using three worksheets, each of which conducted after lesson 1, lesson 2, and lesson 3. The quality of SPS instrument was determined by content validity and reliability test. The instrument was validated by 5 (five) validators who assess (1) the content, (2) the construction, and (3) the language of the instrument. Validity of the instrument is decided into three criteria; feasible, feasible by improvement, and not feasible. Reliability of the instrument was assessed using Interrater Consistency (Linn & Gronlund, 2009). The calculation of the reliability test used intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC). Based on the ICC score, the criteria of the reliability can be classified as follow (Streiner & Norman, 2000).

Based on the validator judgment, the SPS assessment instrument is valid and feasible to use. The calculations of reliability test using intra-class correlation coefficient indicate that all aspects of SPS assessment are reliable with reliability criteria ranging from sufficient to high. The ICC for questioning aspect is .73 (sufficient), the ICC for predicting aspect is .88 (high), the ICC for conducting

investigation/experiments aspect is .63 (sufficient), the ICC for data analysis aspect is .73 (sufficient), the ICC for data classifying aspect is .93 (high), and the ICC for concluding aspect is .94 (high).

The differences on improvement of MI between both groups were identified by calculating the gain score of MI before and after the learning process. The data normality was tested using Saphiro Wilk and the data homogeneity was tested using Levene test.

The data of MI and SPS were not normal and homogeny. Transformation of both data using SPSS 22 resulted normal and homogeny data. Hence, t-test was applied to determine differences of in average-normalized gain (N-gain) of MI between control and experimental groups, while one-way ANOVA was used to determine the differences of students' SPS scores among the three SPS assessment. The highest MI performance of group is determined by comparing the average-normalized gain (N-gain) of both groups, while the highest performance among three SPS assessment scores was determined by post hoc test using LSD test. The effect of MI strategy toward student's MI development was analyzed by simple linear regression. Acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis was conducted by comparing the Sig. value with the probability.

Group	School Categories		Total
	High Achievement	Low Achievement	
Control	27	34	61
Experiment	26	37	63
Total	53	71	124

Table 1. The Distribution of Sample

ICC Score	Category of the Reliability
.90 – 1.00	Very high
.80 - .89	High
.60 - .79	Sufficient
.00 - .59	Poor

Table 2. Interpretation of ICC Score

4. Results

The enhancement of students' development of MI was characterized by the increase in MI scores after the learning process. Descriptive data of MI scores of both groups before and after the learning processes are presented in Table 3.

Group	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Standard Deviation
Control					
Pre-test	19.6	10	28	20	3.4
Post-test	19.2	10	27	19	3.2
Experimental					
Pre-test	19.8	9	28	20	3.3
Post-test	20.4	10	28	21	3.7

Table 3. Descriptive Data of Students' MI

The multiple intelligence scores of students for both groups before and after the learning process can also be seen on Figure 1.




Figure 1. Mean Scores of Students' MI for Both Groups Before and After the Learning Process

In the experimental group, students' MI scores improved primarily in five types of intelligences, namely intrapersonal, interpersonal, kinesthetic, visual spatial, and musical intelligences. Linguistic intelligence was slightly increased, while the mathematical-logic intelligence tends to remain. In contrast, students' MI scores in the control group did not improve. The descriptive analysis of gain score of control and experimental groups can be seen on the Table 4 below.

As it can be seen from Table 4, the difference of gain scores was observed between control and experimental groups. The gain score of experimental group (4.09) was higher than that of control group (-.85). The gain scores difference of eight types of MI between experimental and control class were tested using t-test.

The results indicated that there were significant differences of MI gain scores between the two groups (sig. < .05). It can be stated that the difference of implemented learning strategies gives the different result of students' MI gain scores. Then, to prove the influence of learning strategy toward students' MI, simple linear regression test was implemented. The results are presented in Table 6 and Table 7.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Gain_Control	61	-13.00	50.00	-.85	7.90	62.42
Gain_Exp.	63	-11.00	16.00	4.09	7.08	100.48
Valid N (listwise)	61					

Table 4. MI Gain Score of Control and Experimental Groups

		T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
MI	Equal variances assumed	5.948	121	.000
	Equal variances not assumed	5.969	104.184	.000

Table 5. The result of MI Data t-test

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.453 ^a	.206	.198	5.77681

^aPredictors: (Constant), X_Model

Table 6. The Summary of Linear Regression Model

The summary model above indicated that learning strategy, as a predictor, correlates with MI development by correlation coefficient of .453. Coefficient of determination of .206 means that implementation of learning strategy contributes 20.6% to the development of MI. Furthermore, based on the statistical calculation, the regression model can be generated as follow.

From the constant coefficient and variable coefficient in the Table 7, the regression model can be generated as: $Y = -1.737 + 5.825X$. In addition, the t-value and the significance level ($0.025 < .05$) in Table 7 shows that there is a significant effect of learning strategy toward the development of MI. It also indicates that the regression model generated is significantly used to predict the effect of learning strategy on the development of MI.

Beside the development of MI, the effectiveness of MI-based learning strategies in this study was also tested upon the improvement of students' SPS during and after learning. In the control group, SPS were not applied, therefore measurements are unnecessary. However, in the experimental group, the SPS were embedded within the MI-based learning. The development of SPS of students during and after learning was measured from the initial, the second, and the final mean scores of assessment of students' SPS. The results of the students' SPS can be seen in Table 8.

As indicated in Table 8, the SPS mean scores improved from the initial to the final assessment. This was calculated by the differences between the initial and the final score. Among the aspects of SPS, questioning skill reached the highest improvement.

The development of students' SPS was also proven by comparing the scores of the three times students' SPS assessment by using one-way ANOVA. The result of one-way ANOVA test showed that the scores of the initial, the second, and the final of students' SPS differ significantly with the sig. value = .013. Post hoc test using LSD performed on mean scores of the students' SPS implied no difference between mean scores of the initial and the second of students' SPS assessment with p value = .188. Conversely, there were differences between the mean scores of the initial and the final of students' SPS assessment with p value = .004, as well as between the mean score of the second and the final of students' SPS assessment with the p value = .049.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	-1.737	.765		-2.270	.025
	X_Model	5.825	1.082	.453	5.383	.000

Table 7. The Linear Regression Test Result

Measurement	N	Min	Max	Science Process Skills (SPS) Aspect					Mean
				Questioning	Predicting	Analyzing	Classifying	Concluding	
Initial	63	2.02	3.00	2.01	2.23	3.00	2.98	2.45	2.53
Second	63	2.60	3.01	2.79	2.72	2.77	3.01	2.60	2.78
Final	63	2.98	3.53	3.27	2.98	3.53	3.53	3.00	3.26
Improvement (final – initial)	–	–	–	1.26	0.75	0.53	0.65	0.55	0.75

Table 8. The Improvement of Students' SPS on Each Aspect

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.033	2	.016	6.382	.013
Within Groups	.031	12	.003		
Total	.064	14			

Table 9. The ANOVA Test Result of Students' SPS Data




Figure 2. Improvement of students' SPS score from initial to final measurements

The post hoc test results also indicated that the mean final SPS score (3.262 ± 0.27) was significantly higher than those of initial (2.534 ± 0.44) and the second scores (2.778 ± 0.15). It means that treatment Multiple Intelligences Based Teaching Strategy has improved students' SPS.

5. Discussion

The study tried to reveal that both learning strategies (the traditional and the MI-strategy) do effect on MI development and science process skills of the students. The result of t-test showed that the development of students' MI in control and experimental classes was different. Likewise, the simple linear regression proved that significant relationship observed between learning strategy and the development of MI. Learning strategy contributed 20.6% on the development of students' multiple intelligence. The rest were affected by other factors. The findings are supported by Santrock (2004), Ginnis (2002), and Gaundare and Yeole (2014) who found that intelligence was affected by several factors such as genetics, nutrition, as well as environment where someone grows up. Genetic factors do provide potential for the development of one's intelligence, but other factors such as nutrition and environment also affect the development of intelligences. According to Ginnis (2002) and Santrock (2004), the environment enriched by challenges and stimulation affects the memory connection, which means affecting the intelligence level.

The regression equation $Y = -1.737 + 5.825X$ implied that the increase of students' multiple intelligence was affected by the quality of learning strategy improvement. It was supported by Sternberg (Sternberg, 1984) in Triarchic Theory who stated that Intelligence get affected due to educational and environmental settings of an individual student. In this case, learning strategies can be assumed as an academic environment. Similarly, research conducted by Sánchez-Martín et al. (2017) proved that application of learning strategy based on MI theory in classroom enhanced not only content acquisition but also emotional intelligence.

At the beginning, the initial MI capabilities of both groups were quite similar. However, after the learning process, students in the experimental group showed an improvement in five types of intelligence, namely intrapersonal, kinesthetic, visual-spatial, interpersonal and musical. In contrast, for the control group students, only a little improvement in three types of intelligences, namely kinesthetic, interpersonal and linguistics intelligences.

This difference is caused by different students' activities in both groups. In the experimental group, the learning activities were designed to always involve MI as suggested by Gardner (1993) and Armstrong (2004). For instance, at the stage of concept introduction teacher used the real thing to stimulate visual-spatial intelligence of students. Teacher also used playing cards technique to enable interpersonal, kinesthetic and linguistics intelligence. For core activities, students did various activities involving MI such as telling daily activities, formulating questions, writing personal experiences related to the subject matter,

designing games, writing poems and songs related to the subject matter, as well as doing mini research in the school grounds.

In contrast, the control group used common methods such as lecture, discussion, and demonstration. At the beginning of the lesson, teacher asked questions about previous lessons. While in the core activities, students observed teacher's demonstration before discussing, doing worksheets and presenting. Activities done by the students did not cover the eight aspects of MI, as in the experimental group. Only the linguistic, kinesthetic, visual-spatial and interpersonal intelligence were embedded in the activities.

There is a decrease in percentage of logical-mathematical intelligence among the experimental group students. This may be related to the item in the MI instrument regarding mathematical logical intelligences. From the 7 items, 5 items are related to numbers, calculation, and interest in mathematics, and only two items relate to the ability of logic. According to Gardner (1993) and Armstrong (2004), logical-mathematical intelligence includes not only the mathematical ability but also the ability of mathematical logic, scientific method, deductive thinking, inductive, syllogisms, and analogies. Because science learning trains more logic skills through scientific process skills, and little to do with the mathematical calculations, the actual development of intelligence was the ability of scientific logic rather than mathematical intelligence. As a result, the enhancement of mathematical logic intelligence related to scientific logic was not captured by the instrument. The decreased in mathematical logic intelligence is similar to other studies conducted by Davis (2004) and Pociask and Settles (2007).

Another cause to this phenomenon relates to learning activities. In this study, students are trained to formulate the problem, predict, experiment and observe the results, analyze the data, classify and draw conclusions. Science material characteristics have few calculations leading to little learning concepts related to numbers. As a result, the intelligence-related mathematical logic mathematical calculations were not properly developed.

The higher percentage increase of the experimental group compared to the control group as indicated by the MI gain score differences between both groups is in the tandem with the results of research by Davis (2004), Pociask and Settles (2007), Hanafin (2014), Abdi et al. (2013), Widiana and Jampel (2016), and Sánchez-Martín et al. (2017). According to them, the implementation of MI-based learning will improve several types of intelligences such as interpersonal, intrapersonal, kinesthetic, and visual spatial. Besides, implementation of MI-based learning will also enhance students' emotional and creative thinking ability.

In addition to the change on the scores of MI in general, data on the improvement of dominant intelligence is also obtained from this study. According to Gardner (1993), the dominant intelligence is important, and the increase of dominant intelligence is something that is expected in a learning process. Although in doing something, people use MI simultaneously, dominant intelligence is necessary to adjust to new conditions, such as making decisions, solving problems, as well as viewing and managing the environment. Differences in dominant intelligences of each student lead to differences in the ability to receive lessons, so it is important to recognize the dominant intelligence of students in learning process (Emmiyati, Rasyid, Rahman, Arsyad & Dirawan, 2014; Celikoz, 2017). Knowing the level and type of student intelligence will help teacher to determine whether student is able to follow the lesson, identify the best way for each student, and predict the success or failure of the student after the lesson (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2003).

The enhancement of MI of students in the experimental group is due to repetitive multiple intelligence-based learning activities. The finding concurred with earlier studies conducted by Chuang et al. (2010: page 571), Eberle (2011: page 23), Nurulwahida and Azman (2014), and Nurulwahida et al. (2016). Nurulwahida et al. (2016) suggested that MI favored towards the students with treatment. The students in the treatment group improved on each multiple intelligence profile compared with students in the control group. Therefore, Nurulwahida et al. (2016) recommended that any enrichment activities conducted to enhance teaching and learning should include the MI concept. Furthermore, Yurt and Polat

(2015) found that MI-based learning was also influenced by the duration of its implementation. The longer the activities are implemented, the higher the results will be. Research carried out by Davis (2004) and Posciak and Settles (2007) also showed that by repeatedly performing 30 minutes of Multiple Intelligence learning every day the kinesthetic, visual-spatial, and interpersonal intelligences will improve.

The increase of intrapersonal intelligence is a consequence of communicating about self-interests and habits at the stage of self-reflection, as well as through formulating questions or writing personal experiences related to the subject matter. This is further enhanced through report writing expressing understanding of concepts.

The increase of intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence scores in the experimental group is due to MI-based instructional strategies designed to improve interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence at once such as in pair self-reflection. In the MI-based learning strategy developed, some activities such as self-identification by filling out a MI questionnaire before the learning process, telling about themselves in pairs, evaluating the results their own work, as well as writing a set of personal experiences related to the subject matter which can sharpen the students' sensitivity in reflection so that intrapersonal intelligence increased. According to Kagan (1994), Thompson and MacDougal (2002), the use of strategies which provide opportunities for students to discuss in pairs will help students develop intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence as well. Intrapersonal intelligence development is something that is expected to occur in a learning activity, as by having good intrapersonal intelligence, students will be successful lifelong learners.

The increase of interpersonal intelligence in the experimental group is also resulted by the use of cooperative learning strategies undertaken during the learning. Owolabi and Okebukola (2009), Talib and Bini-Kailani (2014) found that MI based learning conducted by using study group in cooperative situation provide significant different results from conventional learning. Important effect of cooperative learning was tolerance and wider acceptance of racial, cultural, and social difference, as well as cooperation and collaboration. Such attitude was one of the characters of interpersonal intelligence as proposed by Gardner (Campbell, 1997; Arends, 2008: page 6). According to Arends (2008), cooperative learning can improve cooperation which respect and support the development of interpersonal intelligence.

In addition to the MI, learning strategy effectiveness was demonstrated by the increase of SPS of students during and after the learning process. An increase on the experimental group scores of SPS in all aspects of skills trained was also found. The increasing scores trend reflected the process skill development of students taught using multiple intelligence-based learning. Active learning activities, conducted outside the classroom by implementing discovery strategy, led to good development of process skills aspects (Ting & Siew, 2014; Sen & Vekli, 2016).

In general, as is seen from the students' learning process skills scores, all aspects of the process skills develop well. It indicated that MI-based learning strategies train students to conduct process skills at each learning activity contributed to this increase. This is supported by research of Schwert (2004), Othman (2013), and Samsudin, Haniza, Talib and Ibrahim. (2015) which found relationship between MI and SPS, so that the application of MI based activities on one hand can influence the improvement of SPS on the other side. The finding also showed that among all process skills, questioning skill is the well-developed. At first, asking question skill is difficult for students. Almost all students need to read book first before formulating questions. Formulating questions and deepening the concept activities trained students to develop these process skills.

The development of science process skill during learning using MI-based learning is relevant with Sternberg theory (Sternberg, 1984; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2003) about Triarchic Intelligence theory. According to Sternberg (1984) and Sternberg and Grigorenko (2003), intelligence relates to a person's ability to process information. One type of intelligence in Triarchic theory, analytic intelligence, includes the actions of analyzing, comparing and assessing. Student activity working on worksheets that practice

SPS such as questioning, predicting, data analyzing, classifying and concluding in this study actually trained the ability to process information. Thus, practicing the science process skill actually trains the intelligence itself. That's why students' SPS evolved along with the development of multiple students' intelligence in the study

6. Conclusions and Implication for Future Research

This study results important findings of the feasibility of MI-based learning strategy applied in science lessons. Based on the results, it can be concluded that there is a significantly effect of MI-strategy on the development of students MI and SPS. The implementation of MI-strategy in this study improves MI and SPS of students. Six stages of the MI based learning process, which consist of (1) self-reflection (2) introduction of the concept, (3) formulation of the question, (4) concept exploration, (5) talent show, and (6) formulation of conclusions, proved to be effective in improving five types of intelligences, namely interpersonal, intrapersonal, visual-spatial, kinesthetic and musical intelligence. The simple learning strategy steps make this strategy easy to use in the classroom, without having to create a special program as it was applied to the previous researches.

This finding also completes the results of the previous researches on the application of MI theory in learning that is aimed at improving student achievement. Although the improvement was not so high, the implementation of the MI-based learning strategy applied to science lesson not only enhances achievement, but also improves students' MI and SPS. The effects of repetitive exercises in train of SPS improved students' SPS, especially the questioning skills.

The result of this study contributes to improving the quality of science learning in the future. Learning is no longer oriented to improving academic ability only, but also attempted to improve the science process skill and potential of students.

7. Limitations and Suggestions

The development of intelligence is a variable that is not easily measured and observed. The use of questionnaire seems insufficient to measure the development of intelligence. It is needed other supporting instruments to measure intelligence more accurate. In this study, the students' MI slightly increased only. To increase the MI development, the research should be conducted longer and involve more subjects.

In addition, MI instrument which measure the mathematical logic should be developed further in order to focus not only to measure the intelligence of mathematics but also balanced in measuring intelligence of logic.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received financial support by the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education, Indonesia.

References

- Abdi, A., Laei, S., & Ahmadyan, H. (2013). The effect of teaching strategy based on multiple intelligences on students' academic achievement in science course. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 1(4), 281-284.
- Arends, R.I. (2008). *Learning to Teach* (7th ed.). Translated by Helly Prajitno Soetjipto & Sri Mulyantini Soetjipto. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

- Armstrong, T. (2004). *Multiple Intelligences in the classroom* (2nd ed.). Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- Campbell, L. (1997). How teachers interpret MI theory. *Educational Leadership*, 55(1), 14-19.
- Celikoz, M. (2017). Multiple intelligence distribution of prospective teachers: the case at Yıldız Technical University NE University, Kemal Akman Vocational School. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(2). 206
- Chuang, T.Y., Su, S.H., & Tsao, Y.P. (2010). Using handheld gaming device to increase multiple intelligences with digital puzzle game. Wong, S.L. et al. (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Computers in Education* (571-573). Putrajaya, Malaysia: Asia-Pacific Society for Computers in Education.
- Davis, L. (2004). Using the theory of multiple intelligences to increase fourth-grade students' academic achievement in science. *An Applied Dissertation Submitted to the Fischler School of Education and Human Services Nova Southeastern University*. Available at: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED491477>
- Eberle, S.G. (2011). Playing with the multiple intelligences how play helps them grow. *American Journal of Play*, 14(1), 19-51.
- Emmiyati, N., Rasyid, M.A., Rahman, M.A., Arsyad, A., & Dirawan, G.D. (2014). Multiple intelligences profiles of junior secondary school students in Indonesia. *International Education Studies*, 7(11), 103-110. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n11p103>
- Gagne, R.M. (1977). *The Conditions of Learning Third Edition*. New York: Holt Saunders International Editions.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books Hons of Learning Harper Collins Publ. Inc.
- Gaundare, V.S., Yeole, A.D. (2014). An experimental study on factors affecting the multiple intelligences of MBA students with the help of informational technology. *IBMRD's Journal of Management and Research*, 3(1), 94-103.
- Ghamrawi, N. (2014). Multiple Intelligences and ESL Teaching and Learning: An Investigation in KG II Classrooms in One Private School in Beirut, Lebanon. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 25(1), 25-46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202X13513021>
- Ginnis, P. (2002). *Teacher's Toolkit raise Classroom Achievement with Strategies for Every Learner*. Wales: Crown House Publ Ltd.
- Griggs, L., Barney, S., Brown-Sederberg, J., Collins, E., Keith, S., & Iannacci, L. (2009). Varying pedagogy to address student multiple intelligences. *Human Architecture*, 7(1), 55-60.
- Hanafin, J. (2014). Multiple intelligences theory, action research and teacher professional development: the Irish MI project. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(4), 126-142. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n4.8>
- Hergenhahn, B.R., & Olson, M.H. (2009). *Theories of Learning (Teori Belajar)*. Translated by Tri Wibowo. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Kagan, S. (1994). *Cooperative Learning*. San Juan, CA: Kegan Cooperative Learning.
- Linn, R.L., & Gronlund, N.E. (2009). *Measurement and Assessment in Teaching*. Ohio: Prentice Hall.
- Madkour, M., & Mohamed, R. (2016). Identifying college students' multiple intelligences to enhance motivation and language proficiency. *English Language Teaching*, 9(6), 92-107. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n6p92>

- McClellan, J.A., & Conti, G.J. (2008). Identifying the multiple intelligences of your students. *Journal of Adult Education*, 37(1), 13-31.
- Nurulwahida, A., & Azman, A. (2014). The effectiveness of the modular enrichment activities based on Gardner multiple intelligences and Sternberg thinking skills. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5 (2), 55-62.
- Nurulwahida, A., Yaacob, A., & Shaik-Abdullah, S. (2016). The multiple intelligence-based enrichment module on the development of human potential: examining its impact and the views of teachers. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 13(2), 175-200.
- Othman, I. (2013). Elements of multiple intelligences in teaching and learning activities and the effect on students' achievement based on gender. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 2(3), 28-32. <https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-0232832>
- Owolabi, T., & Okebukola, F. (2009). Improving the reading ability of science students through study groups and multiple intelligences. *Online Submission, US-China Education Review*, 6(2), 38-44.
- Padilla, M.J. (1990). *The science process skills. Research masters to the science teachers*. Reston VA: NARST Publication.
- Pociask, A., & Settles, J.S. (2007). *Increasing Student Achievement through Brain Based Studies*. Master Thesis in Teaching and Leadership saint Xavier University Chicago, Illinois.
- Samsudin, M.A., Haniza, N.M., Talib, C.A., & Ibrahim, H.M.M., (2015). The relationship between multiple intelligences with preferred science teaching and science process skills. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 9(1), 53-59.
- Sánchez-Martín, J., Álvarez-Gragera, G.J., Dávila-Acedo, M.A., & Mellado, V. (2017). Teaching technology: from knowing to feeling enhancing emotional and content acquisition performance through Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory in technology and design lessons. *Journal of Technology and Science Education*, 7(1), 58-79. <https://doi.org/10.3926/jotse.238>
- Santrock (2004). *Educational Psychology* (2nd ed.). Dallas: Mc Graw Hill Co.
- Schwert, A. (2004). *Using the Theory of Multiple Intelligences to Enhance Science Education*. Thesis for The Master of Education degree in Secondary Education. Ohio: University of Toledo.
- Sen, C., & Vekli, G.S. (2016). The impact of inquiry based instruction on science process skills and self-efficacy perceptions of pre-service science teachers at a university level biology laboratory. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(3), 603-612. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.040319>
- Slavin, R.E. (2006). *Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Pearson Education.
- Sternberg, R.J., & Grigorenko, E.L. (2003). Teaching for successful intelligence: principles, procedures, and practices. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 27(2/3), 207-228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320302700206>
- Sternberg, R.J. (1984). Toward a triarchic theory of human intelligence. *Behavioral and Brain Science*, 7(2), 269-287 (published online). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00044629>
- Streiner, D.L, Norman, G.R. (2000). *Health measurement scales: A practical guide to their development and use*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Talib, A., & Bini-Kailani, I. (2014). Problem based learning in cooperative situation (PBLCS) and its impact on development of personal intelligence. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education.*, 3(4), 236-244. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v3i4.6969>
- Thompson, B.R., & MacDougall, G.D. (2002). Intelligent teaching. *The Science Teacher*, 69(1), 44-48.

Ting, K.L., & Siew, N.M. (2014). Effects of outdoor school ground lessons on students' science process skills and scientific curiosity. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 3(4), 96-107.

<https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v3n4p96>

Widiana, I.W., & Jampel, I.N. (2016). Improving students' creative thinking and achievement through the implementation of multiple intelligence approach with mind mapping. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 5(3), 246-254. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v5i3.4546>

Yurt, E., & Polat, S. (2015). The effectiveness of multiple intelligence applications on academic achievement: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 6(1), 84-122.

<https://doi.org/10.17499/jsser.75161>

Published by OmniaScience (www.omniascience.com)

Journal of Technology and Science Education, 2018 (www.jotse.org)



Article's contents are provided on an Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 Creative commons International License.

Readers are allowed to copy, distribute and communicate article's contents, provided the author's and JOTSE journal's names are included. It must not be used for commercial purposes. To see the complete licence contents, please visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.