

# The Influence of Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence on Students Learning Outcomes in English at SMA Negeri 1 Sidrap

Rini Handayani<sup>a</sup>, Geminastiti Sakkir<sup>b,\*</sup>, & Rosmini Kasman<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang, Indonesia

<sup>b</sup>Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

---

## Abstract

This study aims to determine verbal linguistic intelligence, to determine the results learning English especially on students' speaking, and to find out the influence of verbal linguistic intelligence on learning outcomes in English students of class X IPA 1 of SMAN 1 Sidrap. This research is quantitative research; this type of research is a pre-experimental design research. The population in this study was all students of class X SMAN 1 Sidrap, amounting to 182 people, while the study sample was the entire population, namely students of class X IPA 1 SMAN 1 Sidrap, amounting to 32 people. The instruments used in this study were interviews, questionnaires, treatment and recording tools. The data analysis technique used is descriptive statistical analysis and simple regression test through the application of SPSS. Based on the results of descriptive statistical analysis, verbal linguistic intelligence obtained an average value of 84.94, the lowest value obtained 0, and the highest value 107 and are at a percentage of 56.25% are in the average category. The results of learning English in this case speaking students obtained an average value of 96, the lowest value of 0, and the highest value of 96 and are in the good category with a percentage of 65.625%. The simple regression test results obtained  $\text{sig} < \alpha$  ( $0,000 < 0,05$ ). This means that  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted, which means there is a positive influence between verbal linguistic intelligence on learning outcomes of students of class X Science 1 of SMAN 1 Sidrap.

*Keywords:* Verbal linguistic intelligence, learning outcomes, speaking.

---

## 1. Introduction

The language used to talk about living things like humans and animals. Language has many forms and variations. Each region has its own color and language characteristics. The language of people in the city is different from the language of the interior or people in remote areas. More so if the language used between countries with other countries, of course very different. Language can be in the form of sound, body language (signs) and writing. Language is "a set of sentences (limited or unlimited), each limited in length and built from a limited set of elements" (Chomsky 1957: 13). In addition, language also has a relationship with intelligence. Intelligent language is intelligence in using or processing effective words, both written and oral. This understanding can be interpreted as linguistic intelligence which is a verbal or non-verbal language that is very important and must be possessed by all humans that are used as a means to communicate with other humans. In languages that have skills that must be learned so that Linguistic Intelligence can be developed. These skills are speaking, reading, listening and writing. These skills need to be drilled and developed through the learning process at school. Gardner (1983, p. 81) said that intelligence is the ability to solve problems, or to create products, which are valued by one of the more cultural settings.

In the learning process, students have their own intelligence which must continue to be trained and developed. One of the intelligence possessed by students is Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence. Verbal linguistic intelligence is intelligence in

---

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [geminastitisakkir@unm.ac.id](mailto:geminastitisakkir@unm.ac.id) (Geminastiti Sakkir)



word processing and is the most universal intelligence among the seven intelligence in the theory of Multiple Intelligence Armstrong in Halimah et al (2018). Verbal Linguistic Intelligence is the intelligence in processing words or the ability to use words effectively both verbally and in writing. People who are intelligent in this field can argue, persuade people, entertain, or teach effectively through spoken words (Sujiono & Sujiono, 2010). Verbal linguistic intelligence is an understanding of phonology, syntax, and semantics of the language, and its pragmatic use to convince others with action, help people to remember information, explain or communicate knowledge, or reflect on the language itself. Examples include storytellers, orators, poets, editors, and novelists (Armstrong, 2014).

Then, in 1999, Gardner returned to produce intellectual works entitled *Intelligence Reframed* which states that the human brain holds at least nine agreed-upon types of intelligence, while the rest remains a mystery, consisting of (1) Linguistic Intelligence, (2) Logical-Mathematical Intelligence, (3) Spatial Intelligence, (4) Kinesthesia Intelligence, (5) Musical Intelligence, (6) Interpersonal Intelligence, (7) Intelligence Sometimes Personal Intelligence, (8) Naturalist Intelligence, and (9) Existentialist Intelligence.

Based on the foregoing it can be stated that intelligence plays an important role in achieving success. Learning ability of students, as well as the ability of teachers to know and utilize Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence of students will grow in achieving learning goals. So that the desired learning objectives are achieved in accordance with the indicators of achievement. In this case, the intelligence of the students is the one of the factors that can effects the students learning outcomes. Learning outcomes in the form of behavioral and personal changes that are functional-structural, substantial and behavioral material, in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor areas (Aisha, 2015). Learning outcomes simply, are the abilities obtained by children after going through learning activities because learning itself is a process of someone who is trying to obtain a form of behavior change that is relatively staring.

In learning activities or instructional activities, usually the teacher sets learning goals. Children who succeed in learning are those who succeed in achieving learning or instructional goals (Susanto, 2013). Student learning outcomes essentially are changes in behavior as a result of broader learning includes cognitive, affective, and psychomotor fields. The cognitive field consists of the level of student knowledge, the affective field about students' attitudes and behavior, and the psychomotor field which is about student skills. To find out the learning outcomes of students, a measuring instrument in the form of learning outcomes is used. But of course, to get the results of learning, this cannot be separated from the learning process carried out through the stages.

The Learning Process is one of the Teachings and Learning Activities carried out both formally (through school) and non-formal (courses etc.) with the aim to train, develop and hone skills and intelligence. (Sugandi (2006: 9) said that learning is a collection of processes that are individual, which converts stimuli from one's environment into a number of information which can further lead to learning outcomes in the form of long-term memory). In the process of language learning, each student has their own individual skills that must be developed which can later be measured as student learning outcomes. One of the skills possessed by students from some of these skills is the ability to convey spoken the language well, systematically and easily understood. In other words, Speaking has a very important role to convey spoken language directly to others. This spoken language is very closely related to Students' Speaking.

According to Thornbury Speaking is an important part of everyday life that is sometimes forgotten. Every day there are so many words that we say from the basic to the less important words. Speaking also an expression of one's thoughts and feelings in the form of linguistic sounds.

Furthermore, Grauberg (1997: 201) reveals that many who think especially in this case are students; the main purpose of learning the language of love is to be able to speak the language.

Although speaking is very important, we often get some obstacles and problems of students in terms of speaking. Many factors may be the cause of the low speaking of students. One of the factors that can influence is the teacher factor; it is possible if the instructor does not provide exercises for speaking. A teacher needs to provide exercises to familiarize students in speaking. Another factor that might influence is the teaching method given by the instructor which is not suitable or suitable for speaking learning. Not all methods can be used in learning; there may be methods that are appropriate or suitable in learning. Reading but are not right for learning speaking. Therefore teachers must

actively find teaching methods for learning speaking. It could also be due to inadequate facilities and infrastructure. This can cause teachers to almost never provide speaking exercises for their students through audio visuals, laptops, speakers, and others. The next factor is that students do not understand the material in speaking. Speaking so they have difficulty understanding it. The last possibility is the factors of the students themselves such as shame, laziness, lack of motivation, and fear of being wrong. This last factor is felt by researchers more influential on students' speaking and on the researchers themselves.

This fact shows that learning activities are still low and only a small proportion of students are motivated to speak English both with friends and teachers. So the need for renewal in the quality of learning, starting from planning learning, selecting interesting material and adjusted to student competencies. Constraints like the above often researchers get in observations made during the apprenticeship process at school, both apprenticeship 2 and apprenticeship 3. In addition, researchers observe that the level of students' ability to process words is still low, especially in English subjects. Only a few students were able to process words correctly and even then included students who were active in school organizations or students who were categorized as smart students in school. Yet as we know that English is very important, especially in the aspect of speaking in this era. From this problem was born curiosity for researcher whether Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence affects student learning outcomes, especially the ability to speak on English subjects. So the researcher wants to conduct a study with the title "The Influence of Verbal- Linguistic Intelligence on Student Learning Outcomes in English at SMA Negeri 1 Sidrap".

## **2. Methodology**

### *2.1. Research Design*

In the research, the researcher uses quantitative research. The research applied pre-experimental design as a part of experiment design of quantitative research where the researcher only used one class to whom the treatment was applied.

### *2.2. Population and Sample*

Population of the research is the students of grade ten in academic year 2020-2021 of SMA Negeri 1 Sidrap. The students were spread in four classes of exact science and three classes of social science. The total number of exact was 182 students. In this research, the research applied cluster sampling technique in which the researcher applied X IPA 1 class as his research sample with 32 numbers of students.

### *2.3. Research Instrument*

The instrument of the research is The interview and questionnaire was use to know the Influence of verbal- linguistic intelligence on student's speaking, Treatment, was given to student after the pre-test to analyzed the student verbal-linguistic intelligence in their speaking, and Recording tool to record when researcher interview student. Researcher can use camera phone.

### *2.4. Technique of Data Analysis*

In this research, the data collected after a given instrument of collecting data to the respondents (students). The data analyzed through quantitative analysis. To get the score, the researcher used the scoring scale which includes the accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility on the students' pieces of speaking. The data was analyzed by employing the following procedures: In this research, the data were collected after the researcher gave the instrument to the respondents or students. In collecting data analysis through tests, the data are analyzed through quantitative analysis. To assess the students speaking, the researcher has some criteria of assessment of speaking.

#### (1) Analysis of Test Results.

(2) The result of the student final score analysis by using SPSS application version 21.

### 3. Findings and Discussions

#### 3.1. The Score of Pretest and Posttest

Table 1. The Classification of the Students' Scores of Pre-test and Post-test

Classification	Score	Pre-test		Post-test	
		F	%	F	%
Excellent	85-100	1	3,125%	7	21,875%
Good	65-84	12	37,5%	21	65,625%
Average	55-64	13	40,625%	3	9,375%
Poor	35-54	3	9,375%	0	0%
Very poor	0-34	2	6,25%	1	3,125%
Total		32	100%	32	100%

After giving questionnaire, the research analyzed the students' score of verbal linguistic intelligence questionnaire. The scoring range of verbal-linguistic intelligence questionnaire shows that there are 0% of verbal linguistic intelligence are in the category of very superior, superior and high average, there are 56.25% are in the average category with a frequency of 18 students, there are 18.75% are in the low average category with a frequency of 6 participants students, there are 12.5% are in the borderline and extremely low category with a total frequency of 4 students. Based on these data it can be concluded that students of class X IPA 1 of SMAN 1 Sidrap have relatively average verbal linguistic intelligence with a percentage of 56.25%. The classification of the students' scores of pre-test and post-test showed that the students' score in test result for pre-test and post-test. In the pre-test there are 1 (3,125%) students' were classified into excellent, there are 12 (37,5%) students' were classified into good, there are 13 (40,625%) students' were classified into average, there are 3 (9,375%) students were classified into poor, and there are 2 (6,25%) students were into classified very poor. While the post-test, there are 7 (21,875%) students were classified as excellent, there are 21 (65,625%) students were classified into good, there are 3 (9,375%) students were classified into average, and there are 0 (0%) students were classified as very poor. There was no students' score classified poor. It meant before the researcher was giving treatment, the level mastery of students' speaking categories average and but after giving treatment, the level mastery of students' speaking categories good.

#### 3.2. Normality Test

Table 2. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z Normality Test through the SPSS App

		Unstandardized Residual
N		32
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	7.34874265
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.091
	Positive	.091
	Negative	-.086
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.517
<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</b>		<b>.952</b>

The normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z test via the SPSS application the Asymp.Sig value was obtained. (2-tailed) of 0.952 means that the significance (sig.) of 0.952 is greater than 0.05 (> 0.05), it can be concluded that the data is normally distributed and can be continued with regression analysis.

### 3.3. Linearity Test

Table 3. Linearity Test

			Sig.
SPEAKING* INTELLIGENCE	Between Groups	(Combined) Linearity	.001
		<b>Deviation from Linearity</b>	<b>.344</b>
	Within Groups		
	Total		

The results of the linearity X test against Y obtained sig values.  $0.344 > 0.05$  so that it can be concluded that between X and Y have a linear relationship.

### 3.4. Simple Regression Test

Table 4. Simple Regression Analysis Results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	14.502	5.998		2.418	.022
	INTELLIJEN CE	.724	.069	.887	<b>10.511</b>	<b>.000</b>

The results of data analysis conducted through the SPSS application shows that the value of t arithmetic = 10,511 with a significance value of 0,000 means that the significance of 0.00 is smaller than the probability of 0.05, meaning that the independent variable significantly influences the dependent variable.

The data shows that alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted and null hypothesis (H0) is rejected. So it can be concluded that there is a significant positive effect (sig <0.05) between verbal linguistic intelligence on learning outcomes of class X science students of SMAN 1 Sidrap. From the simple regression analysis test, the results of the study showed that there was a significant influence between verbal linguistic intelligence on the learning outcomes of students in class X IPA 1 of SMAN 1 Sidrap. This is reflected in the results of the analysis using simple regression analysis obtained by the equation  $Y = 14.502 + 0,724X$ . Based on hypothesis testing with a P value (P = 0,000 <0.05).

Verbal linguistic intelligence is one of eight types of intelligence possessed by each individual. This is based on the theory of Multiple Intelligence introduced in 1983 by Howard Gardner in Thomas Armstrong. Intelligence or often called Intelligence can be improved and developed throughout a person's life.

According to Gardner intelligence is the ability to solve problems, or to create products, which are valued by one of the more cultural settings. (Gardner (1983, p. 81). Verbal linguistic intelligence is intelligence in word processing and is the most universal intelligence among the seven intelligence in the theory of Multiple Intelligence Armstrong in

Halimah et al (2018). Verbal Linguistic Intelligence is the intelligence in processing words or the ability to use words effectively both verbally and in writing. People who are intelligent in this field can argue, persuade people, entertain, or teach effectively through spoken words (Sujiono & Sujiono, 2010). Verbal linguistic intelligence is an understanding of phonology, syntax, and semantics of the language, and its pragmatic use to convince others with action, help people to remember information, explain or communicate knowledge, or reflect on the language itself. Examples include storytellers, orators, poets, editors, and novelists (Armstrong, 2014).

At SMAN 1 Sidrap, learning English subjects has standards of competence in listening, speaking, reading and writing. Listening competence is related to students' ability to understand stories about an event and short stories that are told orally. Speaking competence is related to students' ability to express thoughts and feelings verbally. Reading competence is related to students' ability to understand texts by skimming, scanning reading, and reading stories. Writing competence is the ability of students to express thoughts, feelings, information, and facts in writing in summary form.

To achieve student learning outcomes in English subjects, students' talents and abilities are needed in the language field; the ability possessed is verbal linguistic intelligence. The results of this study indicate that verbal linguistic intelligence is very influential on student learning outcomes in this case speaking of students of class X IPA 1 SMAN 1 Sidrap.

In table 11, in assessing comprehensibility of speaking in pre-test and post-test showed a significantly different score, where the students in pre-test had 76 scores and in the post-test

86 score. These also proved in the mean score where the students in pre-test 3,3 score and in post-test had 3,7 score. It means that the students were good in comprehensibility as a part of assessing speaking after taught by using the audio-lingual method.

#### **4. Conclusions**

Based on the results of data analysis and discussion, it can be concluded that the verbal-linguistic intelligence influence students learning outcomes at SMA Negeri 1 Sidrap. It is proven of the data obtained from the results of a study of 32 students regarding verbal linguistic intelligence of class X science students of SMAN 1 Sidrap are in the average category of 18 people with a percentage of 56.25%. Besides that, from the results of a study of 32 students regarding learning outcomes in this case speaking of class X students of Science 1 of SMAN 1 Sidrap after giving treatment, there are 21 (65.625%) students were classified into good. In addition, there is a significant influence of verbal linguistic intelligence on speaking at class X IPA 1 SMAN 1 Sidrap students. This is seen from the results of the analysis using a regression test proving that the regression equation obtained  $Y = 14.502 + 0,724X$  From the significant test results, a significant value of 0,000 is obtained where a significant value of  $0,000 < 0.05$ , then  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_1$  is accepted. So it can be concluded that there is a significant influence between verbal linguistic intelligence on students' speaking (students learning outcomes).

#### **References**

- Ahmad, S. (2013). *Teori Belajar dan Pembelajaran di Sekolah Dasar*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Aisha, S. (2015). *Perkembangan Peserta Didik dan Bimbingan Belajar*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- Armstrong, T. (2014). *Kecerdasan Jamak dalam Membaca dan Menulis*. Jakarta: Permata Putri Media.
- Atmowardoyo, H., Weda, S., & Sakkir, G. (2020). Information Technology used by Millennial Good English Language Learners in an Indonesian University to Improve their English Skills. *Solid State Technology*, 63(5), 9532-9547.

- Atmowardoyo, H., Weda, S., & Sakkir, G. (2021). Learning Strategies in English Skills used by Good Language Learners in Millennial Era: A Positive Case Study in Universitas Negeri Makassar. *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8(1), 28-40.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind*. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Gardner, H., & Hatch, T. (1989). Multiple intelligences go to school: Educational implications of the theory of multiple intelligences. *Educational Researcher*, 18(8), 4-9.
- Grauberg, W. (1997). *The Elements of Foreign Language Teaching*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- Halimah, A., et al. (2018). Pengaruh Kecerdasan Verbal Linguistik Terhadap Hasil Belajar pada Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Indonesia. Retrieved from: <http://journal.uin-alauddin.ac.id/index.php/auladuna/article/view/162-169>. Accessed on 2019. 11: 24 a.m.
- Kasmawati, K., & Sakkir, G. (2020). IMPROVING STUDENTS READING COMPREHENSION THROUGH “SURVEY, QUESTION, READING, RECITE, REVIEW (SQ3R)” STRATEGY. *Interference: Journal of Language, Literature, and Linguistics*, 1(2), 92-99.
- Nurlaelah, N., & Sakkir, G. (2020). Model Pembelajaran Respons Verbal dalam Kemampuan Berbicara. *Edumaspol: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 4(1), 113-122.
- Rahman, H., Sakkir, G., & Khalik, S. (2020). Audio-Lingual Method to Improve Students’s Speaking Skill at Smp Negeri 1 Baranti. *La Ogi: English Language Journal*, 6(1), 15-21.
- Ririantika, R., Usman, M., Aswadi, A., & Sakkir, G. (2020). PENERAPAN MODEL PEMBELAJARAN TIPE “MAKE A MATCH” TERHADAP HASIL BELAJAR BAHASA INDONESIA SISWA KELAS VIII SMP NEGERI 1 BARANTI KABUPATEN SIDENRENG RAPPANG. *Cakrawala Indonesia*, 5(1), 1-6.
- Sakkir, G. (2018). *Writing: Beginner*. Deepublish.
- Sakkir, G., & Dollah, S. (2019). FACEBOOK-BASED WRITING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL IN ENGLISH CLASS: LECTURERS’PERCEPTION. *Seltics*, 2(2), 76-83.
- Sakkir, G., & Dollah, S. (2019). Measuring students’writing skills using Facebook group application in EFL context. *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI)*, 2(3), 69-72. <https://doi.org/10.33750/ijhi.v2i3.43>
- Sakkir, G., & Usman, M. (2018). MOVIE IN ENHANCING STUDENTS’VOCABULARY. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan Sastra*, 2(2).
- Sakkir, G., Dollah, S., & Ahmad, J. (2020). Favorite E-Learning Media in Pandemic Covid-19 Era. *Jurnal Studi Guru Dan Pembelajaran*, 3(3), 480-485.
- Sakkir, G., Dollah, S., & Ahmad, J. (2021). CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD EFL TEACHER: INDONESIAN EFL STUDENTS PERSPECTIVES. *JURNAL NALAR PENDIDIKAN*, 9(1), 52-59.
- Sakkir, G., Dollah, S., & Ahmad, J. (2021). E-Learning in COVID-19 Situation: Students’ Perception. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 1(1), 9-15.
- Sakkir, G., Dollah, S., Arsyad, S., & Ahmad, J. (2021). Need Analysis for Developing Writing Skill Materials Using Facebook for English Undergraduate Students. *International Journal of Language Education*, 5(1), 542-551.
- Sakkir, G., Zulfirman, Z., Mahmud, N., & Ahmad, J. (2020). Improving speaking ability using English" Shock Day" approach. *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI)*, 3(2), 56-59.
- Saputra, U. R., Maulina, M., Nasrullah, R., & Sakkir, G. (2021). Students’ Sentence Errors on WhatsApp Daily Status: A Literature Review. *Celebes Journal of Language Studies*, 23-31.
- Sugandi, A & Haryanto. (2004). *Teori Pembelajaran*. Semarang: UPT MKK Unnes.

Sujiono, Y. N., & Sujiono, B. (2010). *Bermain Kreatif Berbasis Kecerdasan Jamak*. Jakarta: Indeks.

Syatriana, E., & Sakkir, G. (2020). Implementing Learning Model Based on Interactive Learning Community for EFL Students of Muhammadiyah University. *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(1), 24-30.