



Analyzing the Relationship between Senior High School Teachers' Extent of Application of the Linguistic Intelligence and the Student Motivation in the Classroom

Martina D. Peñalber

Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 14 (5)

<https://jett.labosfor.com/>

Date of reception: 14 Jan 2023

Date of revision: 06 Mar 2023

Date of acceptance: 10 Mar 2023

Martina D. Peñalber (2023). Analyzing the Relationship between Senior High School Teachers' Extent of Application of the Linguistic Intelligence and the Student Motivation in the Classroom. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, Vol. 14(5). 419-438

¹Faculty member, Isabela State University, Philippines



Analyzing the Relationship between Senior High School Teachers' Extent of Application of the Linguistic Intelligence and the Student Motivation in the Classroom

Martina D. Peñalber

Faculty member, Isabela State University, Philippines

Email: martinapenalber1@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to analyze the relationship between senior high school teachers' extent of application of the Linguistic Intelligence theory and their perception regarding student motivation in the classroom. The motivation of the study focuses on how the linguistic intelligence affects the delivery of instruction and the possible teaching technique and innovation for the teachers. The study used the descriptive-correlational method of research, and Kendall Tau b was used to establish the connection for the interpretation and implications of such findings. It is discovered that teachers' levels of perception about student motivation, their levels of self-efficacy for motivating students, and the strategies they employ in the classroom are significantly and directly related to the extent to which they apply the linguistic intelligence theory in the classroom. Additionally, there was a substantial and direct correlation between their level of perception of student motivation, their level of self-efficacy in inspiring students, and the methods they employ in the classroom. This research implies that teachers employ tactics and seek to coordinate their work with the factors they believe motivate their students. A study on the effects of technology on linguistic intelligence and other Multiple Intelligence procedures might be carried out to assist teachers in bettering their comprehension of their students.

Keywords: GMI, Kendall Tau, Multiple Intelligence, Linguistic Intelligence

INTRODUCTION

Motivating students can be challenging, but the benefits are well worth the effort. Motivated pupils are more eager to participate and learn. Simply put, teaching a motivated class is pleasurable for both the teacher and the students. Some students are intrinsically driven and innately enjoy learning. But even with students who lack this intrinsic motivation, a skilled teacher can make learning enjoyable and encourage them to attain their full potential; there are five effective techniques to motivate pupils to learn. One way is by motivating students. Students are more likely to be excited about studying if they perceive that their work has been acknowledged and appreciated by their teachers. To make their students feel valued, instructors should encourage open conversation and unfettered thought. They must be enthusiastic, frequently commend their students, and acknowledge their contributions. If the classroom is a welcoming and respectful environment, children will be more motivated to study. A "good job" or "beautiful work" can be extremely beneficial. The second is requiring student participation. Involving them in classroom activities is one approach to motivate and instruct kids in responsibility. Make participation enjoyable by assigning each student a task. Giving students a sense of ownership enables them to feel successful and promotes class involvement. The third one provides benefits. Setting expectations and making acceptable requests fosters student participation, but there are occasions when kids require an additional push in the correct direction. Offering students little rewards makes studying enjoyable and encourages them to exert effort. Rewards provide pupils with a sense of accomplishment and motivate them to work toward a certain objective. The fourth is creativity. Teachers should vary the arrangement of their classes to avoid boredom. As an alternative to lectures, teaching through games and conversations, and encouraging students to argue and expand the subject matter with visual aids such as colorful charts, graphs, and films. The fifth is making real-world connections. If students do not believe that what they are studying is significant, they will not be motivated to learn, hence it is crucial to establish the subject's relevance to them. The significance of a subject is increased by demonstrating that "actual" people utilize it every day. They may never be enthusiastic about the subject matter, but if they can see how it pertains to them, they may be encouraged to study diligently (Guide to Motivating Students, 2022).

Teachers who understand student motivation can greatly enhance the classroom experience and student performance. According to Ferlazzo (2015), to inspire intrinsic motivation as a daily part of education, schools must nurture the conditions for student growth through autonomy, competence, relatedness, and relevance. Thus, he suggested some practical classroom strategies to reinforce each of these four qualities: (1) Autonomy:

Providing students with freedom of choice is one strategy for promoting learner autonomy. Educators commonly view this idea of choice through the lens of organizational and procedural choice. Organizational choice, for example, might mean students having a voice in seating assignments or members of their small learning groups. Procedural choice could include a choice from a list of homework assignments and what form a final project might take -- a book, poster, or skit; (2) Competence: Feedback, done well, is ranked by education researcher John Hattie as number 10 out of 150 influences on student achievement; (3) Relatedness: A high-quality relationship with a teacher whom they respect is a key element of helping students develop intrinsic motivation; and (4) Relevance: Have students write about how they see what they are learning as relevant to their lives.

Lorenzo and Lorenzo (2015) conducted a study on the learning styles of teacher education students that served as a foundation for enhancing the teaching and learning process based on Howard Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences, which states that humans have nine distinct types of intelligence that reflect different ways of interacting with the world. The majority of students prefer to study in a calm, well-lit room with a cool temperature while seated on comfortable chairs or pillows in an informal atmosphere, according to the findings of the survey. Regarding emotional preferences, the majority of students are self-motivated, prefer to study one lesson at a time, prefer not to be reminded to study, and prefer to be informed precisely what and how to accomplish things. The majority of individuals like to study and learn in pairs. In terms of physiological inclinations, the majority of individuals choose learning by doing; eating or nibbling while studying; studying in the morning; and with fewer breaks and movements. In terms of psychological preferences, the majority of individuals are analytic, favor sequential and reflective learning, or take time to make decisions.

Leonardo (2015) conducted a study with the objective of incorporating multiple intelligences ideas into the teaching and evaluation of mathematics for college freshman at a Philippine state university. The study utilized a semi-experimental design with unequal groups and two intact classrooms to compare the effects of multiple intelligences instruction and evaluation on the experimental group to the traditional lecture-discussion method on the control group. The achievement posttest findings of the two groups demonstrated that students in the multiple intelligences' instruction group did much better than students in the traditional education group. Additionally, the MI group demonstrated more positive learning experiences.

Cancellieri (2018) investigated teachers' perceptions of student motivation and the effects these perceptions may have on their teaching as well as on their students' learning. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivators are analyzed, as well as instructional tactics to encourage intrinsic motivators. The study revealed that although teachers were aware that intrinsic motivation is optimal, they largely depended on extrinsic motivators. The study revealed that teachers require time to design and implement ways to foster intrinsic motivation in their students.

According to Taspinar (2004), teachers adopt task-related tactics independently of the motivation levels of their students. However, teachers should consider the motivation of their students while planning courses and choosing activities to promote learning in the classroom. Depending on how students perceive their teachers' use of instructional strategies, tasks should be designed to address students' needs, interests, and present skill levels. This study's findings can contribute to the production of instructional materials because it tackled motivation as a practical classroom issue.

Varughese (2017) investigated the effect of instructor gender on student motivation and engagement. The study examined if there is a statistically significant difference in the motivation and engagement scores of males taught by male teachers, males taught by female teachers, females taught by male teachers, and females taught by female teachers enrolled in online science courses. Exploring this topic enabled educators to identify techniques for high-quality instruction and learning, boost graduation rates, and reduce student delinquency. Using a causal-comparative research design and the Motivation and Engagement Scale (MES), 629 undergraduate students enrolled in an online science course at a for-profit university were surveyed in this quantitative study. Data was obtained from male professors, female teachers, and undergraduate students participating in a renowned for-profit university's online science course. The Motivation and Engagement Scale was utilized in this investigation. Due to extreme outliers, breaches of normality and variance, a Kruskal-Wallis test was employed to evaluate the difference between the four groups' mean scores. Because of these infractions, the results should be interpreted with caution. The statistical tests of Kruskal-Wallis were employed to determine the difference between the mean scores of the four groups. When taught by male teachers, both male and female pupils display greater levels of motivation and engagement. Future quantitative research must involve a distinct population from various colleges and universities in order to eliminate the prevalent tendencies observed among participants.

Turner (2006) also explored the relationship between high school teachers' assessments of student motivation and their judgments of their own professional development and preparation, efficacy in inspiring students, and motivational activities in the classroom. The study found an association between teachers' evaluations of student motivation and their perceptions of their classroom behaviors and professional development and preparation. In addition, the findings revealed a high level of anxiety among high school teachers who cite student motivation as a daily obstacle. This survey revealed that high school educators have a strong desire for more professional development that will assist them in addressing the difficulty of student motivation. This investigation also

uncovered a number of disparities in correlation based on the gender of high school teachers and the subjects taught.

According to Darling-Hammond and Ifill-Lynch (2006), urban high schools in the United States are frequently failure factories. In many American communities, 50 percent or more of kids do not graduate from high school (Neild, Stoner-Eby, & Furstenberg, 2001). Teachers cite pupils' lack of motivation as one of the greatest obstacles they face in the classroom (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). While research points to an optimal path for education that encourages student engagement and an effective road for teacher professional development, these two tracks rarely intersect. The relevance of this study is to seek a "common road" between the two, or at the very least, to urge the paths to cross as frequently as feasible.

According to Salanga and Bernardo (2016), motivation is an important multidimensional construct that is consistently related to academic accomplishment, yet few theories characterize students' lack of drive as an explicit motivational component. In their study of secondary and tertiary-level Filipino students' reasons for not being motivated in school, they identified three primary themes: beliefs and attitudes about the self and the subject, perceptions of the teacher's skills, and the distractions provided by social support systems. The findings are explored in the context of contemporary explicit theories on amotivation, but also in the context of Filipino and Asian students' implicit ideas regarding motivation and learning in schools.

Ahmad, Abdul; Seman, Ahmad; Awang, Mohd; and Sulaiman, Fadzilah. (2014) conducted a study to investigate the augmentation of motivation among low-achieving students in their History class after the multiple intelligence theory was included into teachers' teaching techniques. To motivate children to learn, teachers were supposed to employ a new instructional strategy involving a variety of instructional activities. The sample consisted of 68 low-achieving students who were subsequently separated into two groups: 34 students were assigned to the treatment group, and another 34 were assigned to the control group. This is a quasi-experiment of non-equivalent control group design. The questionnaire was sent to students from both groups in order to assess the efficacy of the integration strategy. The mean and standard deviation of both groups were analyzed, and the null hypothesis was evaluated using the t-test. There was no significant difference between the two groups on the basis of the pre-test. The post-test revealed substantial differences in motivation between the two study groups. It was determined that the integrated History lesson incorporating several intelligences boosted the motivation of treatment group pupils. This demonstrates that a variety of strategies and activities were able to alter students' perceptions of History and boost their desire to study the subject. Therefore, it can be inferred that activities that integrate many intelligences can boost students' motivation to study History.

Reyes and Galang (2009) examined the motivational and social aspects of the Filipino collegiate experience. According to them, despite the fact that the literature on student motivation has primarily focused on mastery and performance goals, more recent research indicates that social goals predominate among Filipino students. Utilizing mostly an inductive qualitative methodology, this research demonstrated the significance of accounting for the diversity of the college experience. In an effort to chronicle students' motives for studying and the elements that assist or inhibit learning, data from five focus group talks with students at Philippine colleges revealed that students consider education as a way to fulfill their filial and familial responsibilities. The findings that parents and family are a major source of motivation and that excellent relationships with peers and teachers are major learning facilitators demonstrate the centrality of human ties in students' valuing and pursuit of college degrees. The implications of the differences in the responsibilities of family and school relationships are discussed.

Darbyshire and Haarms (2015) aimed to determine how the subcomponents of motivation influence academic achievement. The results give an empirical basis for correlating the self-reported metrics of Asian pupils with their performance and comparing them to contemporary western outcomes. They confirmed that (MSLQSE) was favorably associated with academic achievement for all socioeconomic and cultural characteristics. The self-reported self-efficacy of students had an effect on their total academic achievement. Intrinsic value (MSLQIN) was strongly associated with academic achievement across all evaluated socioeconomic and cultural variables. This suggests that students with a good attitude toward the material of the curriculum and students who are driven to study the content are more engaged in deeper level comprehension. This correlation suggests that students who are either engaged in the subject matter or who think it to be significant acquire stronger levels of self-control, resulting in superior performance. There was no correlation between Test Anxiety (MSLQTA) and academic performance. Anxious pupils demonstrated more self-control and eventually perseverance in their pursuit of subject matter mastery. Self-Regulation (MSLQSR) was favorably associated with academic achievement across all evaluated socioeconomic and cultural variables. Students that were able to arrange and implement metacognitive methods had greater academic achievement. Self-control, as measured by the BSCS, did not correlate with academic achievement throughout the entire student sample. In general, the correlation between the MSLQ components intrinsic values, test anxiety, cognitive strategy utilization, and self-regulation and GPA is favorable. Therefore, it was suggested that teachers should be aware of the significance of these issues in order to address them appropriately. Furthermore, as it has been demonstrated that students with a higher socioeconomic status score lower on these indicators (save for test anxiety), educators responsible

for these demographic groups are urged to give these findings greater weight. Interventions that aim to increase specific motivating elements in the classroom are not well known at this time.

2004's dissertation by Taspinar investigated teacher and student perceptions of task-related motivating technique utilization by teachers at the Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages. In addition, the relationship between students' perceived motivation levels and teachers' task-related motivational strategies was explored. 13 randomly selected teachers and 261 students taught by the participating teachers were issued questionnaires to collect data for this study. The data were quantitatively examined. The study's findings revealed considerable perceptual variations between teachers and students. The judgments of teachers regarding their task-related technique utilization were more favorable than those of students. Teachers often evaluated the motivation of their pupils higher than the students themselves. The association between teachers' perceptions of their usage of instructional strategies and their students' levels of motivation was found to be weak. The link between students' estimates of their own motivation levels and their teachers' usage of task-related motivational tactics was also minimal. teachers use task-related strategies regardless of their students' motivation levels. However, teachers should consider the motivation of their students while planning courses and choosing activities to promote learning in the classroom. On the basis of students' perceptions of how teachers employ instructional strategies, tasks should be designed to address students' needs, interests, and present skill levels. This study's findings can contribute to the production of instructional materials because it tackled motivation as a practical classroom issue.

All of the information constitutes motivational elements that led the researcher to decide to perform this study. There appears to be a need to research the linguistic intelligence and other MI theories in order to establish its benefits for teachers and students in a local context.

METHODS

The descriptive correlational methodology was utilized in this investigation. There are 129 senior high school teachers and 361 secondary school students in Isabela Province who participated in the study. With a confidence level of 95% and an error margin of 5%, respondents were selected at random to represent each category. The researcher modified three (3) questionnaires, one of which was "Teacher's Practice of Multiple Intelligences (MI) Theory" by Al-Wadi, N. (2011). The last two (2) studies were the "Perceptions of Student Motivation Questionnaire" and "Motivating Students Questionnaire" by Hardre, P., Davis, K., and Sullivan, D. (2008). The data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The frequency, percentage, and means were employed to characterize the data, and the Kendall Tau b was employed to determine the relationship between the variables under consideration.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Perception of Teacher-Respondents about Student Motivation in the Classroom

Table 1: Perception about Student Motivation in the Classroom.

Items	Students		Teacher		Grand Mean	Desc.	Z	Sig.
	Mean	Desc.	Mean	Desc.				
Motivation scales								
Effort								
1. The students in this class really try to learn.	4.35	OFT	4.33	OFT	4.34	OFT	1.02 ns	0.31
2. The students work at learning new things in class.	4.19	OFT	4.28	OFT	4.23	OFT	0.84 ns	0.4
3. The students don't put forth much effort to learn the content.	3.54	OFT	3.5	OFT	3.52	OFT	0.28 ns	0.78
Engagement								
1. The students generally pay attention and focus on what the teacher is teaching.	4.03	OFT	4.21	OFT	4.12	OFT	1.89 ns	0.06
2. The students generally do class-related tasks and	3.85	OFT	4.17	OFT	4.01	OFT	3.35*	0

assignments willingly.								
3. The students are often distracted or off task, and the teacher have to bring them back to focus on the topic or work at hand.	3.77	OFT	3.61	OFT	3.69	OFT	1.75 ns	0.08
General Interest								
1. In general, the students are genuinely interested in what they are asked to learn in the class.	3.98	OFT	4.1	OFT	4.04	OFT	1.28 ns	0.2
Reasons/Causes Scale								
Home Factors								
1. Generally, the students are unmotivated because parents don't care about or value education.	3.3	SOT	2.92	SOT	3.11	SOT	2.98*	0
2. Students often lack effort at school because they don't have support at home.	3.49	SOT	3.27	SOT	3.38	SOT	2.02*	0.04
3. Some of the students just have too many problems to make school a priority.	3.68	OFT	3.13	SOT	3.41	SOT	4.92*	0
Current Relevance/Value								
1. When students aren't engaged in school, it's because they don't see the value of what they are being asked to learn.	3.49	SOT	3.11	SOT	3.3	SOT	2.89*	0
2. If students do not see the point of learning the content then they aren't motivated to learn it.	3.63	OFT	3.4	SOT	3.52	OFT	1.80 ns	0.07
3. Most often, if students are not engaged in the class, it is because they don't see the relevance of the content in their world.	3.5	OFT	3.13	SOT	3.31	SOT	2.85*	0
Aspirations/Future Utility								
1. If students are not motivated to learn in the class, it is often because they don't have aspirations that connects to education, like plans to go to college.	3.5	OFT	3.09	SOT	3.3	SOT	3.08*	0

2. Some of the students are not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves.	3.18	SOT	2.88	SOT	3.03	SOT	2.38*	0.02
3. Generally, the students in the class who are not interested in learning are that way because of peer pressure to devalue school.	3.4	SOT	3.21	SOT	3.31	SOT	1.27 ns	0.21
Peer Factors								
1. Some of the students aren't motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves.	3.37	SOT	3.13	SOT	3.25	SOT	2.08*	0.04
2. Most often, the students are not working in the class because they don't see how useful this information can be.	3.66	OFT	3.45	SOT	3.55	OFT	1.63 ns	0.1
Personal factors (lazy, don't care)								
1. Negative peer pressure is one big reason why some of the students are not motivated to learn in school.	3.57	OFT	3.48	SOT	3.53	OFT	0.61 ns	0.54
2. Some students are not motivated to learn because they are just lazy.	3.4	SOT	3.27	SOT	3.33	SOT	0.90 ns	0.37
3. Some students just do not care about learning.	3.98	OFT	4.1	OFT	4.04	OFT	0.10 ns	0.92

*Significant ^{ns} Not significant OFT = Often True SOT= Sometimes True

Table 1 revealed the observation of the two groups of respondents on the extent of student motivation in the classroom.

Motivation scales

Effort. As gleaned from Table 1, the mean ratings of 3.54 to 4.35 given by the students and 3.50 to 4.33 by the teachers resulting to the grand means from 3.52 to 4.34 shows that student effort is often observed in the classroom. It was observed that the class, oftentimes the students really try to learn, work at learning new things and do not put forth much effort to learn the content. The observation of the two groups of respondents were found to be significantly the same as indicated by the Z-scores from 0.28 to 1.02 with significance levels greater than 0.05.

Engagement, Student engagement in the classroom was also observed often by the students and the teachers as indicated by their given mean ratings of 3.77 to 4.03 and 3.61 to 4.21, respectively which resulted to grand means from 3.69 to 4.12. This means the students generally pay much attention and focus on what the teacher is teaching and often do class-related tasks and assignments willingly. Likewise, they were often distracted or off task, and so the teacher has to bring them back to focus on the topic or work at hand.

Moreover, the two groups of respondents significantly differed in their perception with regard to how the

students do class-related tasks and assignments willingly. The Z-score of 3.35 with 0.00 significance level clearly showed that teachers gave a higher rating as compared to the students on this aspect.

General Interest. It was found out in Table 1 that in general, students are genuinely and often interested in what they are asked to learn in the class as indicated by the mean ratings of 3.98 and 4.10 given by the students and the teachers, respectively which resulted to a grand mean of 4.04. Moreover, the Z-score of 1.28 with 0.20 significance level clearly reveal that the students and the teachers gave a comparable observation about the general interest of the students in the class.

The above findings reveal that the senior high school teachers were very much aware that one of the most difficult and most important aspects of becoming a teacher is learning how to motivate the students. It can be noted that teachers spend years of hard work and dedication to become experts in their content areas, with degrees and teaching certification to prove it. In the institutional level, curriculum maps and teaching calendars were developed to make sure that appropriate standards are concerned. Likewise, teachers endure hours of professional development to become well versed in all the current educational pedagogy and collaborate with colleagues to ensure the use of best practices in the classroom and develop assessments for students to track their progress. Teachers who understand student motivation can greatly enhance the classroom experience and student performance.

Reasons/Causes Scale

Home Factors. As indicated in Table 1, mean ratings 3.30 and 3.49 given by the group of students and 2.92 and 3.27 from the teacher group which resulted to the grand means of 3.11 and 3.38, respectively implies that students become unmotivated because parents do not care about or value education and display a lack effort at school because students do not have support at home.

The mean rating or 3.68 reveals that the student group perceive their co-students just have too many problems to make school a priority. The teachers, on the other hand, gave mean rating of 3.13 which showed that they sometimes observe such student attitude.

The Z-scores 2.02 to 4.92 with significant levels less than 0.05 revealed further that there is a significant difference between the observation of the students and the teachers on the above-mentioned home factors which can cause student motivation in the classroom.

Current Relevance/Value. As gleaned from Table 1, both students and the teachers sometimes observed that when students are not engaged in school, it is because they do not see the value of what they are being asked to learn. This was revealed by the mean ratings of 3.49 and 3.11 given by the students and the teachers, respectively, which resulted to a grand mean of 3.30. On the other hand, the mean ratings of 3.63 and 3.50 given by the students reveal that they often witness that if students do not see the point of learning the content then they are not motivated to learn it and most often, if students are not engaged in the class, it is because they do not see the relevance of the content in their world. On the other hand, these attitudes are sometimes seen by the teachers as shown by their given mean ratings of 3.40 and 3.13, respectively. The grand mean of 3.52 also revealed that both groups of respondents often witness that if students do not see the point of learning the content then they are not motivated to learn it whereas the grand mean of 3.31 reveal that they commonly observe that sometimes if students are not engaged in the class, it is because they don't see the relevance of the content in their world.

The Z-scores of 2.89 and 2.85 with significance levels less than 0.05 implies further that the students and the teachers significantly differ in their perception about the students' attitudes in class, particularly, when students are not engaged in school, which maybe because they do not see the value of what they are being asked to learn and if they are not engaged in the class, it is because they do not see the relevance of the content in their world.

Aspirations/Future Utility. Table 1 shows a mean rating of 3.50 which indicates that the students often observes that if students are not motivated to learn in the class, it is because they do not have aspirations connected to education, like plans of going to college. On the part of the teachers, this attitude is sometimes true as indicated by the mean 3.09. The resulting grand mean of 3.30 reveals further that both groups of respondents concur that it is sometimes true that if students are not motivated to learn in the class, it is because they do not have aspirations connected to education, like plans of going to college.

The mean ratings of 3.08 and 3.40 from the students and 2.88 and 3.21 from the teachers resulted to grand means of 3.03 and 3.31. These values indicates that both groups of respondents perceives that it is sometimes true that some of the students are not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the future they see for themselves and generally, the students in the class who are not interested in learning are that way because of peer pressure to devalue school.

Peer Factors. Table 1 shows the mean ratings of 3.37 and 3.13 given by the students and the teachers, respectively. This resulted to the grand mean of 3.25 which reveals that both perceive that it is sometimes true that some of the students are not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the future they see for themselves. On the other hand, the students gave mean ratings of 3.63 and 3.50 which indicates that they frequently observe that most often, students are not working in the class because they do not see how useful this education can be.

The Z-score of 2.08 with a level of significance of 0.04 further implies that the students and the teachers gave a significantly different perception particularly, on their observation that some of the students aren't motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures, they see for themselves. The students observe this attitude more than the teachers.

Personal factors (lazy, don't care). Negative peer pressure is one big reason why some of the students are not motivated to learn in school as revealed by the mean rating of 3.57. Teachers, on the other hand gave the mean rating of 3.48 which reveals that this is sometimes true. The grand mean is 3.53 which indicates that negative peer pressure is one big reason why some of the students are not motivated to learn in school is frequently happening in the classroom.

The mean ratings of 3.40 given by the students and 3.27 by the teachers resulted to a grand mean of 3.33 which show that it is sometimes true that some students are not motivated to learn because they are just lazy.

That some students just do not care about learning is often observed by the two groups of respondents. This was revealed by the mean rating 3.98 from the students and 4.10 from the teachers which resulted to a grand mean of 4.04.

The two groups of respondents did not differ significantly on their perception about the aforementioned personal factors under student motivation in the class as revealed by the Z-scores 0.10 to 0.90 with significance levels greater than 0.05.

Table 2: Relationship between the Perception about student motivation in the classroom and the Senior High School Teachers' Age, Gender and Civil Status.

ITEMS	Age		Gender		Civil Status	
	Corr.	Sig.	Corr.	Sig.	Corr.	Sig.
Motivation scales						
Effort						
1. The students in this class really try to learn.	-0.01 ns	0.89	0.13 ns	0.12	0.02 ns	0.85
2. The students work at learning new things in class.	0.00 ns	0.96	0.13 ns	0.13	0.03 ns	0.69
3. The students don't put forth much effort to learn the content.	0.09 ns	0.25	-0.13 ns	0.10	0.07 ns	0.35
Engagement						
1. The students generally pay attention and focus on what I am teaching.	0.05 ns	0.53	0.05 ns	0.53	-0.01 ns	0.92
2. The students generally do class-related tasks and assignments willingly.	-0.01 ns	0.87	0.11 ns	0.18	-0.08 ns	0.35
3. The students are often distracted or off task, and I have to bring them back to focus on the topic or work at hand.	0.05 ns	0.48	-0.10 ns	0.21	0.00 ns	0.97
General Interest						
1. In general, the students are genuinely interested in what they are asked to learn in the class.	-0.04 ns	0.56	0.06 ns	0.5	-0.10 ns	0.21
Reasons/Causes Scale						
Home Factors						
1. Generally, the students are unmotivated because parents don't care about or value education.	-0.01 ns	0.93	-0.10 ns	0.21	-0.04 ns	0.58
2. Students often lack effort at school because they don't have support at home.	0.06 ns	0.43	-0.12 ns	0.15	0.09 ns	0.26
3. Some of the students just have too many problems to make school a priority.	0.06 ns	0.43	-0.02 ns	0.81	0.10 ns	0.24
Current Relevance/Value						
1. When students aren't	0.03 ns	0.66	-0.11 ns	0.15	0.03 ns	0.72

engaged in school, it's because they don't see the value of what they are being asked to learn.						
2. If students do not see the point of learning the content then they aren't motivated to learn it.	0.02 ns	0.75	-0.09 ns	0.28	0.11 ns	0.19
3. Most often, if students are not engaged in the class, it is because they don't see the relevance of the content in their world.	0.03 ns	0.66	-0.12 ns	0.14	0.05 ns	0.49
Aspirations/Future Utility						
1. If students are not motivated to learn in the class, it is often because they don't have aspirations that connects to education, like plans to go to college.	0.10 ns	0.17	-0.02 ns	0.80	0.06 ns	0.42
2. Some of the students are not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves.	0.02 ns	0.76	-0.10 ns	0.21	0.04 ns	0.62
3. Generally, the students in the class who are not interested in learning are that way because of peer pressure to devalue school.	0.04 ns	0.57	-0.16*	0.05	0.01 ns	0.91
Peer Factors						
1. Some of the students aren't motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves.	0.08 ns	0.26	-0.15 ns	0.06	0.05 ns	0.55
2. Most often, the students are not working in the class because they don't see how useful this information can be.	0.10 ns	0.17	-0.03 ns	0.67	0.09 ns	0.29
Personal factors (lazy, don't care)						
1. Negative peer pressure is one big reason why some of the students are not motivated to learn in school.	0.03 ns	0.72	-0.04 ns	0.62	0.02 ns	0.83
2. Some students are not motivated to learn because they are just lazy.	0.01 ns	0.9	-0.10 ns	0.22	0.03 ns	0.68
3. Some students just do not care about learning.	0.03 ns	0.72	0.10 ns	0.22	-0.11 ns	0.09

Table 3: Relationship between the Perception about student motivation in the classroom and the Senior High School Teachers' Specialization and Highest Educational Attainment

ITEMS	Specialization		Highest Educational Attainment	
	Corr.	Sig.	Corr.	Sig.
Motivation scales				
Effort				
1. The students in this class really try to learn.	-0.13 ns	0.09	-0.07 ns	0.40

2. The students work at learning new things in class.	-0.05 ns	0.47	0.06 ns	0.42
3. The students don't put forth much effort to learn the content.	-0.04 ns	0.54	0.04 ns	0.59
Engagement				
1. The students generally pay attention and focus on what I am teaching.	-0.09 ns	0.23	-0.03 ns	0.75
2. The students generally do class-related tasks and assignments willingly.	-0.10 ns	0.20	-0.04 ns	0.58
3. The students are often distracted or off task, and I have to bring them back to focus on the topic or work at hand.	0.07 ns	0.36	0.04 ns	0.64
General Interest				
1. In general, the students are genuinely interested in what they are asked to learn in the class.	-0.02 ns	0.82	0.02 ns	0.78
Reasons/Causes Scale				
Home Factors				
1. Generally, the students are unmotivated because parents don't care about or value education.	0.02 ns	0.74	0.06 ns	0.43
2. Students often lack effort at school because they don't have support at home.	-0.01 ns	0.94	0.03 ns	0.69
3. Some of the students just have too many problems to make school a priority.	-0.01 ns	0.91	0.09 ns	0.25
Current/Relevant Value				
1. When students aren't engaged in school, it's because they don't see the value of what they are being asked to learn.	0.11 ns	0.1	0.08 ns	0.28
2. If students do not see the point of learning the content then they aren't motivated to learn it.	0.05 ns	0.51	0.07 ns	0.33
3. Most often, if students are not engaged in the class, it is because they don't see the relevance of the content in their world.	0.00 ns	0.99	0.12 ns	0.12
Aspirations/Future Utility				
1. If students are not motivated to learn in the class, it is often because they don't have aspirations that connects to education, like plans to go to college.	0.02 ns	0.76	0.11 ns	0.15
2. Some of the students are not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves.	-0.03 ns	0.70	0.07 ns	0.37
3. Generally, the students in the class who are not interested in learning are that way because of peer pressure to devalue school.	0.01 ns	0.94	0.01 ns	0.91
Peer Factors				
1. Some of the students aren't motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves.	-0.07 ns	0.34	-0.01 ns	0.91
2. Most often, the students are not working in the class because they don't see how useful this information can be.	-0.10 ns	0.15	0.08 ns	0.32
Personal factors (lazy, don't care)				
1. Negative peer pressure is one big reason why some of the students are not	-0.04 ns	0.61	0.05 ns	0.51

motivated to learn in school.				
2. Some students are not motivated to learn because they are just lazy.	-0.08 ns	0.24	0.08 ns	0.32
3. Some students just do not care about learning.	-0.11 ns	0.66	-0.05 ns	0.85

Tables 2 and 3 show relationship between the perception about student motivation in the classroom and the senior high school teachers' profile.

Table 2 revealed correlation values from -0.15 to 0.14 with significance levels greater than 0.05 which implies that the senior high school teachers' age and civil status are not significantly associated with the perception about student motivation.

On the other hand, the correlation value of -0.16 with 0.05 level of significance in one attitude under student aspirations/future utility factors reveal its significant association with the gender of the senior high school teachers.

Hence, male teachers tend to believe that students in their class who are not interested in learning are that way because of peer pressure to devalue school. This can have a connection with the findings of Varghese, Zachariah J. (2017) that male and female students exhibit higher levels of motivation and engagement when taught by male teachers.

Table 3 reveals correlation values from -0.13 to 0.11 with significance levels greater than 0.05, hence, the senior high school teachers' specialization and highest educational attainment were not significantly associated with the perceptions about student motivation in the classroom.

This study countered Turner's findings in 2006 that there is a correlation between teacher's perceptions of student motivation and their perceptions of their actions within their classrooms and their professional development and preparation. In fact, findings uncovered a high level of concern among high school teachers who identify student motivation as a serious challenge that they face in their classes daily which gave them a strong desire for additional professional development that will help them deal with the challenge of student motivation. On the other hand, the result of this study conformed to Darling-Hammond and Ifill-Lynch (2006) who found out that the path for instruction that promotes student motivation and a path toward effective teacher professional development often do not cross. It also agreed with Turner (2006) who identified several differences in correlation as investigated by gender of high school teachers and by subject areas taught by high school teachers.

According to Karimi & Zade (2018), despite the abundance of research on motivation in ELT, teachers' motivational behaviors have received scant attention in prior research. They studied the effect of a professional development course with a focus on training teachers how to use motivational strategies based on Kellers' ARCS model on teachers' use of motivational strategies and additionally to explore likely differences between experienced and inexperienced teachers in their use of motivational strategies. The results revealed a significant difference in their use of motivational strategies before and after the professional development course with a focus on training teachers how to use motivational strategies based on Kellers' ARCS model. Teaching experience, however, did not make any significant difference in teachers' use of motivational strategies. Additionally, teachers' use of motivational strategies had an insignificant effect on students' judgments of their teachers' teaching effectiveness but a significant positive effect on student motivation.

Table 4: Relationship between the Perception about student motivation in the classroom and the Senior High School Teachers' Awareness of Gardner's Multiple Intelligences (GMI) Theories.

ITEMS	Awareness of GMI Theories	
	Corr.	Sig.
Motivation scales		
Effort		
1. The students in this class really try to learn.	0.05 ns	0.54
2. The students work at learning new things in class.	0.13 ns	0.1
3. The students don't put forth much effort to learn the content.	-0.09 ns	0.25
Engagement		
1. The students generally pay attention and focus on what I am teaching.	-0.02 ns	0.75
2. The students generally do class-related tasks and assignments willingly.	-0.01 ns	0.94
3. The students are often distracted or off task, and I have to bring them back to focus on	-0.11 ns	0.14

the topic or work at hand.		
General Interest		
1. In general, the students are genuinely interested in what they are asked to learn in the class.	-0.05 ns	0.52
Reasons/Causes Scale		
Home Factors		
1. Generally, the students are unmotivated because parents don't care about or value education.	-0.13 ns	0.07
2. Students often lack effort at school because they don't have support at home.	-0.12 ns	0.11
3. Some of the students just have too many problems to make school a priority.	-0.11 ns	0.16
Current Relevance/Value		
1. When students aren't engaged in school, it's because they don't see the value of what they are being asked to learn.	-0.12 ns	0.10
2. If students do not see the point of learning the content then they aren't motivated to learn it.	-0.10 ns	0.17
3. Most often, if students are not engaged in the class, it is because they don't see the relevance of the content in their world.	-0.13 ns	0.09
Aspirations/Future Utility		
1. If students are not motivated to learn in the class, it is often because they don't have aspirations that connects to education, like plans to go to college.	-0.18*	0.01
2. Some of the students are not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves.	-0.14 ns	0.06
3. Generally, the students in the class who are not interested in learning are that way because of peer pressure to devalue school.	-0.19*	0.01
Peer Factors		
1. Some of the students aren't motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves.	-0.14*	0.05
2. Most often, the students are not working in the class because they don't see how useful this information can be.	-0.08 ns	0.29
Personal factors (lazy, don't care)		
1. Negative peer pressure is one big reason why some of the students are not motivated to learn in school.	-0.18*	0.02
2. Some students are not motivated to learn because they are just lazy.	-0.17*	0.02
3. Some students just do not care about learning.	-0.52*	0.05

Table 4 reveals that the perception about student motivation on the classroom, particularly, aspirations/future utility, peer factors and personal factors (lazy, don't care) were significantly associated with the senior high school teachers' level of awareness of the GMI theories. The correlation values ranging from -0.52 to -0.14 implies further that there is a greater tendency among senior high school teachers who have higher level of awareness to have lesser conviction that if students are not motivated to learn in the class, it is often because they do not have aspirations connected to education, like plans to go to college. Moreover, teachers not to adhere to the statement that generally, the students in the class who are not interested in learning are that way because of peer pressure to devalue school.

In addition to this, it can be noted further from Table 4 that the senior high school teachers who are more aware

of the GMI theories will less likely believe that some of the students are not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the future they see for themselves. Negative peer pressure, laziness, lack of interest in learning are some reasons why some of the students are not motivated to learn in school. According to Ellingson, Carolann, (2007), Multiple Intelligence theory is one way to implement the advantages of different learning styles. It is important for teachers to understand that students will learn materials differently; therefore, teachers need to provide opportunities for them to succeed. Teachers will be successful in their classroom if they are open to the differences that each student brings to the classroom. Students should be complemented for their different ideas and ways to learn material instead of limited to only a few ways to express what they know. The findings from this study were consistent with Gardner’s MI theory (1983, as cited in Goodnough), that an open mind to intelligence allows teachers the ability to investigate their beliefs about student ability and science instruction.

B. Relationship between the Student Motivation in the Classroom and the Extent of Senior High School Teachers' Practice of the Linguistic Intelligence in the Classroom

Table 5: Extent of Senior High School Teachers’ Practice of the Linguistic Intelligence Theory in the Classroom

Linguistic Intelligence Parameters	Students		Teacher		Grand Mean	Desc.	Z	Sig.
	Mean	Desc.	Mean	Desc.				
1. Read or lecture to the class.	4.26	FR	4.18	FR	4.22	FR	1.05 ^{ns}	0.29
2. Give the students the option to discuss or debate during class.	3.71	FR	3.96	FR	3.83	FR	2.78*	0.01
3. Encourage students to employ their verbal skills to communicate, solve problems, and express inner feelings.	4.2	FR	4.59	VF	4.39	FR	4.37*	0.00
4. Require students to read during class.	3.9	FR	3.94	FR	3.92	FR	0.27 ^{ns}	0.79
5. Require students to perform writing activities in the class.	4.04	FR	4.06	FR	4.05	FR	0.12 ^{ns}	0.90

The mean ratings in Table 5 ranged from 3.71 to 4.36, demonstrating that both students and teachers believe linguistic intelligences theory is regularly implemented in the classroom. This further shows that senior high school teachers frequently read or speak to the class, give students the choice to discuss or debate in class, compel students to read during class, and assign writing exercises in class. On the other hand, a mean rating of 4.59 from the teachers themselves indicates that they frequently encourage students to use their verbal skills to communicate, solve problems, and express inner feelings, whereas a mean rating of 4.20 from the students indicates that this practice is frequently observed. The range of mean ratings from 3.83 to 4.39 indicated that senior high school instructors commonly engaged in language intelligence-related classroom activities. The Z-scores of 2.78 and 4.37 had significance values less than 0.05, indicating that students and teachers hold significantly divergent views regarding the classroom use of linguistic intelligence. In terms of allowing students to discuss or debate in class, encouraging students to use their linguistic skills in communication, problem-solving, and expressing their inner sentiments, teachers had much higher ratings than students.

Table 6: Relationship between Student Motivation in the Classroom and the Extent of Senior High School Teachers' Practice of the Linguistic Intelligence Theory in the Classroom

ITEMS	LI1		LI2		LI3		LI4		LI5	
	Sig.	Corr.	Sig.	Corr.	Sig.	Corr.	Sig.	Corr.	Corr.	Sig.
Motivation scales:										
Effort										
1. The students in this class really try to learn.	0.16*	0	0.14*	0	0.18*	0	0.24*	0	0.24*	0
2. The students work at learning new things in class.	0.21*	0	0.13*	0	0.17*	0	0.25*	0	0.18*	0

3. The students don't put forth much effort to learn the content.	0.10*	0.01	0.10*	0.01	0.15*	0	0.21*	0	0.14*	0
Engagement										
1. The students generally pay attention and focus on what I am teaching.	0.17*	0	0.26*	0	0.25*	0	0.30*	0	0.27*	0
2. The students generally do class-related tasks and assignments willingly.	0.24*	0	0.22*	0	0.30*	0	0.32*	0	0.25*	0
3. The students are often distracted or off task, and the teachers have to bring them back to focus on the topic or work at hand.	0.14*	0	0.09*	0.02	0.18*	0	0.19*	0	0.14*	0
General Interest										
1. In general, the students are genuinely interested in what they are asked to learn in the class.	0.15*	0	0.11*	0	0.18*	0	0.22*	0	0.18*	0
Reasons/Causes Scale										
Home Factors										
1. Generally, the students are unmotivated because parents don't care about or value education.	0.06 ns	0.1	0.07 ns	0.06	0.05 ns	0.18	0.14*	0	0.08*	0.03
2. Students often lack effort at school because they don't have support at home.	0.07 ns	0.1	0.08 ns	0.04	0.12*	0	0.18*	0	0.17*	0
3. Some of the students just have too many problems to make school a priority.	0.14*	0	0.16*	0	0.10*	0.01	0.23*	0	0.20*	0
Current Relevance/Value										
1. When students aren't engaged in school, it's because they don't see the value of what they are being asked to learn.	0.04 ns	0.35	0.10*	0.01	0.06 ns	0.13	0.19*	0	0.16*	0

2. If students do not see the point of learning the content then they aren't motivated to learn it.	0.11*	0	0.14*	0	0.10*	0.01	0.16*	0	0.07 ns	0.06
3. Most often, if students are not engaged in the class, it is because they don't see the relevance of the content in their world.	0.14*	0	0.12*	0	0.11*	0	0.18*	0	0.16*	0
Aspirations/Future Utility										
1. If students are not motivated to learn in the class, it is often because they don't have aspirations that connects to education, like plans to go to college.	0.08*	0.04	0.08*	0.04	0.08*	0.04	0.17*	0	0.08*	0.04
2. Some of the students are not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves.	0.05 ns	0.16	0.13*	0	0.08*	0.04	0.14*	0	0.09*	0.03
3. Generally, the students in the class who are not interested in learning are that way because of peer pressure to devalue school.	0.10*	0.01	0.11*	0	0.15*	0	0.21*	0	0.13*	0
Peer Factors										
1. Some of the students aren't motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves.	0.15*	0	0.09*	0.02	0.08*	0.04	0.18*	0	0.15*	0
2. Most often, the students are not working in the class because they don't see how useful this information can be.	0.14*	0	0.10*	0.01	0.14*	0	0.16*	0	0.12*	0
Personal factors (lazy, don't care)										
1. Negative peer pressure is one big reason why some of the students are not motivated to learn in	0.12*	0	0.01 ns	0.73	0.17*	0	0.13*	0	0.15*	0

school.										
2. Some students are not motivated to learn because they are just lazy.	0.08*	0.03	0.09*	0.02	0.04 ns	0.36	0.09*	0.01	0.06 ns	0.14
3. Some students just do not care about learning.	0.02 ns	0.71	- 0.14*	0	0.07 ns	0.15	-0.01 ns	0.91	0.06 ns	0.22

Table 6 shows correlation values from 0.09 to 0.32 with significance levels less than 0.05 indicating a significant relationship between perception about student motivation in the classroom in terms of effort, engagement and general interest and the extent of senior high school teachers' practice of the linguistic intelligence (LI) theory in the classroom. The data imply that the more teachers practice the linguistic intelligence modalities in the classroom, particularly, reading or lecturing to the class, giving the students the option to discuss or debate during class, encouraging students to employ their verbal skills to communicate, solve problems, and express inner feelings, requiring students to read during class and perform writing activities in the class the better the students really try to learn in the class, work more at learning new things in class, and put more put forth much effort to learn the lesson content. In the same way, teachers who frequently practice this theory tend to increase the engagement of students in the classroom, that is, students tend to become more attentive and focused on what the teachers are teaching, and generally do more class-related tasks and assignments willingly. Similarly, the teachers will have the greater tendency to always try to bring the students who are often distracted or off task back to focus on the topic or work at hand. With an increase in practicing the linguistic intelligence in their teaching in the classroom, they become better well in bringing out the interest of their students in what they are asked to learn in the class.

On home factors relating to reasons/causes of motivation, the correlation values from 0.10 to 0.23 with significance levels less than 0.05 revealed in Table 16 imply that some are significantly correlated with the practice of linguistic intelligences theory. More specifically, it indicates that there is a greater chance among teachers who often require students to read during class and perform writing activities in the class to become more perceptive about the idea that generally, the students are unmotivated because parents do not care about or value education. Likewise, it can also be noted that teachers who often require students to read during class and perform writing activities in the class will have the greater tendency believe that students often lack effort at school because they do not have support at home. Moreover, the data also implies that there is a greater chance among teachers who often read or lecture to the class, give the students the option to discuss or debate during class, require students to read during class and perform writing activities in the class to become more aware about the idea that some of the students just have too many problems to make school a priority.

On current relevance/value of motivation, the correlation values from 0.10 to 0.19 with significance levels less than 0.05 implies a significant association with the practice of linguistic intelligences theory in the classroom. The more teachers give the students the option to discuss or debate during class, require students to read during class, and perform writing activities in the class, the greater the chances that they will have the belief that when students are not engaged in school, it is because they do not see the value of what they are being asked to learn. Moreover, the teachers who always read or lecture to the class, give the students the option to discuss or debate during class, encourage students to employ their verbal skills to communicate, solve problems, and express inner feelings and require students to read during class will likely become very assured that if students do not see the point of learning the content then they are not motivated to learn it. Teachers who also always read or lecture to the class, give the students the option to discuss or debate during class, encourage students to employ their verbal skills to communicate, solve problems, and express inner feelings, always require students to read during class and to perform writing activities in the class will likely adhere very much to the contention that most often, if students are not engaged in the class, it is because they do not see the relevance of the content in their world.

Aspiration factors pertaining to student motivation in the classroom has a significant bearing on teachers' practice of the linguistic intelligence theory in the classroom. The correlation values of 0.08 to 0.21 with significance levels less than 0.05 reveal that teachers who tend to always practice reading or lecturing to the class, give the students the option to discuss or debate during class, always encourage students to employ their verbal skills to communicate, solve problems, and express inner feelings and often require students to read during class and perform writing activities in the class will have the greater tendency to constantly believe that if students are not motivated to learn in the class, it is often because they do not have aspirations that connects to education, like plans to go to college and observe more that generally, the students in the class who are not interested in learning are that way because of peer pressure to devalue school. Also, their observation that some

of the students are not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the future they see for themselves will tend to be heightened among teachers always give the students the option to discuss or debate during class, always encourage students to employ their verbal skills to communicate, solve problems, and express inner feelings and often require students to read during class and perform writing activities in the class. Peer factors relating to motivation in the classroom have a significant association with the teachers' practice of linguistic intelligence in the classroom. The correlation values 0.08 to 0.15 with significance levels less than 0.05 clearly indicate that teachers who always read or lecture to the class, frequently give the students the option to discuss or debate during class, encourage students to employ their verbal skills to communicate, solve problems, and express inner feelings and often require students to read during class and perform writing activities in the class will likely become more sold to the idea that some of the students are not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves and most often, the students are not working in the class because they do not see how useful this information can be.

The correlation values from 0.12 to 0.17 with significance levels less than 0.05 shown in Table 16 imply that personal factors relating to motivation in the classroom are in some ways significantly associated with the teachers' practice of linguistic intelligence theory in the classroom. Thus, the more they read or lecture to the class, encourage students to employ their verbal skills to communicate, solve problems, and express inner feelings, require students to read during class and perform writing activities in the class the greater is their tendency to believe that negative peer pressure is one big reason why some of the students are not motivated to learn in school. When they tend to always read or lecture to the class, the more they read or lecture to the class, give the students the option to discuss or debate during class and require students to read during class will likely make them become more sold to the idea that some students are not motivated to learn because they are just lazy. Finally, the correlation value of -0.14 with 0.00 significance level implies that teachers who tend to always give the students the option to discuss or debate during class will likely believe more that some students just do not care about learning.

This study reinforced Celik, Suleyman (2015) in his statement that classroom management is one of the challenging and difficult tasks to achieve for many of the foreign language teachers and they confront different types of classroom management problems every day, such as students disobeying the school and classroom rules, misbehaving during the lessons, using obscene words and gestures, and showing disrespect. Teachers who use different types of teaching activities can control their classes easier than the ways they used when they applied traditional teaching approaches. If teachers take into consideration students' Multiple Intelligences, they can achieve higher student engagement in the class activities. On the other hand, those teachers who use the same teaching techniques all the time have difficulties in managing the classes or their lessons are so boring. As a result, using different types of activities which are related to learners' intelligence can both foster a positive climate and help the teachers to control their classes.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final analysis shows that the linguistic intelligence practices in the classroom pertains to the senior high school teachers' application of strategies, particularly, reading or lecturing to the class; giving the students the option to discuss or debate during class; encouraging students to employ their verbal skills to communicate, solve problems, and express inner feelings; requiring them to read during class; and perform writing activities in the class. In practice of the Linguistic Intelligence theory, it can be noted that teachers rated themselves significantly higher in their giving the students the option to discuss or debate during class and encouraging students to employ their verbal skills to communicate, solve problems, and express inner feelings. This study also dealt with the perceptions about student motivation in the classroom, categorized into two (2): Motivation scale and Reasons/Causes Scale. Motivation scale has three (3) subscales, effort, engagement and general interest while Reasons/Causes scale contains home factors, current relevance/value, aspirations/future utility, peer and personal factors.

The data revealed that effort in learning were oftentimes observed in the classroom. The students really tried to learn, often worked at learning new things in class and did not put, much forth much effort to learn the content. Students' engagement in the classroom was also often observed, they generally gave much attention and focus on what the teacher was teaching, did class-related tasks and assignments willingly but were often distracted or off task, and the teachers have to bring them back to focus on the topic or work at hand. As to their general interest, it was found out that the students were oftentimes genuinely interested in what they are asked to learn in the class.

Home factors affecting student motivation were sometimes observed in the classroom. Generally, the students were sometimes unmotivated because parents don't care about or value education, occasionally lacked effort at school because they don't have support at home, and some of them just have too many problems to make school a priority.

Current relevance/value of student motivation was also sometimes observed. At times, when students were not engaged in school, it was because they don't see the value of what they were being asked to learn, sometimes if students do not see the point of learning the content then they were not motivated to learn it, and occasionally, if

students were not engaged in the class, it was because they don't see the relevance of the content in their world. At times, factors under aspirations/future utility subscale were also observed. If students were not motivated to learn in the class, it was sometimes because they don't have aspirations that connects to education, like plans to go to college, occasionally some of the students were not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves, generally, the students in the class who were not interested in learning were sometimes that way because of peer pressure to devalue school.

On peer factors on student motivation, it the result showed that sometimes, some of the students were not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves and at times, they were not working in the class because they don't see how useful this information can be.

Personal factors that were often observed were negative peer pressure which was one big reason why some of the students were not motivated to learn in school and some students oftentimes just did not care about learning. Some students were sometimes not motivated to learn because they were just lazy.

As to the practice of linguistic intelligence, the teachers tend to always who use all of the strategies in the classroom have a stronger certainty that if students are not motivated to learn in the class, it is often because they don't have aspirations that connects to education, like plans to go to college and generally, the students in the class who are not interested in learning are that way because of peer pressure to devalue school. Likewise, they will likely have a very strong conviction that some of the students are not motivated to work in school because education has no place in the futures they see for themselves when they tend to always give the students the option to discuss or debate during class, encourage them to employ their verbal skills to communicate, solve problems, and express inner feelings and require then to read during class and perform writing activities in the class.

Lastly, in terms of personal factors, there are greater chances that teachers who often all of the identified approaches under linguistic intelligence, except, giving the students the option to discuss or debate during class to become more sold to the idea that negative peer pressure is one big reason why some of the students are not motivated to learn in school. Likewise, the more frequent they read or lecture to the class, give the students the option to discuss or debate during class and require then to read during class and perform writing activities in the class, the greater chances are, they will believe more that some students are not motivated to learn because they are just lazy. They will also tend to accept more that some students just do not care about learning when they frequently give the students the option to discuss or debate during class. It is advised that senior high school classroom teachers consistently integrate linguistic intelligence theory and other MI theories in their instructional activities. This involves reading, studying, and learning more about not only Gardner's theory, but also other theory-based methods. Teachers at the high school level, on the other hand, need additional resources in their practice of linguistic intelligence and other MI theories to support their abilities to educate and motivate pupils to continue their study.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad, Abdul & Seman, Ahmad & Awang, Mohd & Sulaiman, Fadzilah. (2014). Application of Multiple Intelligence Theory to Increase Student Motivation in Learning History. *Asian Culture and History*. 7. 10.5539/ach.v7n1p210.
2. Al-Wadi, N. (2011). Teachers' perceptions toward enhancing learning through multiple intelligences theory in elementary school: A mixed methods study (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database. (UMI No. 277098534)
3. Cancellieri, Amy. (2018). Teachers' Perceptions of Student Motivation and the Possible Implications for Teaching and Learning. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/>.
4. Celik, Suleyman. (2015). Managing the Classes by using Multiple Intelligence Instruction. *Journal of Education*; ISSN 2298-0172; Volume 4, Issue 1, 2015. 4. 25-29.
5. Darbyshire, D. (2015). Student Motivation In Asian Countries And Its Impact On Academic Success For Second Language University Students, *Asian Journal of Educational Research* Vol. 3, No. 3, 2015 ISSN 2311-6080 . Retrieved from <http://www.multidisciplinaryjournals.com/>
6. Darling-Hammond, L., & Ifill-Lynch, O. (2006). If they'd only do their work!. *Educational Leadership*, 63(5), 8-13.
7. Ellingson, Carolann, (2007) "Multiple Intelligence Theory in the Classroom". All Regis University Theses. 15. <https://epublications.regis.edu/theses/15>
8. Ferlazzo, L. (2015). Strategies for Helping Students Motivate Themselves. Adapted from *Building a Community of Self-Motivated Learners: Strategies to Help Students Thrive in School and Beyond*. Retrieved from <https://www.edutopia.org/>.

9. Hardre, P., Davis, K., & Sullivan, D. (2008). Measuring teacher perceptions of the "how" and "why" of student motivation. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, 14(2), 155-179.
10. Karimi, M. N., & Hosseini Zade, S. S. (2018). Teachers' use of motivational strategies: effects of a motivation-oriented professional development course. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 13(2), 194-204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2017.1422255>
11. Keller, J. M. (2012). ARCS Model of Motivation. *Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning*, 304-305. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_217
12. Leonardo, R. (2015). Multiple Intelligences Teaching and Assessment: Its Influences on Filipino College Students' Mathematics Performance and Learning Experiences *International Journal of Educational Science and Research (IJESR)* ISSN (P): 2249-6947; ISSN (E): 2249-8052 Vol. 5, Issue 5.
13. Lorenzo, A. And. B. Lorenzo. Learning Styles of Teacher Education Students: Basis in Improving the Teaching - Learning Process. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 103 (2013) 595 - 605. Retrieved from <https://ac.els-cdn.com/>
14. Neild, R. C., Stoner-Eby, S., & Furstenberg, F. (2008). Connecting Entrance and Departure: The Transition to Ninth Grade and High School Dropout. *Education and Urban Society*, 40(5), 543-569. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124508316438>
15. Reyes, Melissa & Galang, Adrienne. (2009). Motivational and social aspects of the Filipino college experience. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/>.
16. Salanga M.G.C., Bernardo A.B.I. (2016) Filipino Students' Reasons for Not Being Motivated in School: Insights into Their Implicit Beliefs About Motivation and Learning. In: King R., Bernardo A. (eds) *The Psychology of Asian Learners*. Springer, Singapore
17. Taşpinar, Havva Kurt (2004). Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of Teachers' Task-Related Motivational Strategy Use and Students' Motivation Levels the Institute Of Economics and Social Sciences. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/11693/29497>.
18. Turner, J. (2006). The Relationship between Secondary School Teacher Perception of Student Motivation and the Effects of Teacher Professional Development on Student, Retrieved from <https://Mospace.Umsystem.Edu/>
19. Varughese, Zacharia J. (2017). The Influence of Teacher Gender on College Student Motivation and Engagement in an Online Environment. Retrieved at: <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2562&context=doctoral>.