




Probing into the Effects of Multiple Intelligence-based Activities (MIBAs): Iranian EFL Students' Writing Performance in Focus

Mozhgan. Madhkhan¹, Hadi. Salehi^{2*}, Omid. Tabatabaei², Mohammad Reza. Talebinejad³


¹ PhD Candidate, English Department, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran

² Assistant Professor, English Department, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran



³ Associate Professor, English Department, Isfahan University, Isfahan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Hadisalehe1358@yahoo.com

E d i t o r

Anela Hasanagic
Full Professor, Department of
Psychology, Faculty of Islamic
Education, University of Zenica,
Bosnia and Herzegovina
anela.hasanagic@unze.ba

R e v i e w e r s

Reviewer 1: Abotaleb Saadati Shamir
Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, University of Science and
Research, Tehran, Iran. Email: psychology@iau.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Karim Afshariniya
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Kermanshah, Iran Email: k.afsharineya@iauaksh.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This section could benefit from a clearer distinction between Gardner's theory and competing theories like Spearman's g or Sternberg's triarchic theory for conceptual depth.

Please clarify what specific gaps in previous MI studies this work addresses, especially in the Iranian EFL context.

This appears to conflate Multiple Intelligences (MI) with "motivational interviewing," a distinct concept in psychology. Please revise to avoid terminological confusion.

While the list of MI-based activities is comprehensive, it lacks citations. Please support the activity design with pedagogical or empirical sources to ground them in literature.

Clarify whether regression models were used in these cited studies and include effect sizes if available, to support comparison with your own results.

Please elaborate on what "traditional methods" entailed in the control group. Specify the duration, frequency, and instructional content to ensure comparability.

The procedure lacks information on the instructors. Were the same teachers used in both groups? Were they trained in MI implementation? Clarifying this helps control for teacher effects.

The results of the Shapiro-Wilk test show a violation of normality. Consider discussing why non-parametric methods (e.g., Mann-Whitney) were chosen and their limitations in detecting small effect sizes.

Strengthen this argument with examples from classroom implementation or observational data, if available, to provide empirical grounding.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The objectives and research questions are repetitive. Consider synthesizing them into clearer, non-redundant statements to improve conciseness and structure.

Provide a rationale for the selection of these studies and consider using a table to synthesize findings, MI domains examined, and results for clearer comparison.

This language is inappropriate and potentially stigmatizing. Use more respectful terminology such as “students with different learning needs.”

Consider reporting effect sizes (e.g., r or Cliff’s delta) alongside significance tests to better interpret the practical significance of the findings.

Although a bar graph is mentioned, it is not present. Please ensure all figures are included and properly labeled. Consider using error bars to show variability.

The sample size for gender analysis ($N=30$) is quite small. Acknowledge the limited statistical power in the discussion section.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.