

Intelligence, Aptitude, Motivation, Support, Opportunity, Readiness, and Interest (IAMSORI) Affecting Students in Learning English

 <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v10i4.1180>

*Yasminar Amaerita Telaumbanua, Akhmad Fauzan^{ab} 

¹Universitas Nias, Indonesia.

²Universitas Palangkaraya, Indonesia.

Corresponding Author: yasminaramaeritatelaumbanua@unias.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The goal of this research is to identify the main factor that influences students when learning English. A survey was conducted with 57 students from the English Education Study Program at the University of Nias participating. Data was gathered using a questionnaire on Google Form that employed a Likert scale, and it was analyzed statistically to obtain descriptive statistics and Pearson Correlation results. The results reveal that intelligence shows a perfect positive correlation in sig. (2-tailed) with all factors at levels of 0.01 and 0.05. It has an unstandardized coefficient (B) of 4.439 and a standard error of 0.657, culminating in a t-value of 6.761. The significance level of intelligence is below 0.001, suggesting that it is an extremely important part of the model. The conclusion of the research indicates that intelligence is the primary factor among all the influences on students in learning English, as determined by Beta Coefficient.

Keywords: IAMSORI, Students, Learning English

Article History:

Received 29th June 2025

Accepted 25th July 2025

Published 28th July 2025



INTRODUCTION

English has elevated its status as a worldwide language. It usually emphasizes a specific function for English that is created among various social interactions across the globe, (Mughei et.al, 2022). Since it is important to prepare students to use their refined skills in English and to engage confidently in global discussions with their own knowledgeable abilities, English has become a compulsory subject for students not only in primary and secondary education, but also in higher education in Indonesia (Kemendikbud, 2022). Learning English is not easy for all students due to the success in learning English is influenced by several factors. The factors may come from the students themselves or internal factors and from the outside or external factors. Both factors can motivate and hinder students in learning (Alharbi, 2021; Belda & Tutor, 2017). This is emphasized by (Curso, 2019) and (Khoiriyah, n.d.), that the internal and external factors affect English acquisition. Furthermore (Wulandari et al., 2020) says that learning difficulties are influenced by internal and external factors. Internal factors are all those things that influence a student's motivation to learn language. They come from within and are in the student's control (Wulandari et al., 2020). In addition, Madrid; Mahmoudi & Mahmoudi in (Khoiriyah, n.d.) say that internal factors in language learning refer to the presence of various factors within the learner. Internal factors in language learning are variables present among learners such as age, gender, motivation, intelligence, personality, etc. that affect the outcome of language learning. External factor is those originating from outside the students, Hamdani in (Wulandari et al., 2020). Internal factor includes intelligence, aptitude, motivation and interest meanwhile support and opportunity are included external

Intelligence, Aptitude, Motivation, Support, Opportunity, Readiness, and Interest (IAMSORI) Affecting Students in Learning English factor (Mahmoudi, 2015), (Utama, 2017), (, 2020, San Salvador, El Salvador, 2019) and (Wulandari et al., 2020).

Intelligence factor is intelligence as an important part of psychology. It is considered an innate human characteristic that distinguishes all learners from each other when learning a language (Hajebi M. & Noshadi, 2018). Gardner in (Hajebi M. & Noshadi, 2018) defines intelligence as "the ability to solve problems or produce products of value in one or more cultural environments. Aptitude factor is another important factor that can affect children's language acquisition in both natural and educational environments. Aptitude refers to the specific language learning ability that a learner should have, Carroll & Sapon in (Sun et al., 2016). It is considered relatively stable and consists of several aspects, such as phonemic coding ability, language analysis ability, and memory, Skehan in (Sun et al., 2016) and Carroll in (Ishikawa & Suzuki, 2023). In addition, Dörnyei & Skehan in (Ishikawa & Suzuki, 2023) state this is thought to be a special aptitude for learning languages beyond the first, with large individual differences between learners. Motivation factor is a factor that can affect language learning at any age and includes the desire to achieve goals and a positive attitude toward learning, Gardner in (Cabrera-Solano et al., 2019). This factor is considered an internal learning and emotional factor that plays an important role in second language learning, Macaro in (Cabrera-Solano et al., 2019). This is associated with success in learning English, King & Mackey, in (Cabrera-Solano et al., 2019). Support factor is help, encouragement or motivation from parents, school and environment for children to learn English (Yan, 2022). Opportunity factor is time for more personalized learning experiences in education, for practice and application of language skills, especially in speaking and writing (Hong, 2023). Readiness factor is willingness or a state of being prepared for doing something. Nwankwo, Kemjika & Ekeh in (Amadi, 2018) say that they see readiness as a prerequisite for learning. In their view, readiness is an individual's willingness to learn, and without readiness, learning will not occur. Interest factor is the desire to perform an activity to achieve a goal as pointed out by Sardiman in (Lena et al., 2022) that interest is a state that arises when someone sees the features and meanings of a situation that are relevant to his or her wants and needs.

These factors can occur and be experienced by every student. This is also what happened to students of the English education study programme in semester IV of the faculty of teacher training and education, the University of Nias. One of the researchers who daily carries out learning to these students was interested in examining what happened with students. The problem was that in the previous semesters, the completion of assignments, mid and final semester exams did not produce maximum results. There were many students who did not complete several courses taught by several lecturers. There seem to be an indication that these students actually did not have enthusiasm in learning. Seeing these symptoms, the researchers were motivated to look in more detail at what happened and being experienced by students.

Some previous the researchers already conducted researches but not all factors were investigated in the same time. Some of the researchers focused on one or two factors only. First, (Erlina et al., 2019) did a research entitled linguistic intelligence of undergraduate EFL learners in higher education: a case study and found there were learners who used language effectively to persuade others (rhetoric), learners who could easily remember written and oral information (mnemonic), learners who could reproduce information orally and in writing (explanation), and a few learners who reflected on language and talked about language itself (metalinguistics). Second, (Debatin et al., 2019) in their research entitled does fluid intelligence facilitate the learning of English as a Foreign language: a longitudinal latent growth curve analysis and found liquid insights and inborn inspiration were found to be related to the starting level of English accomplishment. Be that as it may not be one or the other liquid insights nor inherent anticipated the rate of alter concerning the English scores. Third, (Bokander, 2020) in his research entitled language aptitude and cross linguistic influence in initial L2 learning and obtained linguistic aptitude was found to be more important for

learners with a typologically similar L1 than for learners with a more distant L1. Furthermore, the results support theoretical suggestions from the individual differences literature that suggest auditory processing abilities may be particularly important in the early stages of L2 acquisition. Fourth, (Lena et al., 2022) in their research entitled the effect of motivation and interest on students' learning outcomes and showed the results that neither motivation nor interest in learning English had any effect on students' learning outcomes. Furthermore, there was a negative correlation between motivation and interest and students' learning outcomes. This study enriches the research on motivation in learning English and interest in learning outcomes. Furthermore, it also shows that motivation and interest are not factors that lead to students' success in English courses. Fifth, (Refinery et al., 1980) in their research investigated language learning opportunities provided by out-of-school online EFL course for Chinese K-12 students and the findings from this study provide insights into how to design and implement effective online EFL courses and programs, ultimately expanding and improving Chinese K-12 students' utilization of online EFL learning opportunities and better supporting student learning and development. Sixth, other researchers such as (Mutiah et al., 2020), (Sumarni et al., 2021), (Banit et al., 2022), (Walia & Kaharuddin, 2023), and (Imam Santosa et al., 2024) focused on searching students' readiness only in English e-learning and online learning meanwhile (Daflizar et al., 2022) and (Lee & Hwang, 2022) paid attention to the teachers' readiness on online English language teaching and sustainable learning as well as (Gregory et al., 2021) gave an attention to investigate both of teacher and students' readiness. As results, there were teachers and students who were ready but others were not. Last was (Galloway & Ruegg, 2020) and (Yan, 2022) did research and focused on students' support; and family and parents' support only.

Of all previous researches above, it is seen that all the researchers have not done yet a research which investigated all factors as mentioned above. Most of the researchers focused on one or two factors only, why they happened and how they are correlated to each other. Moreover, there is a theory stating that it is important to gain a deeper understanding of the innovative learning opportunities that such courses can provide. Research shows that K-12 EFL instruction in China focuses on reading and writing English, but gives students few opportunities to speak and write English. This limits their ability to communicate effectively using English, negatively impacting their writing and speaking scores on international English tests (Refinery et al., 1980). Those previous researches result encouraged the researchers to conduct research by investigating all factors in the same time.

The results of this research were contributed to students at different educational levels, parents, families, communities, environments, teachers and research institutes by honing their intelligence and aptitude, enhancing their motivation and support, seizing opportunities, preparing and stimulating their interests (IAMSORI) to support the maximum English learning process. Thus this research aims at finding out what the most dominant factor among seven factors above based on students' perception about the factors influencing students in learning English.

METHOD

Survey was the design used by the researchers in conducting this research. Survey designs quantitatively describe trends, attitudes, and opinions of a population or test relationships between variables in a population by examining a sample of the population, (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Research sample was students of the fourth semester which the total amount was 57 persons. They were students of English education study program of faculty of teacher training and education of the University of Nias. English level was middle to low.

Instrument used in the research was questionnaire by using five-point Likert scale that were strong agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strong disagree. A survey was conducted using a questionnaire that included a Likert scale. The questionnaire had 8 statements about

Intelligence, Aptitude, Motivation, Support, Opportunity, Readiness, and Interest (IAMSORI) Affecting Students in Learning English intelligence, 8 statements about aptitude, 8 statements regarding motivation, 12 statements about support, 5 statements on opportunity, 9 statements about readiness, and 8 statements on interest. The researchers ensured it was tested for accuracy before using it to gather data.

To collect data, the researchers asked students to be sample and filled in the questionnaire through link of Google form which was sent in WhatsApp group. It was filled in without writing identity and personal email so that the researchers did not know what had been filled in by any student. After the questionnaire was filled in by students, it was closed by the researchers.

Data collected was analyzed using statistically formulation with IBM SPSS Statistics 29.0., and descriptive statistics and Pearson Correlation. The researchers found validity, mean, variance, standard deviation, correlation and coefficients. Furthermore, the researchers found out the most dominant factors among all factors affecting students in learning English using Beta Coefficient based on students' perception towards the factors influencing their English learning.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In Figure 1 and Figure 2 below, it is seen that all data are valid, that is 57 and there are no missing data points since all values are 0 as well as having different means for each factor. The highest mean lies on readiness with 4.00, the second is on intelligence and aptitude with 3.79, the third is on interest with 3.75, the fourth is on motivation with 3.65, the fifth is on opportunity with 3.54 and the sixth is on support with 3.49, with the maximum is 5 and lying on range 2 and 3.

In the following it also shows standard deviation wherein some variables indicate more concentrated data but mostly show more spread out data. Intelligence and aptitude show low standard deviation, it is 0.491 indicating more concentrated data, students in learning English shows higher standard deviation than intelligence and aptitude which should exactly affect it, it is 0.504 indicating higher data variation, motivation shows standard deviation which is 0.551 indicating moderate data variation, opportunity and interest show higher standard deviation which are 0.600 and 0.606 indicating more spread out data, support and readiness show highest standard deviation which are 0.630 and 0.627 indicating mostly spread out data. The rank of all standard deviations also show which variables show significant effect to students in learning English.

In addition, variance shows how much each value differs from the mean counted wherein intelligence and aptitude have 0.241, motivation has 0.303, support has 0.397, opportunity has 0.360, readiness has 0.393, interest has 0.367 and students in learning English has 0.254. In other words, the tables below provide an overview of the data distribution for each factor that is intelligence, aptitude, motivation, support, opportunity, readiness and interest and identifying the level of variation or diversity in the data which can affect the outcomes or students in learning English. In the following, both of Figures are seen.

Descriptive Statistics						
	N	Range	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Intelligence	57	2	5	3.79	.491	.241
Aptitude	57	2	5	3.79	.491	.241
Motivation	57	2	5	3.65	.551	.303
Support	57	3	5	3.49	.630	.397
Opportunity	57	3	5	3.54	.600	.360
Readiness	57	2	5	4.00	.627	.393
Interest	57	3	5	3.75	.606	.367
Valid N (listwise)	57					

Figure 1. Descriptive Statistics

Frequencies

		Statistics							
		X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	Y
N	Valid	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Std. Deviation		.491	.491	.551	.630	.600	.627	.606	.504
Variance		.241	.241	.303	.397	.360	.393	.367	.254

Figure 2. Validity, Standard Deviation and Variance

Further in Figure 3 below, it is seen that first, intelligence has a perfect positive correlation with aptitude with 1.000**, positive correlations with motivation with 0.383*, support with 0.456**, opportunity with 0.335*, readiness with 0.348*, and interest with 0.304*. Second, aptitude has a perfect correlation with intelligence with 1.000**, positive correlation with motivation with 0.383*, support with 0.456**, opportunity with 0.335*, readiness with 0.348*, and interest with 0.304*. Third, motivation has positive correlations with intelligence with 0.383*, aptitude with 0.383*, support with 0.403**, interest with 0.540** and no significant correlation with opportunity and readiness wherein opportunity is 0.210 and readiness is 0.207. Fourth, support has positive correlations with intelligence, aptitude, motivation, opportunity, readiness and interest. They are 0.456**, 0.456**, 0.403**, 0.603**, 0.542**, and 0.322*. Fifth, opportunity has positive correlations with intelligence with 0.335*, aptitude with 0.335*, support with 0.603**, and readiness with 0.428** meanwhile it has no significant correlation with motivation and interest. They are 0.210 and 0.276. Sixth, readiness has positive correlations with intelligence with 0.348*, aptitude with 0.348*, support with 0.542**, opportunity with 0.428**, and interest with 0.329* meanwhile there is no significant correlation with motivation with 0.207. Seventh, interest has positive correlations with intelligence, aptitude, motivation, support, opportunity, readiness and interest. They are 0.304*, 0.304*, 0.540**, 0.322*, 0.276*, and 0.329*.

From the results, it is observed that most of factors have positive correlations with each other, indicating relationships among these factors. Higher correlations indicate stronger relationships among intelligence, aptitude, motivation, support, opportunity, readiness and interest. In the following, it is seen Figure 3 showing correlation.

		Correlations							
		Intelligence	Aptitude	Motivation	Support	Opportunity	Readiness	Interest	
Intelligence	Pearson Correlation	1	1.000**	.383**	.456**	.335*	.348**	.304*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<.001	.003	<.001	.011	.008	.022	
	N	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	
Aptitude	Pearson Correlation	1.000**	1	.383**	.456**	.335*	.348**	.304*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001		.003	<.001	.011	.008	.022	
	N	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.383**	.383**	1	.403**	.210	.207	.540**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.003		.002	.118	.122	<.001	
	N	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	
Support	Pearson Correlation	.456**	.456**	.403**	1	.603**	.542**	.322*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	.002		<.001	<.001	.015	
	N	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	
Opportunity	Pearson Correlation	.335*	.335*	.210	.603**	1	.428**	.276*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.011	.118	<.001		<.001	.038	
	N	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	
Readiness	Pearson Correlation	.348**	.348**	.207	.542**	.428**	1	.329*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.008	.122	<.001	<.001		.012	
	N	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	
Interest	Pearson Correlation	.304*	.304*	.540**	.322*	.276*	.329*	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.022	.022	<.001	.015	.038	.012		
	N	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Figure 3: Correlation

Looking at the following Figure, it is found that when all predictor variables (IAMSORI) are 0, the expected value of the dependent variable 'students in learning English' is 4.439, and the result is statistically significant. Aptitude has a negative relationship with 'students in learning English'. For each one unit increases in 'aptitude', the expected value of 'students in learning English' decreases by 0.374 units. The relationship is statistically significant at the 0.05

Intelligence, Aptitude, Motivation, Support, Opportunity, Readiness, and Interest (IAMSORI) Affecting Students in Learning English level. Motivation has a positive relationship but non-significant relationship with 'students in learning English'. The coefficient is not statistically significant. Support is same with motivation which has a positive relationship but non-significant relationship with 'students in learning English'. The coefficient is not statistically significant. Opportunity has a negative relationship but non-significant relationship with 'students in learning English'. The coefficient is not statistically significant. Readiness has a positive relationship but non-significant relationship with 'students in learning English'. The coefficient is not statistically significant. Interest has a negative relationship but non-significant relationship with 'students in learning English'. The coefficient is not statistically significant.

Of the explanation among all factors 'intelligence, aptitude, motivation, support, opportunity, readiness and interest' (IAMSORI), it is concluded that 'aptitude' only which has a statistically relationship with the dependent variable 'students in learning English' at the 0.05 level. Other factors such as motivation, support, opportunity, readiness and interest do not show significant effects on 'students in learning English' in this research. Clearly it is seen in Figure 4 below.

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.439	.657		6.761	<.001
	Aptitude	-.374	.159	-.364	-2.351	.023
	Motivation	.023	.155	.025	.148	.883
	Support	.090	.155	.112	.577	.566
	Opportunity	-.133	.142	-.158	-.937	.353
	Readiness	.155	.131	.193	1.182	.243
	Interest	-.021	.136	-.025	-.151	.881

a. Dependent Variable: Learning English

Figure 4. Coefficients

From the results or findings above, it is found that seven (7) factors have different values towards students in learning English. In other words, intelligence, aptitude, motivation, support, opportunity, readiness and interest have different levels or ranks in affecting students in learning English.

Based on the obtained data, the constant term in the model has an unstandardized coefficient (B) of 4.439 and a standard error of 0.657, leading to a t-value of 6.761. The significance level for the constant is less than 0.001, indicating that it is a highly significant component of the model. This shows that intelligence has the most dominant influence towards students in learning English. It is seen from students' perception about intelligence that are among eight (8) statements, 14% strongly agreed and 70.2% agreed with intelligence makes them imaginative persons in creating English courses assignments when it is instructed to do as stated by Gardner in (Madkour & Mohamed, 2016) that the human ability to perform activities that require spatial judgments called visual-spatial intelligence with high levels are able to visualize in their mind's eye which is characterized by the ability to look at an image or situation and determine areas where its appearance can be changed; 19.3% strongly agreed and 61.4% agreed with intelligence makes them curious persons to know more and more about English courses in English classroom or outside the classroom, 29.8% strongly agreed and 50.9% agreed with intelligence makes them have a high interest when English courses are being discussed as mentioned by Gardner in (Madkour & Mohamed, 2016) that mental search intelligence refers to the human ability to search and scan for information; 12.3% strongly agreed and 49.1% agreed with intelligence makes them bravely argue something wrong with English course materials being discussed as delivered by Gardner in (Soleimani et al., 2012) that intelligence is the ability to process information that is activated in cultural competition to solve problems or create products that are valuable in that culture; 17.5% strongly agreed and 49.1% agreed with intelligence makes them confidently express opinions, comments, critics, and suggestions in English teaching-learning process as written by Gardner in (Madkour & Mohamed, 2016) and (Derakhshan & Faribi, 2015) that the ability to use language effectively, create using spoken or written language is called verbal and linguistic intelligence

wherein people with high verbal and linguistic intelligence are good at reading, writing and telling stories which manipulates the syntax and structure of language, the semantics and meaning of language, and the pragmatic or practical use of language; 5.3% strongly agreed and 47.4% agreed with intelligence makes them remember all English materials they have learnt previously meanwhile 42.1% is neutral or undecided and 5.3% disagreed with intelligence makes them pose HOTS and LOTS questions in English teaching-learning process since 40.4% only who agreed with it. As said by previous researchers named (Erlina et al., 2019), learners who were able to effectively use language to persuade others (rhetoric), learners who were able to remember information both orally and in writing (mnemonic), learners who were able to reproduce information both orally and in writing (explanation), and a few learners who reflected on language and discussed language itself (metalinguistic) are learners whose high intelligence. It means that intelligence affects students in using, remembering, reproducing, reflecting and discussing language, in this case is English. In addition, what is found by (Debatin et al., 2019) that fluency and innate inspiration were related to baseline English proficiency. In any case, neither fluency nor innate inspiration alone could predict the rate of change in English outcomes. As a whole, using multiple intelligences allows students to master language skills as integrated components rather than studying grammar, reading, listening, speaking and writing as separate units without understanding the importance of integration in reaching an advanced language level. College students need to acquire fluency in English to pursue graduate studies at their alma mater or abroad, Gardner in (Madkour & Mohamed, 2016). This multiple intelligence has important implications for education in general and language learning in particular, Gardner in (Soleimani et al., 2012).

Furthermore, with aptitude, it has an unstandardized coefficient (B) of -0.374 and a standard error of 0.159, resulting in a t-value of -2.351. The significance level (Sig.) for aptitude is 0.023, indicating that aptitude is a statistically significant predictor of learning English with a negative impact. It indicates only aptitude has a statistically significant impact on learning English, and it does so negatively. This is contrast with Li; Stefanou & Révész in (Ishikawa & Suzuki, 2023) conveying some studies have found that explicit instruction results in less statistically significant relationships between aptitude and learning ability than implicit instruction, suggesting that explicit instruction can minimize individual differences in ability. However, Sheen; Yilmaz in (Ishikawa & Suzuki, 2023) found other studies have shown a more significant association between aptitude and development under explicit instruction, suggesting that learners need both higher aptitude and explicit instruction to promote their development. Against the differences, learners' prior knowledge of the target construction may be another key, (Ishikawa & Suzuki, 2023). It is spotted from students' perception in respect to aptitude that is among eight (8) statements, 15.8% strongly agreed and 57.9% agreed with aptitude makes students have background knowledge about English, 14% strongly agreed and 59.6% agreed with aptitude makes students understand each course taught by lecturers in English classroom as delivered by Carroll; Doughty; Wen & Skehan in (Wen et al., 2023) that language aptitude refers to the set of cognitive abilities that enable us to understand, explain, diagnose and predict why and how some people are able to learn one language more effectively and efficiently than others, all else being equal; 15.8% strongly agreed and 61.4% agreed with aptitude students have an opportunity to complete a lot of assignments before a deadline, 8.8% strongly agreed and 64.9% agreed with aptitude students clearly do assignments based on instruction, 17.5% strongly agreed and 64.9% agreed with aptitude students finish better different types of assignments correctly as a challenge, 15.8% strongly agreed and 40.4% agreed with aptitude students can do better all assignments by themselves meanwhile 3.5% strongly agreed and 36.8% agreed with lack of aptitude English medium instruction makes them blank during teaching-learning process and 42.1% is neutral or undecided that English courses materials are difficult to learn. As found by (Doughty & MacKey, 2021) that some empirical papers conclude that there is a relationship between aptitude and language learning, while others conclude that there is no relationship. This

supported by Doughty in (Doughty & MacKey, 2021) who describes unresolved debates regarding issues such as whether aptitude is a stable trait across the lifespan, whether talent develops (or can be trained!), to what extent and how talent provides a blueprint, whether learners can quickly master a new language (and, more broadly, whether aptitude represents a "ceiling" for language learning), and whether components of aptitude affect the language learning process differently at different stages of maturity or ability. From these perceptions, it is concluded that higher aptitude will have better English learning. Otherwise, lower aptitude will have worse English learning. This is supported by (Bokander, 2020) that this is to be more important for learners with a typologically similar L1 than for learners with a more distant L1. Furthermore, the results support theoretical suggestions from the individual differences literature that auditory processing skills may be particularly important in the early stages of L2 acquisition.

Hereinafter motivation, on the other hand, has an unstandardized coefficient (B) of 0.023 and a standard error of 0.155, leading to a t-value of 0.148. Its significance level is 0.883, suggesting that motivation does not significantly affect students in learning English. It is noticed from students' perception dealing with motivation among eight (8) statements, wherein 61.4% agreed with motivation if supported by various teaching methods make students learn each English course better, 57.9% agreed with motivation appears if students' engagement created by lecturers during teaching-learning process makes students actively participate to share knowledge, pose questions, give opinions and criticize contents being discussed, 71.9% agreed with motivation if supported by fun English classroom to learn English courses materials better, 57.9% agreed with motivation if group assignment makes students easily learn English courses material meanwhile 38.6% agreed that they were motivated in learning each English course material if students have presentation, mid and final test only, 31.6% agreed and also disagreed with doing their assignments to fulfill students' marks only, 36.8% agreed that they are not motivated if many assignments to do since many assignments make students down and get stress, 47.4% agreed if individual assignment is a burden for students to do. From these perceptions it is remarked that mostly motivation found in students' perception was external motivation. It means students exactly did not have any internal motivation to learn English from their own self. Students depended on their lecturers how to manage each course taught to them. If a course was managed as students expected, they would learn English better. Otherwise they did nothing as it was stated as a burden to do. In other words, self-motivation does not significantly affect students in learning English as supported by (Lena et al., 2022) neither motivation nor interest in learning English had any effect on students' learning outcomes.

Further, support has an unstandardized coefficient (B) of 0.090 and a standard error of 0.155, resulting in a t-value of 0.577. The significance level for support is 0.566, indicating that it is not a significant predictor in this model. This is viewed from students' perception that 52.6% agreed their parents support them to use English at home, 43.9% agreed their brothers and sisters urge them to use English at home, 47.4% agreed their family encourages them to practice English at home, 66.7% agreed students develop their language components and skills if they practice English with their family; 50.9% was undecided whether students with their close friends use English outside the classroom every day in a community, 50.9% agreed students with their classmates use English outside the classroom at least once in a week in a community, 63.2% agreed students and their friends never mock each other if they practice English with them in a community, 68.4% agreed students develop their language components and skills if they practice English with them in a community; 36.8% was undecided if people around them laugh if students use English in environment, 47.4% was undecided if people support students to use English to their neighbor, 40.4% was undecided if people mock students if they use English in their environment, and 56.1% agreed if students develop their language components and skills if they practice English with them in environment. It is concluded that support can affect students in learning English but since support comes from

different sides such as from family at home, community and environment. Three of these sides showed different result to give effect to students in learning English. It was evident that support from family makes students learn English, but support from community was hesitated except from their close friends moreover from environment which showed uncertainty wherein students develop their English if practice was done. This was in line with (Galloway & Ruegg, 2020) and (Yan, 2022) that support from students, family and parents only affect students in learning English.

Next, opportunity shows an unstandardized coefficient (B) of -0.133 and a standard error of 0.142, giving a t-value of -0.937. Its significance level is 0.353, suggesting that opportunity does not significantly influence students in learning English. This is witnessed from students' perception towards among five (5) statements that was come into sight 55.4% of students could not decide whether they spend their time to read English courses materials if no class at the day, 49.1% of students could not decide whether they spend their time to speak English with others if holiday, 47.4% of students agreed to spend their time to write English on their notes if they are reading English outside, 63.2% of students agreed to spend their time to listen to English courses materials from audio/video if their house works are done, and 54.4% of students develop their other English skills outside the classroom. It can be seen that students could not utilize off class and holiday as opportunities to learn English. Students learn English if it is conditioned by their own self. This is not in line with (Refinery et al., 1980) who states that to expand and improve ultimately Chinese K-12 students' utilization of online EFL was by designing and implementing effective online EFL- courses and programs, learning opportunities and better supporting student learning and development.

In addition, readiness has an unstandardized coefficient (B) of 0.155 and a standard error of 0.131, leading to a t-value of 1.182. The significance level for readiness is 0.243, indicating that it is not a significant predictor. This is noted from students' perception towards statements which showed 56.1% agreed physically students are ready to learn each English course taught by their lecturers, 56.1% agreed mentally students are ready to learn each English course taught by their lecturers, 59.6% agreed emotionally students are ready to learn each English course taught by their lecturers; 49.1% agreed with students' family is ready to prepare and to create a favorable environment at home to help them gain the best level of learning, 47.4% agreed with students' family is ready to prepare and to contribute to achieving the best learning among them, 50.9% agreed with students' family is ready to fulfill their learning needs; 52.6% agreed with university is ready to prepare and to create a favorable environment, 63.2% agreed with lecturers are ready to create a favorable environment, and 52.6% agreed with lecturers are ready to teach, educate, advice, monitor, control, supervise, assess, evaluate, and have good decisions. It is concluded that institute readiness is higher than students' readiness meanwhile students' readiness is higher than family readiness. In other words, students and institute readiness are better than family readiness in supporting students to learn English. This is not in line with (Mutiah et al., 2020), (Sumarni et al., 2021), (Banit et al., 2022), (Walia & Kaharuddin, 2023), (Imam Santosa et al., 2024) (Daflizar et al., 2022), (Lee & Hwang, 2022), (Gregory et al., 2021) who state teachers and students were ready but others were not.

Finally, interest has an unstandardized coefficient (B) of -0.021 and a standard error of 0.136, resulting in a t-value of -0.151. The significance level for Interest is 0.881, suggesting that interest does not significantly affect students in learning English. It is apparent from 52.6% agreed with students choose English education study program because they are interested in only, 56.1% agreed that they like learning English because mastering English makes them proud of, 50.9% agreed that students learn English courses materials if they are interesting, 50.9% agreed that students have some ways how to read English courses materials, 50.9% of students could not decide whether they spend their time to read English courses materials at least an hour everyday outside the classroom or not, 35.1% agreed that students better read English courses materials using mobile phone and laptop than manual papers and 35.1% also

students could not decide whether better read English courses materials using mobile phone and laptop than manual papers, 49.1% agreed that it is more interesting to read English courses materials using manual papers than mobile phone and laptop, 40.4% agreed that it is more easily comprehensive to read English courses materials using manual papers than mobile phone and laptop. It can be concluded that students feel interest in learning English but still do not know how to choose a better choice in learning English. In other words, students' interest did not make them learn English and comprehend English as a need. It is seen from 31.4% students were still hesitant toward their comprehension to English. This is in line with (Lena et al., 2022) who deliver that motivation and interest are not factors that lead to students' success in English courses.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, using the beta coefficient to answer the research question to find out the most dominant factor among all factors (IAMSORI) that influence students in learning English, statistically that is intelligence. Among all factors, only aptitude has a statistically significant effect on students' learning English and it is negative. The other factors such as motivation, support, opportunity, readiness, and interest do not significantly influence students in learning English according to this model. The research results or findings can contribute significantly to both theory and practice. In theory, it may add insights into literature regarding intelligence, aptitude, motivation, support, opportunity, readiness and interest have different significant influence on students in learning English. In practice, students may develop and upgrade their internal and external potentials to affect a better English learning. The negative coefficient for aptitude suggests that higher aptitude is associated with students' lower scores in learning English, which might require further investigation to understand the underlying reasons. In addition, it is suggested for students, parents, families, communities, environments, lecturers and research institutions at various levels of education to hone students' intelligence and aptitude, increase motivation and support, seize opportunities, prepare and awaken interests (IAMSORI).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers are so grateful for the students who have already participated and willing to be sample in this research. Without the students' concern, the data collection would not complete.

REFERENCES

- Alharbi, A. (2021). A review of the internal and external factors affecting teachers' ICT use in classroom. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 9(12), 105-116. www.ijern.com
- Amadi, G. N. (2018). Horse-stream truism in Thorndike's law of readiness: Educational implications. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 5(7), 25-28.
- Banit, O., Shtepura, A., Rostoka, M., Cherevychnyi, G., & Dyma, O. (2022). Students' Readiness to Distance Learning: Results of Research in the Institutions of Higher Education. *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, 389 LNNS, 426-434. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-93904-5_43
- Belda, F., & Tutor, P. (2017). *July*, 2017.
- Bokander, L. (2020). Language Aptitude and Crosslinguistic Influence in Initial L2 Learning. *Journal of the European Second Language Association*, 4(1), 35. <https://doi.org/10.22599/jesla.69>
- Cabrera-Solano, P., Gonzalez-Torres, P., Solano, L., Castillo-Cuesta, L., & Jiménez, J. (2019). Perceptions on the internal factors influencing EFL learning: A case of Ecuadorian

- Intelligence, Aptitude, Motivation, Support, Opportunity, Readiness, and Interest (IAMSORI) Affecting Students in Learning English children. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(4), 365–380. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12424a>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Mixed Methods Procedures. In *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*.
- Curso, L. I. (2019). Internal factors in the acquisition of English as a second language : Age Trabajo de fin de grado and Motivation Facultade de Filoloxía Internal factors in the acquisition of English as a second language : Age Trabajo de fin de grado and Motivation Grao e.
- Daflizar, Indrayadi, T., & Irawan, Y. (2022). Unveiling Indonesian Pre-Service Teachers' Perceived Competencies and Readiness for Online English Language Teaching: A Mixed Methods Study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(2), 392–400. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1302.21>
- Debatin, T., Harder, B., & Ziegler, A. (2019). Does fluid intelligence facilitate the learning of English as a foreign language? – A longitudinal latent growth curve analysis. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 70(June 2018), 121–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.01.009>
- Derakhshan, A., & Faribi, M. (2015). Multiple Intelligences: Language Learning and Teaching. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5(4), 63–72. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v5n4p63>
- Doughty, C. J., & MacKey, A. (2021). Language aptitude: Multiple perspectives. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 41, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190521000076>
- Erlina, D., Marzulina, L., Astrid, A., Desvitasari, D., Sapriati, R. S., Amrina, R. D., Mukminin, A., & Habibi, A. (2019). Linguistic intelligence of undergraduate EFL learners in higher education: A case study. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7(10), 2143–2155. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2019.071012>
- Galloway, N., & Ruegg, R. (2020). The provision of student support on English Medium Instruction programmes in Japan and China. In *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* (Vol. 45). Elsevier B.V. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100846>
- Gregory, T., Dal Grande, E., Brushe, M., Engelhardt, D., Luddy, S., Guhn, M., Gadermann, A., Schonert-Reichl, K. A., & Brinkman, S. (2021). Associations between School Readiness and Student Wellbeing: A Six-Year Follow Up Study. *Child Indicators Research*, 14(1), 369–390. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-020-09760-6>
- Hajebi M., T., & Noshadi, M. (2018). The relationship between interpersonal intelligence, reading activity and vocabulary learning among Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 6(1), 50.
- Hong, W. C. H. (2023). The impact of ChatGPT on foreign language teaching and learning: opportunities in education and research. In *Journal of Educational Technology and Innovation* (Vol. 5, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.61414/jeti.v5i1.103>
- Imam Santosa, Ifan Iskandar, & Lulu Atul Munawaroh. (2024). Assessing Students' Learning Readiness Toward Student-Centered Learning. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 8(1), 254–268. <https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.8.1.254-268>
- Ishikawa, M., & Suzuki, W. (2023). Effects of written languaging on second language learning: Mediating roles of aptitude. *Modern Language Journal*, 107, 95–112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12817>
- Kemendikbud. (2022). Kurikulum Pada Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar, Dan Jenjang Pendidikan Menengah. *Badan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Dan Penjaminan Mutu Pendidikan*, 1–26.
- Khoiriyah, R. (n.d.). *the Moderating Role of Internal Factors*. 1–13.
- Lee, H. J., & Hwang, Y. (2022). Technology-Enhanced Education through VR-Making and Metaverse-Linking to Foster Teacher Readiness and Sustainable Learning. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 14(8). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14084786>

- Lena, M. S., Trisno, E., & Khairat, F. (2022). The Effect of Motivation and Interest on Students' English Learning Outcomes. *Mextesol Journal*, 46(3), 0–2. <https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v46n3-2>
- Madkour, M., & Mohamed, R. A. A. M. (2016). Identifying College Students' Multiple Intelligences to Enhance Motivation and Language Proficiency. *English Language Teaching*, 9(6), 92. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n6p92>
- Mahmoudi, S. (2015). Internal and External Factors Affecting Learning English as a Foreign Language. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(5), 313. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20150305.16>
- Mughei, N.A., Siddiqui, A., & Kurd, S.A. (2015). Importance of English in Regional Academic Practices: A Case Study of Asian-Pacific Countries. *Asia Pacific, Research Journal, Volume 40*, 145-163.
- Mutiah, S. D., Nakhriyah, M., HR, N. H., Hidayat, D. N., & Hamid, F. (2020). The Readiness of Teaching English to Young Learners in Indonesia. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 4(4), 1370–1387. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v4i4.541>
- Refinery, T. O. A., Project, A., & Ukala, J. G. V. A. (1980). *Submitted in partial fulfillment of*.
- Soleimani, H., Moinnzadeh, A., Kassaian, Z., & Ketabi, S. (2012). The effect of instruction based on multiple intelligences theory on the attitude and learning of general English. *English Language Teaching*, 5(9), 45–53. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n9p45>
- Sumarni, S. S., Vianty, M., & Andika, W. D. (2021). Readiness to Learn English for Early Childhood. *Jurnal Obsesi: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 6(3), 1480–1492. <https://doi.org/10.31004/obsesi.v6i3.1805>
- Sun, H., Steinkrauss, R., Tendeiro, J., & De Bot, K. (2016). Individual differences in very young children's English acquisition in China: Internal and external factors. *Bilingualism*, 19(3), 550–566. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728915000243>
- Utama, N. R. (2017). *Student Perceptions about Internal and External Obstacles Factors on English Language Learning Process at Nutrition Study Program of Palangka Raya Health Polytechnic*. 5(5), 125–130.
- Walia, S. K., & Kaharuddin, K. (2023). Gen Z: Readiness of Using English As a Medium of Learning in Port Dickson Polytechnic. *Ijbsae.Org*, September, 45–54. <https://www.ijbsae.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/6.pdf>
- Wen, Z. (Edward), Skehan, P., & Sparks, R. L. (2023). Language Aptitude Research: From testing to theory and practice. *Language Aptitude Theory and Practice*, 2002, 1–22.
- Wulandari, C., Surtikanti, M. W., & Agung, A. S. S. N. (2020). a Case Study of Internal and External Factors on the Difficulties in Learning English. *JOEEL: Journal of English Education and Literature*, 1(2), 43–48. <https://doi.org/10.38114/joeel.v1i2.81>
- Yan, M. (2022). The Effect of Family Income on Parents' Motivation to Support Children's English Learning at Primary Level. *Proceedings of the 2022 5th International Conference on Humanities Education and Social Sciences (ICHESS 2022)*, 2978–2985. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-89-3_342