گۆڤاری ئەکادیمیای کوردی

Kurdish Academic Journals

No. 60 2024

هەولێر - شەقامی هەڵەبجە

http://gov.krd/ka

گۆڤاری ئەکادیمیای کوردی

Kurdish Academic Journals

No. (60) 2724 Kurdish 2024

http;//gov.krd/ka ISSN: 2520-4106 Erbil - Halabja Street

INVESTIGATING ENGLISH VOCABULARY TEACHING TO EFL STUDENTS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES THEORY

Lween Latif Darwesh

MA student/ University of Sulaimani
Lweenlatif96@gmail.com

Prof. Dr. Hoshang Farooq Jawad

University of Sulaimani
Hoshang.jawad@univsul.edu.iq

Abstract

The present study investigates the relationship between Multiple Intelligence Theory MIT and vocabulary teaching. MIT has prompted some educators and language scholars to reevaluate classroom practices in education and other aspects of language teaching and learning. This paper attempts to clarify the applications of this theory in the context of teaching vocabulary. This article aims to discover: (1) whether there is a correlation between the instructors' MIT profile and the type of intelligence they employ in the classroom. (2) whether there is a significant relationship between the use of MIT and higher EFL English as a Foreign Language student achievement in vocabulary learning. Therefore, a questionnaire and a checklist served 18 EFL instructors and 50 EFL sophomores as the means of data collection at two distinct universities in Sulaymaniyah City for the academic year 2022–2023. Some questionnaire items were adapted from (Christison, 1996). The descriptive analysis of the data revealed an association between the multiple intelligences MIs and instructional approaches of EFL instructors. Moreover, a significant positive correlation exists between the use of MIT and higher EFL student achievement in vocabulary learning. However, age, field of study, and gender did not significantly impact EFL instructors' multiple intelligences teaching strategies and their student's learning styles.

Keywords: Multiple Intelligence Theory, vocabulary teaching, EFL instructors, and EFL students

1.1 Introduction and the Statement of the Problem

As an inherent component of a language, vocabulary is crucial to the language teaching and learning process. Regarding this, Elyas and Alfaki (2014) mentioned that teaching vocabulary is the most essential aspect of language acquisition for students. The absence of basic vocabulary knowledge presents EFL learners with an obvious and significant obstacle. Also, Armstrong (2018) stated that it cannot be denied that vocabulary is vast, and its acquisition takes time. Nonetheless, numerous scholars, such as Fleetham (2006), have demonstrated that applying MIT for vocabulary instruction can facilitate teaching and learning and boost vocabulary size and level. The present study will investigate vocabulary instruction using MIT. The fact that it has not been studied in the area of the study, particularly from the teachers' perspective, makes the thesis distinctive. Therefore, the problem that this study seeks to address is that one of the most significant issues facing Kurdish EFL students in English departments is their inadequate vocabulary inventory; a well-developed vocabulary has long been considered essential for reading and literary achievement. Accordingly, in the researcher's opinion, teaching methods are also inadequate in English departments of different Sulaymaniyah city universities, and instructors lack knowledge of the diversity of strategies that can be used to teach vocabulary based on current theory. Moreover, MIT techniques can enhance vocabulary education and increase vocabulary repertoire and proficiency.

1.2 Aims of the Study

This study aims to investigate EFL university instructors' viewpoints regarding using MIT for teaching vocabulary. In addition, the study seeks to ascertain the extent to which MIT is utilized in the area of the study to determine the efficacy of this theory in vocabulary instruction as well as the impact of students' training in this regard.

1.3 The Research Questions

1- Is there a significant relationship between the MI profile of instructors and the kind of intelligence they use in their classrooms?
2- Is there a significant relationship between the use of MIT and higher EFL student achievement in vocabulary learning?
3- What is the order of MIT types preferred by Kurdish EFL instructors in teaching English vocabulary?
4- Is there a difference between the MIT profile of male and female students in learning vocabulary?

1.4 Methodology of the Study

Regarding the design of the study's theoretical background, the researcher followed Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences. While for vocabulary teaching, different theories were presented. Concerning the data collection, the study is a quantitative method that used a questionnaire and checklist to collect data from 18 Kurdish EFL instructors and 50 Kurdish EFL students at two universities in Sulaymaniyah City. Some of the questionnaire items were adapted from (Christison, 1996).

1.5 Limitations of the Study

This research has some limitations. Firstly, the study focuses solely on the theory of multiple intelligences for teaching vocabulary to Kurdish EFL students; however, in chapter two (theoretical background), we present some theoretical sections on other related theories for teaching vocabulary. Secondly, this study is narrowed to a group of Kurdish EFL instructors and students currently working and studying in the English departments of the Universities of

Sulaimaniyah City in the Kurdistan region of Iraq during the academic year 2022-2023. Therefore, one should not generalize the conclusions to all EFL learners in the Region.

1.6 The Significance of the Study

This study can assist Kurdish EFL university instructors and curriculum designers in enhancing their vocabulary teaching techniques. As it is difficult for Kurdish EFL university teachers to assist students in improving their vocabulary and comprehension, they may highlight this strategy in their lessons and train students to identify their intelligence type and learning style. Hence, this study is significant since it enhances EFL students' awareness of the available options for vocabulary acquisition.

1 Theoretical Background

1.1 History of Vocabulary Teaching

EFL vocabulary research dates back to Harold E. Palmer in the 1920s. During the last couple of decades, a number of Palmer's suggestions have become research topics. Palmer (2019) was the first to highlight concerns regarding teaching and learning English vocabulary. Nevertheless, due to the prevalence of the grammar-translation method at the time, his colleagues had little interest in his ideas.

Regarding language education methods that acknowledge vocabulary teaching, the Grammar-Translation Method was the first to do so. According to Usman (2016), the method utilized the student's native language as a foundation for learning new words. This method aims to improve learners' written language ability and exemplary reading. Throughout the 18th century, the Grammar- Translation method was regarded as the most effective way to teach new vocabulary since morphology is the source of vocabulary, and morphology is classified as grammar. Therefore, the Grammar-Translation Method for teaching vocabulary might be effective.

After that, Sinaga et al. (2018) claimed that the Direct method which was teaching a foreign language, particularly a modern language, by conversation, debate, and reading in the target language, without translating and studying formal grammar. As Patel and Jain (2008) stated, the initial words are indicated by pointing to objects, images, or performing actions. It is also referred to be a natural way, and it helps language learners appreciate the language.

Richards and Rodgers (2018) asserted that reading became the focus of most foreign language programs in the United States after the publication of the Coleman Report in 1929, and this popularity continued until World War II. It was chosen as an alternative to the Direct method for various reasons, including limited class hours, the instructor's qualifications, and the student's requirements. According to Mora (2017), this method teaches vocabulary by emphasizing reading.

Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011) argued that the Audio-lingual method is an oral approach similar to the direct method. However, it is significantly different because "rather than stressing vocabulary teaching through exposure to its use in context, the Audio-lingual method drills students on the use of grammatical sentence patterns." It was assumed that to acquire the target language's sentence patterns, conditioning may assist students in responding appropriately to stimuli through shaping and reinforcement.

In this regard, the Communicative approach, which became popular in the 1970s, is the most effective language teaching method. Based on Krashen's theory, the method emphasizes an incidental and naturalistic approach to vocabulary acquisition. Yuliawati and Aprillia

(2019) claimed that Krashen believes the only method to acquire any language is by unconscious acquisition through natural communication.

1.2 Importance of Vocabulary in Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Great vocabulary researcher Nation (2011) claims that a significant amount of vocabulary may be acquired with the assistance of suitable vocabulary teaching methods and strategies. Vocabulary teaching is closely associated with phonetic, morphological, lexical, and semantic links and the construction of words. In a nutshell, the most important aspects of a word are its pronunciation, form, meaning, and usage. Moreover, Schmitt (2000, p. 55) argues that lexical knowledge is essential for communicative competence and second language acquisition. As defined by Thornbury (2002), vocabulary is the set of all the words in a language that can be used in a given context to convey a specific meaning. According to Lessard-Clouston (2013), "vocabulary" refers to the number of words in a language and the exact words chosen to convey a particular purpose. Also, Brown (2002) added that most students and teachers acknowledge the importance of vocabulary in language development. In the context of EFL language teaching, vocabulary has not always been emphasized. Despite being acknowledged as an essential aspect of language mastering, some instructors have not fully realized the considerable communicative benefits of acquiring a large vocabulary bank. Consequently, according to Coady and Hucki (1997), instructors and researchers no longer wrongly stigmatize language as an impediment to L2 learning. Many researchers, including (Laufer and Nation, 1999; Maximo, 2000; Read, 2000 and Nation, 2011), have recognized the importance of vocabulary acquisition in developing fully formed spoken and written texts. Without adequate vocabulary, students cannot comprehend or articulate their thoughts. As claimed by Wilkins (1972, p. 111), very little can be conveyed without grammar, without vocabulary, nothing can be conveyed. Additionally, according to Brown (2001), in English teaching, teachers ought to regard students as the body part of study and development. Teachers should advocate the spirit of independence, cooperation, and exploration in class, which can change the traditional vocabulary teaching method based on exposition and adopt diverse teaching methods to inspire students' learning interests as well as help them translate learned vocabulary into language skills and ultimately reach the goal of studying and using English creatively. Schmitt (2008) concludes that vocabulary teaching is currently one of the most frequently discussed aspects of EFL teaching.

1.3 The Theory of Multiple Intelligences

Multiple intelligence theory was initiated when Gardner (1983) and his colleagues, Jean Piaget, Jerome Bruner, and philosopher Nelson Goodman, investigated human potential. His theory is based on extensive brain studies, including interviews, tests, and reflections on hundreds of people. Fleetham (2006) stated that Gardner's theory does not question the existence of general intelligence but probes the possibilities of intelligences not covered by one concept. Moreover, Richards and Rodgers (2018) believe that Multiple Intelligences refers to a learner-centered philosophy that views human intellect as possessing multiple aspects that must be acknowledged and fostered in education. Gardner (2000) notes that traditional IQ tests, based on the Stanford-Binet test, measure only logic and language, despite the brain possessing other types of intelligence. Thus, MI was created

as a new paradigm for intelligence. Gardner (2003) research suggested that intelligence is centered in many different areas of the brain, which are interconnected, and rely upon one another. He argues that all humans have these intelligences, but people differ in the strengths and combinations of intelligences. Gardner (1993) believes that all of the intelligences can be enhanced through training and practice. MI belongs to a group of instructional perspectives that focus on differences between learners and the need to recognize learner differences in teaching. Learners are viewed as possessing individual learning styles, preferences, or intelligences. Richards and Rodgers (2018) find it convenient to claim that pedagogy is most effective when these student variations are acknowledged. Findings shook the educational community, which had become very comfortable with the notion that intelligence was a singular genetic quality measured by a paper-and-pencil test Teele (2000). Instead, Gardner (1983, p. 81) defined intelligence as the capacity for problem-solving or creating items valued in one or more cultural contexts. Therefore, "intelligence" as an individual capacity was investigated from eight distinct criteria from the biological sciences, logic, developmental psychology, and experimental psychometrics. Gardner (2009) proposed and defined seven intelligences and added two more. As a result, Armstrong (2018) and Gardner (2009) described the nine intelligences as follows:

1- Linguistic intelligence: this highlight using language in creative ways, which is something lawyers, writers, editors, and interpreters are strong in (word smart)
2- Logical-mathematical intelligence: this mean the ability to think rationally, which is commonly found among doctors, engineers, and scientists (number/reasoning smart).
3- Spatial intelligence: is the capacity to form mental representations of the physical world, which architects, designers, sculptors, and painters excel at (picture smart).
4- Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence refers to having a well-coordinated body, which is common in athletes and craftspeople (body smart).
5- Musical intelligence: a good musical ear, as found in singers and composers (music smart).
6- Interpersonal intelligence: the capacity to work well with others, which is particularly strong in salespeople, politicians, and teachers (people smart).
7- Intrapersonal intelligence: The ability to comprehend oneself and successfully apply one's gift, which leads to happy and well-adjusted individuals in all aspects of life; entrepreneurs, therapists, psychologists, and philosophers possess a high level of intrapersonal intelligence (self-smart).
8- Naturalist intelligence is the capacity to comprehend and organize natural patterns. Biologists, gardeners, ecologists, landscapers, and farmers likely possess this intelligence (nature smart).
9- Existential intelligence: Capacity to ponder phenomena or questions that transcend sensory facts, such as the infinite and the infinitesimal. Those with this intelligence are suited to shamans, priests, physicists, and psychologists, among other professions.

After introducing MI theory, Armstrong (2018) states that changes have been made in schools' curricula and teaching methodology. MI pedagogy focuses on the language class as the setting for a series of educational support

systems to make the language learner a better designer of their learning experiences. Such a learner is better empowered and more fulfilled than one in traditional classrooms. A more goal-directed learner and happier person is held to be a likely candidate for being a better second language learner and user. According to Snider (2001, p. 6), teachers are encouraged not to think of themselves merely as language teachers. They have a role that is not only to improve the second language abilities of their students but to become major "contributors to the overall development of students' intelligences.

In this respect, Christison (1996, p. 10) recommends three steps in teaching through the multiple intelligences: the ability of teachers and learners to recognize and understand their preferred intelligences (comprehension), the ability of teachers to incorporate the multiple intelligences to guide students with their learning (application); and the importance of teachers supporting students to recognize and apply their preferred intelligences (stimulation).

1.4 Review of Previous Studies on Vocabulary Teaching According to Multiple Intelligences Theory

There is a paucity of research on the application of the MI theory to language teaching, especially in foreign and second language contexts. The prior study investigated the relationship between MI theory and vocabulary learning and instruction. The current paper differs from its predecessors due to its location, time, and data collection perspective. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, this study is the first attempt to investigate the idea of multiple intelligence utilized by university instructors in the Iraqi Kurdistan Region to teach vocabulary to Kurdish EFL university students. Some studies in this area will be discussed below as part of the literature review.

In their research paper, Jiang and Zhou (2019) focus on the current state of college English vocabulary instruction and attempt to determine the viability of vocabulary teaching based on MIT to shed light on vocabulary instruction since vocabulary teaching is a challenge for teachers in college. Hence, it is high time for the teachers to explore an efficient English teaching methods and strategies to arouse students' interest as well as improve their English vocabulary levels. Moreover, Farahani and Kalkhoran (2014) study examines the relationship between MI and incidental vocabulary acquisition among Iranian intermediate EFL students. Ahour and Abdi (2015) designed a study titled "The Relationship between EFL Learners' Multiple Intelligences and Vocabulary Learning Strategies Use with a Focus on Gender" The study's objective is to investigate the connection between Iranian EFL male and female learners' MI types and their vocabulary learning strategies VLS use.

In conclusion, the aforementioned studies demonstrate that teaching vocabulary in English using MIT is effective, as it improves comprehension and retention and increases vocabulary size. However, this study is unique in that it seeks to investigate the vocabulary Teaching by MIT theory from the researcher's perspectives, teachers' and students' outcomes.

2 Methodology

2.1 The Study's Tool and Sampling

The study adopted a quantitative approach. This research utilizes a questionnaire and a checklist, with an instructor and student questionnaire component taken from the (Christison, 1996). The questionnaire covered six of the nine intelligences due to the most applied intelligence globally by teachers; the three intelligences that were not covered are the least common among

the MIs that have been applied thus far, and the MI type called "Existential intelligence" was recently introduced as number nine on the list. As a result, the study was considered less researchable by the researcher. The terms "Musial intelligence" and "naturalist intelligence" were also found to be unpopular and rarely utilized in the context of the KRG. This is supported by the fact that not enough studies have been conducted on the practical use of the two MIs Fleetham (2006). The participants are 18 instructors and 50 second-year students (e.g., 33 female and 17 male) within the age range of 18-25. The instructors were selected through non-probability and purposive sampling, while the students were chosen using probability sampling and simple random sampling. Participants were given 42-item questionnaires and asked to reply to each intelligence type based on their applicability to themselves. In order to have more accurate data, another instrument is used to support the first one. Therefore, seven classes (approximately (14) hours, two hours each) were observed to collect original data from Kurdish EFL teachers as they taught vocabulary. Instructors are told verbally of the research aims and allowed permission to assist with data collecting in order to find a correlation between the MI profile of teachers and the kind of intelligence they use in their classrooms.

2.2 Reliability and Validity

Johnson and Christensen (2014) state that reliability of a study's results relates to their consistency, stability, or repeatability. The Chronbach alpha is used for the forty-two items in student and instructor questionnaires, and the result is 0.913 and 0.811, respectively, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency and are considered highly reliable (See Table 1). Although measuring the validity of research data is not a simple task, validity is defined as the extent to which an instrument measures what it claims to measure Ary et al. (2014). And a jury of ELT, TESOL, and applied linguistics experts validated the questionnaire and the checklist.

Table (1) Reliability of the Questionnaire Items

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items	N
0.913	42	18
0.811	42	50

2.3 Data Analysis

This study employs a quantitative methodology. The questionnaire and the observation checklist collected data are examined using version 27.0 of IBM SPSS Statistics. After entering the data into the software, descriptive analysis was conducted to explain the study's findings for each analyzed variable. Moreover, based on the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test, the differences between items are assessed as statistically significant or not, and the Mann-Whitney U test evaluated the difference between the two independent item responses. Also, hypotheses about association were evaluated using the Chi-square test. Finally, the Spearman correlation was used to measure the correlation between variables.

3 Results & Discussion

This section reports the analysis of the collected data from the students' and instructors' questionnaires and classroom observation checklist (See Appendix A). A list of intelligences was investigated to determine if MI-based lessons enhance vocabulary teaching and learning. After calculating the participant scores on the questionnaires, instructors' responses were compared using Spearman correlation with the classroom observation checklist to determine if there is a significant relationship between the MI profile of instructors and the type of intelligence

they apply in the classroom. Moreover, the student's answers on the questionnaire were utilized by Spearman correlation to determine if there is a significant relationship between the use of MIT and higher EFL student achievement in vocabulary learning. A p-value of 0.05 or less used in the analysis led to the conclusion that the results were statistically significant. A p-value of 0.05 or lower was considered statistically significant across the board for all the tools.

3.1 The Instructors Questionnaire

This section details the outcomes of the instructor's MIT-related items to answer the research questions about the instructors MIs. The performance of the subjects has been investigated through descriptive statistics. Each category contained seven individual statements. Eighteen teachers were multiplied by seven to determine the final score. Therefore, the average score of the weighted mean is (4.02), and the total standard deviation score is (0.98) besides the total score of relative importance is (80.45). The overall trend of this variable is toward (always), indicating that the approval of research community members has a significant relationship with MIT and is of considerable value. Therefore, the instructors are familiar with MIT and suggest that teachers utilize MIT for teaching vocabulary to college-level students, with (40%) are always, (30%) often, (22%) sometimes, and (6% and 1%) answered with rarely and never, respectively (See Table 2).

Table (2) Results of the Instructor MIs Questionnaire

Categories	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Relative Importance
	count	count	count	count	count			
	%	%	%	%	%			
Verbal-linguistics	0.00	5.00	31.00	38.00	52.00	4.09	0.90	81.75
	0.00	3.97	24.60	30.16	41.27			
Logical-mathematical	0.00	5.00	23.00	44.00	54.00	4.16	0.87	83.33
	0.00	3.97	18.25	34.92	42.86			
Visual-spatial	2.00	9.00	30.00	34.00	51.00	3.98	1.05	79.52
	1.59	7.14	23.81	26.98	40.48			
Bodily-kinesthetic	4.00	17.00	50.00	28.00	27.00	3.45	1.05	69.05
	3.17	13.49	39.68	22.22	21.43			
Interpersonal	0.00	11.00	20.00	37.00	58.00	4.12	0.99	82.54
	0.00	8.73	15.87	29.37	46.03			
intrapersonal	0.00	0.00	19.00	47.00	60.00	4.33	0.73	86.51
	0.00	0.00	15.08	37.30	47.62			
Total	6.00	47.00	173.00	228.00	302.00	4.02	0.98	80.45
	0.79	6.22	22.88	30.16	39.95			

3.2 The Students Questionnaire

This section details the outcomes of the student's MIT-related items to answer the research questions about the profile of the students MIs. The performance of the subjects has been investigated through descriptive statistics. Each category contained seven individual statements. The score was calculated by multiplying fifty students by seven. The total score of the weighted mean is (3.80), and the total standard deviation score is (1.25) besides the total score of relative importance is (76.10). The overall trend of this variable is toward (agree), suggesting that the acceptance of members of the research community has a high association with this theory and is of major value. Therefore, the students are familiar with MIT and suggest they use MIT for learning vocabulary, as evidenced by the percentages (36%) (strongly agree), (33%) (agree), and (14%) don't have complete knowledge or are unsure about this strategy, (7% and 8%) (disagree) and (strongly disagree) (See Table 3).

Table (3) Results of the Student MIs Questionnaire

Categories	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Relative Importance
	count	count	count	count	count			
	%	%	%	%	%			
Verbal-linguistics	28.00	15.00	54.00	129.00	124.00	3.87	1.17	77.49
	8.00	4.29	15.43	36.86	35.43			
Logical-mathematical	58.00	31.00	61.00	116.00	84.00	3.39	1.37	67.83
	16.57	8.86	17.43	33.14	24.00			
Visual-spatial	27.00	13.00	51.00	126.00	133.00	3.92	1.17	78.57
	7.71	3.71	14.57	36.00	38.00			
Bodily-kinesthetic	30.00	31.00	55.00	120.00	114.00	3.73	1.24	74.69
	8.57	8.86	15.71	34.29	32.57			
interpersonal	28.00	45.00	43.00	113.00	121.00	3.72	1.28	74.51
	8.00	12.86	12.29	32.29	34.57			
intrapersonal	16.00	19.00	36.00	96.00	183.00	4.17	1.10	83.49
	4.57	5.43	10.29	27.43	52.29			
Total	187.00	154.00	300.00	700.00	759.00	3.80	1.25	76.10
	8.90	7.33	14.29	33.33	36.14			

3.3 Classroom Observation Checklist

Twenty items comprise the checklist used to authenticate the results of instructors using MIT to teach vocabulary. The checklist and instructor questionnaire results are used to find a correlation. As a result, the Spearman correlation is used to Determine if there is a significant relationship between the MI profiles of instructors and the type of intelligence they employ in the classroom. Accordingly, the total weighted mean is (2), the total score of the standard deviation is (1) and the general trend of the Classroom observation checklist as a whole towards (Apparent), and the percentage (10%) at the level of (strong), (50%) at the level of (apparent), and 40% at the (not displayed) level, indicating that the instructors are utilizing MIT in their classes for teaching vocabulary (See Table 4).

Table (4) The Instructors Classroom Observation Checklist

Items	Not displayed	Apparent	Strong	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation
	count	count	count		
	%	%	%		
1	3	2	2	1.8571	0.89974
	42.9	28.6	28.6		
2	0	7	0	2	0
	0	100	0		
3	1	5	1	2	0.57735
	14.3	71.4	14.3		
4	1	5	1	2	0.57735
	14.3	71.4	14.3		
5	3	3	1	1.7143	0.75593
	42.9	42.9	14.3		
6	4	3	0	1.4286	0.53452
	57.1	42.9	0		
7	3	3	1	1.7143	0.75593
	42.9	42.9	14.3		
8	0	7	0	2	0
	0	100	0		
9	1	6	0	1.8571	0.37796
	14.3	85.7	0		
10	2	5	0	1.7143	0.48795
	28.6	71.4	0		
11	6	1	0	1.1429	0.37796
	85.7	14.3	0		
12	7	0	0	1	0
	100	0	0		
13	0	7	0	2	0
	0	100	0		
14	0	3	4	2.5714	0.53452
	0	42.9	57.1		

15	0	5	2	2.2857	0.48795
	0	71.4	28.6		
16	4	3	0	1.4286	0.53452
	57.1	42.9	0		
17	5	2	0	1.2857	0.48795
	71.4	28.6	0		
18	7	0	0	1	0
	100	0	0		
19	1	4	2	2.1429	0.69007
	14.3	57.1	28.6		
20	7	0	0	1	0
	100	0	0		
Total	55	71	14	2	1
	39.28571429	50.7143	10		

3.4 Finding related to the Research Questions

The findings of the study are presented in the order of the research questions.

1. Is there a significant relationship between the MI profile of instructors and the kind of intelligence they use in their classrooms?

The following table illustrates the answer to the first research question. The study relies on two types of information. First, there is a positive correlation between the MI profile of instructors and the type of intelligence they employ in the classroom, as indicated by the association between the quantitative data collected from the questionnaire and the classroom observation checklist. Second, (57%) of instructors have a moderately favorable association between their MI profile and the type of intelligence they employ in the classroom. However, the p-value is (0.179), more than (0.05), indicating that this correlation is not statistically significant.

Table (5): Relationship between the MI profile of instructors and the kind of intelligence they use in their classrooms

	MI profile of teachers	P-value
Type of Intelligence use in classrooms	0.573	0.179

2. Is there a significant relationship between the use of MIT and higher EFL student achievement in vocabulary learning?

The link between the use of MIT and higher vocabulary learning achievement among EFL students is represented in Table (6). Using the Spearman correlation, a strong positive correlation exists between using MIT and higher vocabulary learning achievement among EFL students (76%). With a p-value of (0.000), which is less than (0.05), this association is statistically significant.

Table (6) Relationship between the use of MIT and higher EFL student achievement in vocabulary learning

	MIT and higher EFL student	P-value
Vocabulary Learning	0.76	0.000

3. What is the order of MIT types preferred by Kurdish EFL instructors in teaching English vocabulary?

The study also has demonstrated that 85% of the instructors think positively toward (intrapersonal intelligence) with a relative importance of (86.51) Consequently, there is complete consensus regarding this type of intelligence as a profile for instructors and its use in teaching vocabulary. 77%

of Kurdish EFL instructors are aware of the benefits of employing (logical/mathematical intelligence) in the classroom, with a relative importance of (83.33). In this regard, it can be observed that roughly 75% of instructors believe that (interpersonal intelligence) with relative importance (82.54) makes vocabulary teaching exercises more demanding and interactive than a straightforward explanation of terms. Furthermore, 71% of instructors believe (verbal/ linguistic intelligence) for teaching vocabulary enhances student comprehension, with a relative importance of (81.75). In addition, nearly 67% of instructors indicate that (visual/spatial intelligence) significantly improves vocabulary teaching with a relative importance of (79.52). Finally, 43% of respondents desire that (bodily/kinesthetic intelligence) be utilized in the classroom with relative importance (69.05). This low percentage may be attributed to the massive number of students and space availability (See Table 2).

4. Is there a difference between the MIT profile of male and female students?

The distribution of MIT responses by gender (64.7%) of males and (39.4%) of females strongly agreed with MIT, and (23.5%) and (51.5%) of males and females agreed with MIT, respectively. The Chi-Square test indicates no statistically significant correlation (α= 0.05) between gender and MIT. Note that the P-value of Chi-square tests is (0.16), more than the significance level (α= 0.05), showing no statistically significant difference between the MIT profiles of male and female students.

Table (7): The Distribution of MIT by Gender

MIT	Neither Agree nor Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total		p-value
Gender	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
Male	2	11.80%	4	23.50%	11	64.70%	17	100.00%	0.16
Female	3	9.10%	17	51.50%	13	39.40%	33	100.00%	
Total	5	10.00%	21	42.00%	24	48.00%	50	100.00%	

4 Conclusions

The majority of Kurdish EFL instructors at Sulaimani City universities are aware of MIT's benefits. Moreover, most of them utilize intrapersonal and logical/mathematical intelligence for teaching vocabulary other than the other types of MIT. Then most Kurdish EFL instructors believe that practicing MIT is undemanding, although a few admit to encountering difficulty when employing the method. Nevertheless, the majority of participants in this study have a favorable opinion of MIT. Intrapersonal intelligence is the most prevalent type of MIT among Kurdish EFL university students, indicating that they are more self-reliant and attempt to overcome their language challenges prior to seeking assistance from their instructors. Regarding gender, there is no discernible difference in MIT employment of Kurdish EFL students. In other words, male and female Kurdish EFL students employ the same methods with equal frequency. Furthermore, It has been noticed that training students in the MIT method have a favorable effect on vocabulary learning and acquisition, as they will be able to utilize their preferred intelligence when acquiring vocabulary and gain more interest in learning English vocabulary based on their individual intelligences hence expanding their vocabulary inventory much more rapidly and effectively. Further studies may help recognize the most effective vocabulary teaching procedures. For the time being, the approach that is most likely to be successful for a language instructor is to

carefully experiment with the different kinds of activities that are available to the student based on the student's preferred intelligence and to evaluate how helpful these activities are in assisting learners in acquiring vocabulary. Additionally, the language instructor should try to involve the learners in their own learning and give them responsibility for their own vocabulary expansion.

References

1. Ahour, T., & Abdi, M. (2015). The relationship between EFL learners' multiple intelligences and vocabulary learning strategies use with a focus on gender. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *5*(4), 800. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0504.16
2. Armstrong, T. (2018). *Multiple intelligences in the classroom* (4th ed.). ASCD.
3. Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen Irvine, C. K., & Walker, D. (2014). Introduction to research in education (9th ed.). Wadsworth Publishing.
4. Brown, H.D. (2001).Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to
5. Language Pedagogy (2nd ed.). London, England: Longman.
6. Brown, H. D. (2000). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. White Plains: Longman. Fourth Edition.
7. Christison, M.A. (1996). *Teaching and Learning Languages Through Multiple Intelligences*. TESOL Journal, 6 (1), 10-14.
8. Christison, M. (1999). Multiple Intelligences: Teaching the whole student. *ESL Magazine* 2(5): 10–13.
9. Coady, J and Huckin, T.N. (1997). *Second language vocabulary acquisition: a rationale for pedagogy. New York*: Cambridge University Press.
10. Elyas, T., & Alfaki, I. (2014). Teaching vocabulary: The relationship between techniques of teaching and strategies of learning new vocabulary items. *English Language Teaching*, 7(10). https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n10p40
11. Farahani, A & Kalkhoran, E. (2014). *The relationship between incidental vocabulary learning and multiple intelligences of Iranian EFL learners*, *Theory and language studies*, 4(1), 58-64.
12. Freedheim, D. K., & Weiner, I. B. (2013). *Handbook of Psychology*. John Wiley & Sons.
13. Fleetham, M. (2006). *Multiple intelligences in practice : enhancing self-esteem and learning in the classroom*. Stafford: Network Continuum Education.
14. Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames Of Mind: the theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
15. Gardner, H. 1993. *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory and Practice*. New York: Basic Books.
16. Gardner, H. (2000). *Intelligence reframed: multiple*

intelligences for the 21st century. New York: Basic Books.
17. Gardner, H. (2003). Multiple Intelligences After Twenty Years: Paper presented at the American Education Research.
18. Gardner, H. (2009). *Multiple intelligences around the world*. New York: Basic Books.
19. Hiebert, E.H & Kamil, M. (2005). Teaching and Learning Vocabulary Bringing Research to Practice. United States: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
20. Hi.Usman, A. (2016) 'Teaching vocabulary through grammar- translation method,' *EDUKASI*, 13(2). doi:10.33387/j.edu.v13i2.50.
21. Johnson, B. R., & Christensen, L. B. (2014). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. SAGE.
22. Jiang, X., & Zhou, L. (2019). Application of Multiple Intelligences Theory to English Vocabulary Teaching in College, 3(1), 41. DOI: 10.25236/FER.2020.030107.
23. Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques & principles in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
24. Laufer, B. & P. Nation. (1999). A vocabulary size test of controlled productive ability. Language Testing 16, 33- 51.
25. Lazear, D. 1991. *Seven Ways of Teaching: The Artistry of Teaching with Multiple Intelligences*. Palatine, Ill.: IRI Skylight.
26. Maximo, R. (2000). Effects of rote, context, keyword, and context/ keyword method on retention of vocabulary in EFL classroom, Language Learning, 50, 2, 385-412.
27. Mora, J K. (2017). Second and foreign language teaching methods. Mora Models: Enhancing academic achievement of bilingual learners.
28. Nation, I.S.P. (2011) 'Research into practice: Vocabulary,' *Language Teaching*, 44(4), pp. 529–539. doi:10.1017/s0261444811000267.
29. Palmer, H.E. (2019) The *Principles of language-study*. Good Press.
30. Patel, M.E & Jain, P. M. (2008). English Language Teaching (Method, tools and Techniques). Sunrise Publisher & Distributors.
31. Read, J. (2000). Assessing vocabulary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
32. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2018). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
33. Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
34. Sinaga, G.A., Safitri, A.N. and Efransyah, M. (2018) 'Teaching vocabulary using direct method at seventh grade of Junior High School,' *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 1(5), p. 651. doi:10.22460/project.v1i5.p651-656.
35. Sinder, D. P. (2001). *Multiple intelligence Theory and foreign language teaching*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.
36. Teele, S. 2000. *Rainbows of Intelligence: Exploring How Students Learn*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Corwin Press.
37. Wilkins, D. A (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching*. Cambridge: CPU.
38. Yuliawati, L. and Aprillia, A. (2019) 'The application of communicative language teaching method in vocabulary teaching,' *Loquen: English Studies Journal*, 12(2), p. 99. doi:10.32678/loquen.v12i2.2095.
39. Appendix A
40. Research Tools
41. Instructors' Questionnaire

Specialty	
Participants' Highest Academic Degree	
Years of Teaching Experience	
Work Place	
Gender	

Tick (√), please.

Item No.	Items	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Verbal/linguistic intelligence When teaching vocabulary in my classes, I apply the following items						
	Projectors, posters, and quotations in lesson planning and presentations.					
	Debate and/or discussion.					
	New words are introduced to students.					
	Students prepare and give oral presentations.					
	Frequently, Students answer multiple questions related to a text.					
	Students routinely use new vocabulary in their sentences and stories.					
	Synonyms/antonyms for better clarification.					
Logical/mathematical intelligence When teaching vocabulary in my classes, I apply the following items						
	The students are aware of the rules and procedures.					
Items		**Always**	**Often**	**Sometimes**	**Rarely**	**Never**
	Problem-solving activities.					
	Give rise to compelling debates.					
	Compare/contrast ideas.					
	Semantic Webs to facilitate clarification.					
	My lesson plan includes exercises that promote critical thinking.					
	Usually, when confronted with new words, I draw on prior knowledge for my students					
Visual/spatial intelligence When teaching vocabulary in my classes, I apply the following items						
	Slides and pictures.					
	Variety of colored markers to “color code” materials when writing in front of the students.					
	Create graphs, diagrams, and maps to enhance clarity.					
	Utilize hand-eye coordination when completing tasks.					
	Organize vocabulary using Mind maps or spider grams.					
	Ask my students to visualize new words as shapes or actions.					
	Utilize graphic organizers.					
Items		**Always**	**Often**	**Sometimes**	**Rarely**	**Never**
Bodily/kinesthetic intelligence When teaching vocabulary in my classes, I apply the following items						
	Conduct classroom activities that require students to get up and move around.					
	When describing a topic, I frequently use hand gestures and other forms of body language.					
	Body movement activities (pantomime, roleplay, and acting).					
	Acting out the meanings of words.					
	Competitive games involving small group work and team competitions.					
	Clapping and tapping syllables as a mnemonic device.					
	Physical education-related activities (play, jumping, sport, and physical exercises).					
Interpersonal intelligence When teaching vocabulary in my classes, I apply the following items						
	My students engage with the content and learning process with their peers.					
	Discussions of word meanings.					

	Students usually have peer teaching and paired activities.					
	Group and circle work.					
	Students participate in selecting content and instructional methods.					
	Using peer groups for brainstorming, revising, and editing.					
	When I have problems about teaching vocabulary, I discuss it with other teachers.					
Items		**Always**	**Often**	**Sometimes**	**Rarely**	**Never**
Intrapersonal intelligence When teaching vocabulary in my classes, I apply the following items						
	Choosing activities for my students to work on alone or independently (Assign independent projects).					
	Adapting lessons and creating my own rather than using lessons directly from a book.					
	Encourage my students to continuously self-esteem their performance.					
	Incorporating activities that encourage my students to engage in an independent study.					
	Design new activities					
	Predict my students' emotions and behaviors in various situations accurately.					
	Relating my lesson to the students' real-world experiences by exposing them to authentic materials.					

1. Students Questionnaire

A Questionnaire for 2nd Year Students

Name of University	
Age	
Gender	

Kindly tick one box that best represents your current opinion on the statements below. Your accurate selection is highly appreciated

	Items	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**
Verbal/linguistic intelligence						
1	I like to read books, magazines, or newspapers to increase my vocabulary range.					
2	Working with language and words puts me at ease.					
3	As I learn new words, I use these words while speaking and writing.					
4	At school, my most favorite subject was English.					
5	Participating in debates and/or discussions is something that I enjoy doing.					
6	Foreign languages interest me.					
7	Written texts attract my attention more than visuals.					

Logical/mathematical intelligence						
8	I am most productive at learning new words in an organized workspace.					
9	When I encounter a challenge, I like to give it my full attention and think of every possible outcome.					
10	Math and/or science were among my favorite subjects in school.					
11	Logic and number games are some of my favorites to play in my free time.					
Items		**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**
12	I quickly grasp cause-and-effect relationships while acquiring vocabulary.					
13	When it comes to logic-based puzzles, I am skilled at a variety of games, including Sudoku, chess, and checkers.					
14	I keep a to-do list to expand my vocabulary.					
Visual/spatial intelligence						
15	When I read, I form illustrative pictures or designs in my mind.					
16	Even as a young child, I have always been able to recognize the locations I have visited.					
17	I am observant. I often see things that others miss while studying vocabulary.					
18	Diagrams, maps, and visual organizers facilitate my vocabulary acquisition.					
19	Jigsaw puzzles, mazes, and other visual puzzles are enjoyable to me.					
20	I understand color combinations and how colors work well together.					
21	When recalling information, I am able to visualize scenes including the vocabulary I was considering.					
Bodily/Kinesthetic intelligence						
22	While seated, I enjoy moving, tapping, and fidgeting so I can think about what words mean.					
23	I am skilled at physical activities like sports and dancing.					
24	Experiencing things firsthand is the best way for me to learn new words.					
25	When conversing with someone, I frequently use hand gestures and other body languages.					
26	Because I like to learn about the world through my sense of touch, I always look at and touch new things when I want to expand my vocabulary.					
27	Being physically active is more appealing to me than simply watching while learning new words					
28	In my free time, I like to play active sports.					
Items		**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**
Interpersonal intelligence						
29	When interacting with others, I am most productive with a variety of vocabulary.					

30	My friends often talk to me about their problems because I have a wide range of vocabulary to use for their advice.					
31	I am sensitive to the moods and emotions of others and able to put it into words precisely.					
32	I get along easily with different types of people.					
33	Learning about other cultures is enjoyable.					
34	Frequently, I assist others in learning new words without being asked because I have a wide range of vocabulary.					
35	Sharing my feelings and ideas with others is something I enjoy doing.					
Intrapersonal intelligence						
36	I have a few close friends.					
37	I frequently consider and express my hopes and dreams for the future in various words.					
38	There are certain hobbies and interests of mine that I much rather do on my own.					
39	The opinions of others do not easily influence me while learning vocabulary.					
40	Time spent alone in thought is valuable to me when thinking about the meaning of words.					
41	When given the opportunity, I prefer to work independently with expanding my vocabulary inventory.					
42	I am completely aware of how I will feel and react while dealing with words in every situation.					

2. Classroom Observation Checklist

University	
College	
Department	
Subject	
Time	

No	Items	Strong	Apparent	Not displayed
1	The classroom activities include group work for teaching vocabulary.			
2	When teaching vocabulary, the teacher and students share ideas in the classroom.			
3	When teaching vocabulary, the instructor employs a variety of activities and questioning techniques.			
4	When explaining new words, clear and detailed explanations are provided.			
5	The instructional materials employed to teach vocabulary capture the students' interest.			
6	High standards of effort, accuracy, and presentation are encouraged.			

7	The class contains visual aids to facilitate understanding.			
8	The teacher uses questions throughout the lesson to assess the students' understanding of the new vocabulary.			
9	Mistakes and misconceptions are acknowledged and constructively used to support vocabulary learning.			
10	The teacher engages the entire class in sharing, planning, and evaluating			
11	The teacher provides clear instructions and explains what is expected on assignments and tests.			
12	The teacher establishes clear classroom rules to prevent students from wasting time while learning new vocabulary.			
13	The teacher welcomes student opinions and suggestions.			
14	The teacher speaks clearly and fluently while using appropriate language and word choice.			
15	The class includes time for communication and discussion.			
16	While teaching vocabulary in the classroom, logical reasoning is encouraged.			
17	Students can get up and move around during class activities while learning new words.			
18	To facilitate vocabulary comprehension, charts and other diagrams are utilized.			
19	Regular recognition is given to students for their work and accomplishment in acquiring new words.			
20	While teaching vocabulary, physical activities are implemented in the classroom.			

پوختە

لێکۆڵینەوەیەک لە فێرکردنی وشەسازیی ئینگلیزی بۆ ئەو خوێندکارە کوردزمانانەی زمانی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانی بێگانە دەخوێنن لە ڕوانگەی تیۆری زیرەکیی فرەییەوە

ئەم توێژینەوەیە لێکۆڵینەوە لە پەیوەندیی نێوان تیۆری زیرەکیی فرەیی و فێرکردنی وشەسازی دەکات. تیۆری زیرەکیی فرەیی وای لە هەندێک لە پەروەردەکاران و زانایانی زمان کردووە کە هەڵسەنگاندن بۆ پراکتیکەکانی پۆل لە پەروەردە و لایەنەکانی تری فێرکردن و فێربوونی زمانداا بکەن. ئەم توێژینەوەیە هەوڵ دەدات بەکارهێنانی تیۆری زیرەکیی فرەیی لە چوارچێوەی فێرکردنی وشەسازیدا ڕوون بکاتەوە .ئەم بابەتە ئامانجیەتی بزانێت(١) :ئایا پەیوەندییەک لە نێوان پرۆفایلی ڕاهێنەران و جۆری ئەو زیرەکییەی کە لە پۆلدا بەکاری دەهێنن هەیە یان نا (٢) .ئایا پەیوەندییەکی بەرچاو لە نێوان بەکارهێنانی تیۆری زیرەکیی فرەیی و دەستکەوتی خوێندکارانی کوردی زمانی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانی بێگانە لە فێربوونی وشەسازیدا هەیە یان نا؟ بۆیە پرسیارنامە و لیستی پشکنینێک خزمەت بە١٨ ڕاهێنەری کوردی زمانی ئینگلیزی و٥٠ خوێندکاری قۆناغی دووەمی زمانی ئینگلیزی کە وەک ئامرازی کۆکردنەوەی زانیاری لە دوو زانکۆی جیاواز لە شاری سلێمانی بۆ ساڵی خوێندنی٢٠٢٣ - ٢٠٢٢کرد و هەندێک بابەتی پرسیارنامەکە وەرگیراون .شیکاری وەسفکەری داتاکان پەیوەندییەکی نێوان زیرەکیی فرەیی و ڕێبازە فێرکارییەکانی ڕاهێنەرانی کوردی زمانی ئینگلیزی ئاشکرا کرد .هەروەها، پەیوەندییەکی ئەرێنی بەرچاو لە نێوان بەکارهێنانی تیۆری زیرەکیی فرەیی و دەستکەوتی بەرزی خوێندکارانی کوردی زمانی ئینگلیزی لە فێربوونی وشەسازیدا هەیە .سەرەڕای ئەوەش، تەمەن، بواری خوێندن و ڕەگەز کاریگەرییەکی بەرچاویان نەبووە لەسەر ستراتیژییەکانی فێرکردنی زیرەکیی فرەیی ڕاهێنەران و شێوازی فێربوونی خوێندکارەکانیان.

وشە سەرەکییەکان :تیۆری زیرەکیی فرەیی، فێرکردنی وشەسازی، ڕاهێنەرە کوردزمانەکانی زمانی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانی بێگانە، خوێندکارە کوردزمانەکانی زمانی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانی بێگانە.

الملخص

التحقيق في تدريس مفردات اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة اجنبيه من منظور نظرية الذكاء المتعدد

تبحث الدراسة الحالية في العلاقة بين نظرية الذكاء المتعدد وتدريس المفردات. دفع نظرية الذكاء المتعدد بعض المعلمين وعلماء اللغة لإعادة تقييم ممارسات الفصول الدراسية في تعليم والجوانب الأخرى لتدريس اللغة وتعلمها. تحاول هذه الورقة توضيح تطبيقات نظرية الذكاء المتعدد في سياق مفردات التدريس. تهدف هذه المقالة إلى اكتشاف: (١) ما إذا كانت هناك علاقة ارتباط بين ملف تعريف الخاص بالمدرسين ونوع الذكاء الذي يستخدمونه في الفصل الدراسي. (٢) ما إذا كانت هنالك علاقة ذات دلالة إحصائية بين استخدام نظرية الذكاء المتعدد واللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في إنجاز الطالب في تعلم المفردات. لذلك خدم الاستبيان وقائمة المراجعة ١٨ معلما من مدرسي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية و٥٠ طالبا في السنة الثانية قسم لغة الإنجليزية كوسيلة لجمع البيانات في جامعتين متميزتين في مدينة السليمانية للعام الدراسي ٢٠٢٣-٢٠٢٢. وتم اقتباس بعض عناصر الاستبيان. كشف التحليل الوصفي للبيانات عن وجود ارتباط بين الذكاء المتعدد والأساليب التعليمية لمدربي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. علاوة على ذلك، توجد علاقة إيجابية كبيرة بين استخدام نظرية الذكاء المتعدد وتحصيل الطلاب في اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في تعليم المفردات. ومع ذلك، لم يؤثر العمر ومجال الدراسة والجنس بشكل كبير على استراتيجيات الذكاء المتعدد لمعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية وأنماط تعلم طلابهم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: نظرية الذكاء المتعدد، تدريس المفردات، معلمو اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية.