

In The Name of God

89-6

Tarbiat Modarres University
Faculty of Humanities
English Department

روزنامه‌های تاربیات مدرس
تهران

This Thesis by:

Cobra Hosseini

۱۳۸۲ / ۳ / ۳۰

Entitled:

The relationship between Iranian EFL students' multiple intelligences and their use of language learning strategies

Is approved as Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the degree of Master of Arts (MA)
In Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL).

Committee on Final Examination

Supervisor: **Dr. Ramin Akbari**



Advisor: **Dr. GH. Kiany**



Reader: **Dr. Parviz Birjandi**

Reader: **Dr. Akbar Mirhassani**



۹۹-۶

آیین نامه چاپ پایان نامه (رساله) های دانشجویان دانشگاه تربیت مدرس

نظر به اینکه چاپ و انتشار پایان نامه (رساله) های تحصیلی دانشجویان دانشگاه تربیت مدرس مبین بخشی از فعالیتهای علمی - پژوهشی دانشگاه است. بنا براین به منظور آگاهی و رعایت حقوق دانشگاه دانش آموزان این دانشگاه نسبت به رعایت موارد ذیل متعهد می شوند.

ماده ۱: در صورت اقدام به چاپ پایان نامه (رساله)ی خود، مراتب را قبلاً به طور کتبی به مرکز نشر دانشگاه اطلاع دهد.

ماده ۲: در صفحه سوم کتاب (پس از برگ شناسنامه) ، عبارت ذیل را چاپ کند:
((کتاب حاضر ، حاصل پایان نامه کارشناسی ارشد نگارنده در رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی است که در سال ۱۳۸۱ در دانشکده علوم انسانی دانشگاه تربیت مدرس به راهنمایی جناب آقای دکتر اکبری و مشاوره جناب آقای دکتر کیا نی از آن دفاع شده است.))

ماده ۳: به منظور جبران بخشی از هزینه های نشریات دانشگاه تعداد یک در صد شمارگان کتاب (در هر نوبت چاپ) را به مرکز نشر دانشگاه می تواند مازاد نیاز خود را به نفع مرکز نشر در معرض فروش قرار دهد.

ماده ۴: در صورت عدم رعایت ماده ۳ ۵۰٪ بهای شمارگان چاپ شده را به عنوان خسارت به دانشگاه تربیت مدرس ، تادیه کند.

ماده ۵: دانشجو تعهد و قبول می کند در صورت خودداری از پرداخت بهای خسارت ، دانشگاه می تواند خسارت مذکور را از طریق مراجع قضایی مطالبه و وصول کند، به علاوه به دانشگاه حق می دهد به منظور استیفای حقوق خود، از طریق دادگاه ، معادل وجه مذکور در ماده ۴ را از محل توقیف کتابهای عرضه شده نگارنده برای فروش ، تامین نماید.

ماده ۶: اینجانب کبری حسینی دانشجوی رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی مقطع کارشناسی ارشد تعهد فوق و ضمانت اجرایی آن را قبول کرده ، به آن ملتزم می شوم .



T.M.U

The relationship between Iranian EFL students' multiple intelligences and their use of language learning strategies

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts (MA) in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)

By:

Cobra Hosseini

Supervisor:

Dr. Ramin Akbari

Advisor:

Dr. GH. Kiany

Feb, 2003

To My Family

Acknowledgments

The number of persons to whom the researcher is indebted for the growth of this study are too numerous to mention. However, some of the major contributors warrant special comment. First, Special appreciation to my supervisor Dr. R. Akbari for his very invaluable suggestions and fruitful guidelines without which the completion of this thesis seemed far from possible. I am also very grateful to him for his support and encouragement during all the phases of this procedure. Of course, any problem in the literature associated with errors of fact or errors of interpretation, should be labeled mine.

I am also very much indebted to my advisor, Dr Gh. Kiani who kindly read through the pages of the thesis. I am much beholden to him for his perusing criticisms which taught me to have a broader perspective.

Moreover, I owe a great deal to Dr. A. Mirhassani and Dr. Birjandi for their kind cooperation in reading the final drafts of this research.

Also, special acknowledgment to Dr Faghieh for his tolerance and cooperation in the administration of the tests in Al-Zahra university.

Additionally, I am grateful to all the subjects of my study in Tarbiat Modarres , Al-Zahra and Booshehr universities for their tolerance and friendly cooperation in gathering the data for this research.

Also, special debt of gratitude to my sister, Aazam Hosseini, who kindly helped me in the administration of the tests in her university in Booshehr.

Last, but not, of course, least, I want to express my thanks and apologies to my husband and my son for the unavoidable periods of neglect associated with the completion of this work.

Abstract

Educators, professional teachers, syllabus designers, and psycholinguists have for long been concerned with making an appropriate match between intelligence and ability to learn foreign languages. In the case of intelligence and language learning strategies, several Iranian researchers have found no relationship between the two (Akbari ,2001; Ardestani, 2000). But, the very point, here, is that so far most researchers have maintained the traditional view of g-factor and have measured their subjects' intelligence by traditional IQ tests. However, Gardner's theory of Multiple Intelligences (1983) challenged the traditional view (g-factor) as a unitary capacity that can be adequately measured by IQ tests. . Gardner suggested eight different forms of intelligence-- linguistic, musical, spatial, kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, naturalist and logico-mathematical. The present study was an attempt to investigate the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' multiple intelligences and (1) their use of language learning strategies , and (2) their language proficiency. The relationship between the variables was investigated through the administration of Multiple Intelligences Developmental Assessment Scale (MIDAS), Strategy Inventory for Language Learners (SILL), and International English Language Testing Systems (IELTS) on 90 EFL university students. The results obtained from the correlational procedures and also multiple regression analyses indicated that there is a meaningful relationship between the subjects' multiple intelligences and their use of language learning strategies. Among the eight intelligences identified by Gardner (1983 -1995) , four of them -- linguistic, interpersonal, naturalist and kinesthetic-- were found as the predictors of language learning strategy use. As to the relationship between multiple intelligences and language proficiency, Even though a significant relationship was found between the two variables, but the

positive predictor of subjects' second language proficiency. As a corollary. It was , also, found that there is a meaningful relationship between language learning strategy use and language proficiency while the Metacognitive strategies were appeared as the positive predictor of language proficiency. However, the correlation index was too low to be considered.

Key terms: Multiple Intelligences, Language Learning Strategies, English Proficiency

Table Of Contents

1. CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

1.1. Introduction.....	1
1.2. Multiple intelligence & language learning.....	7
1.3 Statement of the problem and significance of the study.....	8
1.4 Research questions and hypotheses.....	9
1.5 Operational definition of key terms.....	10
1.6 Delimitation of the study.....	10

2. CHAPTER TWO : Review of related literature

2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 Intelligence.....	12
2.2.1 Explicit theories of intelligence.....	12
2.2.1.1 The Psychometric approach.....	13
2.2.1.2 Critique.....	15
2.2.1.3 The Cognitive approach	18
2.2.1.4 Problem solving approach.....	19
2.2.1.5 Critiquie	20
2.2.1.6 Evaluation of explicit theories.....	21
2.2.2 Implicit theories.....	26

2.2.2.1 Evaluation of implicit theories.....	27
2.2.3 Relation between explicit and implicit theories.....	30
2.2.4 Multiple intelligences.....	31
2.2.4.1 Sternberg's theory.....	32
2.2.4.2 Gardner's theory.....	33
2.2.4.3 Assessment of multiple intelligence.....	36
2.3 Language learning strategies.....	38
2.3.1 Introduction.....	38
2.3.2 Definition of LLS.....	38
2.3.3 Taxonomy of LLS.....	39
2.4 Multiple intelligences & LLSs.....	47

CHAPTER THREE: Method

3.1 Introduction.....	49
3.2 Subjects.....	50
3.3 Instrumentation.....	50
3.3.1 MIDAS.....	50
3.3.1.1 General information.....	51
3.3.1.2 Validity of MIDAS.....	53
3.3.1.3 Reliability of MIDAS.....	55
3.3.2 SILL.....	57
3.3.3 IELTS.....	58

3.4 Design.....	60
3.5 Procedure.....	61
3.6 Statistical procedures	63

Chapter Four: Data Analyses and Discussion of Findings

4.1 Overview	64
4.2 Data Analyses.....	65
4.2.1 Validity of MIDAS.....	65
4.2.2 Reliability of MIDAS.....	72
4.2.3 Descriptive Statistics.....	72
4.2.4 Investigating the first research question.....	74
4.2.5 Investigating the second research question.....	78
4.2.6 Investigating the corellary research question.....	80
4.3 Discussion of findings.....	82

Chapter Five: Conclusions

5.1 Conclusions.....	84
5.2 Pedagogical Implications.....	86
5.3 Implications for further research.....	88

References.....	90
Appendices.....	98
Appendix A: original MIDAS test.....	98
Appendix B translated version of MIDAS.....	109
Appendix C strategy inventory (SILL).....	124
Appendix D IELTS test of language proficiency.....	129
Appendix E sample MIDAS result profiles.....	151
Farsi absrract.....	153
List of Tables.....	
Table 4.1.....	65
Table 4.2.....	66
Table 4.3.....	69
Table 4.4.....	70
Table 4.5.....	70
Table 4.6.....	71
Table 4.7.....	71
Table 4.8.....	72
Table 4.9.....	74
Table 4.10.....	75
Table 4.11.....	76
Table 4.12.....	77
Table 4.13.....	78
Table 4.14.....	79

مرکز اطلاعات و مدارک علمی ایران
 مستطاب آراک

Table 4.15.....	79
Table 4.16.....	80
Table 4.17.....	81
Table 4.18.....	82

List of Histograms.....	
Histogram 4.1.....	73
Histogram 4.2.....	73
Histogram 4.3.....	74

List of Scree plots.....

Scree plot 4.1.....	66
---------------------	----

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

There has been a prominent shift within the field of language learning and teaching over the last twenty years with a greater emphasis being put on learners and learning rather than on teachers and teaching. In parallel to this new shift of interest, how learners process new information and what kinds of strategies they employ to understand, learn or remember the information has been the primary concern of the researchers dealing with the area of foreign language learning.

Research both outside the language field (e.g., Brown, Bransford, Ferrara, & Campione, 1983) and investigations with language learners (Skehan, 1989; Oxford, 1989; Oxford & Crookall, 1989) frequently show that the most successful learners tend to use learning strategies that are appropriate to the material, to the task, and to their own goals, needs, and stage of learning. In general, more proficient learners appear to use a wider range of strategies in a great number of situations than do less proficient learners. The significance of learner variables in language learning has been studied extensively, including abilities, motivation, cognitive styles, and learning strategies. Research on learning strategies (e.g., O'Malley & Chamot, A., 1990; Wenden & Rubin, 1987) indicates that student

performance can be improved by following certain strategies, but the results are highly different across learners.

Theories of intelligence (e.g., Gardner & Sternberg, 1982), on the other hand, clearly indicate that there are distinct linguistic abilities that differ across individuals. But what kind of relationship, if any, does exist between intelligence and language learning strategy use has so far been a controversial issue in the field of applied linguistics. This is mostly because no subject in psychology has provoked more intense public controversy than the study of human intelligence. From its beginning, research on how and why people differ in overall mental ability has fallen prey to political and social agendas that obscure or distort even the most well-established scientific findings. Let's have a brief overview.

One Intelligence or Many

The debate over intelligence and intelligence testing focuses on the question of whether it is useful or meaningful to evaluate people according to a single major dimension of cognitive competence. Is there indeed a general mental ability we commonly call "intelligence," and is it important in the practical affairs of life?

Today, there are two major schools of thought on the nature of intelligence. The first, supported by such psychologists as Eysenck(1982), Galton (1870) , Jensen (1997), and Spearman (1973), believe that all intelligence comes from one general factor, known as *g*. The proponents of the other school of thought include Gardner (1983), Sternberg (1982), and Thurstone (1938) think that there is more than one general type of intelligence, or in other words, that there are different types of intelligences.

One General Intelligence

There are strong arguments to support the theory of one general type of intelligence. The most convincing evidence for a single general intelligence model is the fact that there is proof of a single general factor that governs the level of