Extent of Iraqi EFL Students' Multiple Intelligences in Secondary

Asst.Inst.Hayder Abdulzahra Shalash
Researcher. Asma'a Abdul Nabi Khudair
AL-Mustunsiryah University
College of Basic Education - English Department

Abstract

This study aims at investigating EFL students' multiple intelligences in secondary schools. To achieve the aims of the study, the researcher improperly used sample of (60) female and male students studying at AL-Jamhuria for boys and AL-Nassera for girls secondary schools in AL-Resafa / 2 . The researcher used descriptive method which fitted the nature of the present study. Regarding the instrument of the study, the researcher adopted (MI) questionnaire with 40 items distributed to eight intelligences. The findings came to prove that secondary school EFL students' MI is good, and there is significant difference between students' MI due to the gender variable. Besides, visual intelligence came to the first rank whereas interpersonal intelligence came to the last rank. The study ends up with presenting a number of recommendations and suggestions that might aid improving the environment of language learning in the classroom.

Chapter one
Introduction

1.1. Problem of the Study and its Significance

Teaching English language has grown in popularity especially in the last two decades of the globalization and it becomes the lingua franca of many fields like science, commerce, technology, world trade, and industry. Thus, it become the main concern of the school systems and educational institutes consequently .

Many students are frustrated by their failure in school environment , which measure primarily reading and mathematics skills . they feel that they are intellectually inferior their classmates who score higher on tests and that they can't succeed whatever they do . while in fact those students could be successful in stuff that requires other aptitudes , like music , design , art and other professions areas (Lahad ,Jebur and Jaboori,2017:64).

With regards to the application of Gardner's multiple intelligences (henceforth MI) theory in the educational field, many educators started to adopt instructions based on MI as a way to deal with the students'

difficulties due to their individual differences and the variety of learning style. These difficulties include inability to reach most students' needs. Consequently, MI enables educators and students to strive for their goals (Hoerr, 2000, p.37). Dung and Tuan (2011:92) state that the eight intelligences involve logical-mathematical intelligence, linguistic intelligence, musical intelligence, spatial intelligence, naturalistic intelligence, bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence, and interpersonal intelligence. According to Xie & Lin (2009:106) the reason to investigate MI theory is to enhance the effectiveness of teaching and curriculum design. So that the use of this theory not only provides teachers with more choices in teaching and evaluating methods, but also allow learners to show that they have learned in many ways. Besides, it helps teachers understand their students better.

1.2. Aims

The present study aims at:

1. Identifying Iraqi EFL students multiple intelligences.
2. Investigating whether gender makes difference in the students' MI.
3. Identify the most frequent type of MI that most of Iraqi students interest .

1.3 Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that:

1. There is no statistically significant difference between the mean score and theoretical mean of the total sample in MI scale.
2. There is no statistically significant differences between the mean scores due to gender variable .
3. There is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of MI subscales.

1.4 Limits

The research is limited to the fifth year secondary school , on the academic year (2017-2018).

1.5 Values

1. It is hoped that this study would be of some benefits as it suggests a new standard for dealing with the students.
2. The students might be having feeling of success and achievement.
3. It is hoped that the results of the research might provide English Foreigner Language teachers with insights into how learners actually learn in a classroom setting .

1.6 Definitions of Basic Terms

1.6.1. MI

A group of mental skills that characterizes each person and approved by the theory Howard Garner, which are eight basic types include: linguistic

intelligence, logical, spatial, social, personal, musical, and natural. (Cherry, 2018: online).

Chapter Two
Literature Review

2.1. Gardner's MI Theory

Many scholars and educators were interested in examining the relationship between student achievement and level of intelligence. In 1904, the French scientist designed the first intelligence test for learners to identify those who are at risk of failing. The test was developed as intelligence can be measured and expressed as percentage (Gardner and Hatch, 2010: 31).

Following this idea of intelligence for nearly 80 years, Dr. Howard Gardner challenged this popular belief. In his (Frames of Mind 1983), he suggested that multiple intelligences in individuals could be identified in at least eight intelligences. In his theory of multiple intelligences, he sought to expand the scope of human potential beyond IQ. The theory provided reasonable explanations for the rejection of the traditional intelligence tests, as it did not take into consideration the other abilities of the individual. Gardner wanted the concept of intelligence to be compatible with the requirements of success in life.

The (MI) and their variety among are considered an appropriate means to identify the diversity of individual learning methods. This requires teachers to adopt different teaching methods and strategies that are compatible with MI and learning patterns so as to achieve the highest level of communication in classroom, and take the learners' levels, abilities, and characteristics into account. The theory of MI then is the basis of creativity, production and innovation (Hassan, 2016:3).

2.2 Gardner's Classification of MI

Howard Gardner in his theory of (MI) presents eight types of intelligences. They are as follows

2.2.1. Linguistic Intelligence

This type of intelligence is concerned with the ability of the individual to deal with and use the construction of the language and its sound system, whether orally written, and understand the complex meanings, which reflect the overall high levels of intelligence (Armstrong , 2000 : 2).

2.2.2. Visual-Spatial Intelligence

This type of intelligence concerns with the ability of the individual to visual perception and images of the surrounding accurately, and to absorb mental images and deal with them for the purpose of solving problems or make adjustments and re-create perceptions. Spatial intelligence is

expressed through geometric and technical drawing, map reading and image reflection, and navigation. It includes architects, pilots and fishers (Armstrong, 2000: 2).

2.2. 3. Logical-Mathematical   Intelligence:

The ability of the individual to abstract thinking, the use of numbers effectively, the perception of relationships, and the discovery of logical patterns through: inference, imagination, extrapolation, reasoning, predicting, organizing and sequencing, asking questions, generalization and formulation of hypotheses. This intelligence in its final state includes inventors, logical scientists, mathematicians, accountants and computer programmers. (Nicholson, 1998: 11).

2.2.4. Bodily - Kinesthetic Intelligence

The ability of the individual to employ his mental abilities associated with the movements of his body as a whole to express ideas and physical activities. Bodily - Kinesthetic Intelligence is shown in the form of body language, dance, acting, lightness, and smooth physical skills. The final case includes runners, dancers and ballet dancers (Mckenzie , 2005 : 46).

2.2.5. Interpersonal Intelligence

It refers to the ability of individual to explore the psychological and mental state of others, and understanding their intentions, goals, and motivations. This intelligence includes the sensitivity to the facial expressions and body language. Those who have this type of intelligence could have the ability to feel of others feelings and interact with them. The appropriate filds for them are teaching, medicine, leadership and so on (Banm ; Viens and Slatin , 2005 :17).

2.2.6. Intrapersonal Intelligence:

It refers the individual's ability to understand and recognize himself and his internal feelings, value, and beliefs. Besides, the Awareness of its strengths and weaknesses. Those who have this intelligence also have a picture of self-knowledge, strengths, shortcomings, awareness of your moods, intentions, motivations, desires and ability to self-control, self-understanding and respect. (Griswold, Harter and Null, 2002).

2.2.7. Musical Intelligence:

The ability to understand and analyse music, musical production, and musical expressions. This intelligence includes sensitivity to rhythm and tone, and it may be expressed by writing songs, tunes, and playing musical instruments. The final case includes music authors, singers, songwriters and songwriters. (Armstrong , 2000 : 2).

2.2.8. Naturalist Intelligence:

The ability to distinguish and classify things organisms in the natural environment such as plants, animals, insects and rocks, and identify their

similarities and differences. The final case of environmental intelligence includes biologists, zoologists, environmentalists, oceanographers, veterinarians and geologists. (Nicholson , 1998 : 11).

1.3 Principles of MI

There are a lot of discussions about the principles of the theory of MI and its effectiveness on the educational process. They are as follows:

1-Each person has all eights intelligence: MI theory , a cognitive functioning , pro-poses that each person has capacities in the eight intelligence to some degree and displays the eight intelligence uniquely.

2- Most learners can enhance each intelligence to a certain level of competency. Almost every one processes the capacity to develop adequate encouragement, enrichment, as well as instruction.

3- The abovementioned intelligences interact with each other and almost work tgether in a certain way.According to Gardner's theory, there is no intelligence exist by itself in life.

4- There are a number of ways to be intelligent each category . Learners show their talents within intelligence and between intelligence in a variety of ways (Slah , 2013: 60).

Teachers are advocated to be aware of the learners' individual differences. Besides, each learner has different learning style, for instance, some learners learn visually better than aurally. Therefore, the prefer reading their materials rather than listening to them (Larsen and Anderson. 2011: 191).

2.4.Educational and Psychological Criticism of MI

1. Denig, (2005:99) argues that multiple intelligences lacks of experimental researches.

2. Spearman proposes a general ability of intelligence behind all the mental activities; this ability is one of the main characteristics and superior to other forms of human cognition. It can be measured through IQ tests (Pirozzolo, 2002:17).

3. Willingham (2004:24) argues that multiple intelligences theory is not helpful and unlikely to help students.

4. Some critics believe that several intelligences are talents and are not new such as bodily skill, musical ability and interpersonal ability. (Woolfolk, 2013:120).

5. In addition, the domains of intelligences are only other names for the types of personality and talents. Gardner does not create a new thing in his theory, but he just imitates and copies the type of talents and personality and attributes them to his theory (Neisser, et al, 1996:79).

Chapter Three: Methodology and Procedures

3.1 Population and Sample of the Study

The study population consists of all the fifth secondary graders at the governmental schools in Al-Risafa/ Baghdad\ Iraq for the academic (2017-2018). Sampling as defined by Al- Samawi (2000:112) is selecting a number of individuals to represent the population. Berg (2004:34) states that the logic of using a sample of subjects is to make interferences about some larger population from a smaller one (a sample). Seventeen students were chosen randomly to represent the main study sample and other fifteen students represent the pilot administration from AL-Jamhuria for boys and AL-Nassera for girls in AL-Resafa / 2 .

3.2. Description of the Questionnaire:

To achieve the aims of the study, a questionnaire was used to measure MI for secondary graders . MI questionnaire consists of eight classifications of intelligences. The questionnaire comprises 40 items which cover the eighth multiple intelligences theory suggested by Howard Gardner.

Five scales are used to obtain the students' answer. 1 point is given to the first scale (this is not like me at all), 2 points are given to the second scale (this is a bit like me), 3 points are given to third scale (this is sometimes like me), 4 points are given to the fourth scale (I am like this more often than not), and 5 points are given to the fifth scale (I am always like this).alternatives to each item : (always , often , sometimes , rarely , never) (see appendix 1)

3.3 Validity

The questionnaire is to distributed to a jury member in methodology, linguistic and psychology . Some items were revised according to the jury suggestions which is item number . None of the items were omitted and all the jury member agree upon their validity .(see appendix 2)

3.4 The Pilot Study:

On the 23nd of February, 2018 a pilot administration of the questionnaire was carried out. It was experimentally tried out on a sample of 20 students selected equally apart from the sample of the study. It was found that the time needed to complete the test was 38 minutes, and that the instructions were clear and stated in an adequate way.

3.5 Reliability

Reliability is an important step for assessing the research instrument. Mousavi (1999:323) indicates that the reliability in its general concept is that the test given by the researcher will give the same results if it is

returned to the same group and in the same circumstances later The researcher administered the questionnaire to (20) EFL secondary school students. After two weeks re-administration of the questionnaire has been taken place. Frequencies and reliability coefficient have been found between the first responses and the second for all the items of the questionnaire. The reliability correlation coefficient is reached (0.87). This result indicates that the questionnaire is reliable and is suitable for final administration.

3.6. Final Administration of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was administered from 3rd of march, 2018 on the sample . the researcher himself presented the instruction of the questionnaire to the students and let them patiently answer all the items .

3.7 Statistical Tools

1. Person correlation coefficient .
2. Mean score .
3. One sample t-test .
4- Two-independent sample.

Chapter four
Results Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions

4.1 Results Related to the First Aim and Verification of the First Hypothesis

In order to achieve the first aim and verify the first hypothesis which states that here is no statistically significant difference between the mean score and theoretical mean of the total sample in MI scale, a questionnaire has been adopted and administered to the sample of the study as mentioned in chapter three .

The mean scores and the standard deviations of the instrument are calculated and compared to the theoretical mean . Then by using one sample t-test , the results are found out to be as shown in Table (4.1).

Table 4.1
Statistics of the One Sample t-Test to Find out the Response of the Students on the (MI) Questionnaire

No.	Degree freedom	Mean score	Target mean	Stand deviation	Calculated t-value	Tabulated value	Level of significance
60	59	155.5	120	3.14	4.19	2.01	0.05

Table 4.1 reveals that the mean score of the overall subjects' response on (MI) questionnaire is 155,5 with a standard deviation of 120 . The computed t-value is 4.19 and the tabulated t-value is 2.01 at level of significance of 0.05 . Since the computed t-value is higher

than the tabulated one , and the theoretical mean is lower than the mean score, then difference between the two means is significant . This rejects the first hypothesis and proves that the students' over level in MI is average .

4.2 Results Related to the Second Aim and Verification of the Second Hypothesis

To achieve the second aim and verify the second hypothesis, two independent sample t-test has been applied. It revealed that the mean score for the sample of male students is (164) and the standard deviation is (4.8) . Whereas the mean score of the sample of female students is (158) with a standard deviation of (3.67) and degree of freedom (5.8) . After having applied the statistical tools, it turned out that the computed t-value (5.78) which is higher than the tabulated t-value (2.01) with degree of freedom 58 as shown in table (4.2).

Table 4 .2
Statistics of two Independent Sample t-test to Find out the Differences According to the Gender Variable

Sample	No.	Stand deviation	Mean score	DF	Calculated value	Tabulated value	Level of significance
Male	30	4.08	164	58	5.75	2.01	0.05
Female	30	3.67	158				

Table 4.1 shows that there is a statistically significant differences between the mean scores in favour of the male students . This rejects the second hypothesis which states that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores due to gender variable and proves that there is significant differences in favour of male students.

4.3 Results Related to the Third Aim and Verification of the Third Hypothesis

In order to achieve the third aim and verify the third hypothesis which states that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of MI subscales, the mean score and the standard deviation of each intelligence questionnaire are also calculated and compared to the theoretical mean of each subscale. (See Table 4.3).

Table   4.3
Statistics of one Sample t-Test to Find out the Differences between Intelligences.

MI	Sample	DF	Mean score	Theoretical mean	Calculated value	Tabulated t-value	Level of sign.
Linguistic intelligence	60	59	152	15	3.45	2.01	0.05
Visual intelligence	60	59	165	15	2.76	2.01	0.05
Logical intelligence	60	59	143	15	3.84	2.01	0.05
Bodily intelligence	60	59	135	15	6.25	2.01	0.05
Intrapersonal intelligence	60	59	154	15	4.07	2.01	0.05
Interpersonal intelligence	60	59	134	15	3.65	2.01	0.05
Musical intelligence	60	59	184	15	2.67	2.01	0.05
Naturally intelligence	60	59	150	15	2.44	2.01	0.05

Table 4.3 displays that mean scores of the highest intelligence is visual intelligence with a mean score of (165). The second rank of MI is intrapersonal with a mean score of (154) . The third rank is linguistic intelligence with a mean score of (152). The fourth rank of MI is naturalistic intelligence with a mean score of (150) . The fifth rank of MI is musical intelligence with a mean score of (148). The sixth rank of MI is logical intelligence with a mean score of (143) . The seventh rank of MI is bodily-kinesthetic intelligence with a mean score of (135) .Finally, the eighth rank of MI is interpersonal intelligence with a mean   score   of   (132). The researcher justifies having the visual intelligence the first rank in that the visual sense is crucial to construct intelligence and develops human's skills, abilities and experience. Whereas the interpersonal intelligence had the last rank between MI. The researcher attributes that to the students' lack in social interaction due to the nature of materials of scientific preparatory schools which requires much thinking and much time reading.

5.1 Conclusions
    The study conclusions can be summed up as the following:
1. Iraqi EFL students' overall multiple intelligences are good
2. Gender variable make differences in students' MI in favour to male students.

3.It was observed that intelligence ranked first was visual one whereas interpersonal intelligence ranked last due to students' responses to MI questionnaire .

5.2. Recommendations

The following recommendations are drawn as follows:

1. English language teachers should have awareness of MI various activities.

2. Variety of techniques or strategies based on MI should be adopted in teaching English effectively

3. Awareness of the individual differences between students through the usage of MI. They must choose the classroom activities appropriately to enhance learners to learn better.

4. Conduct workshops to train teacher lessons plan depend on MI.

3. Using Gardener's theory of MI for curriculum development.

5.3. Suggestions for Further Studies

1.Many experimental studies could be held to identify the effect of using MI in teaching .

2. A similar study can be carried out in primary schools.

3. A similar study to investigate the effect of multiple intelligences on developing language skills of fifth graders.

References

*Alsaadi , S.K. and Hatim , Shahad .(2016) . **Investigating Iraqi EFL College Students Multiple Intelligences.** retrieved on 15/2/2018 at : http:\\ www J. of college of education for women .

*Al- Samawi, Ahmed, M. (2000) **An Introduction to Research Techniques in Linguistics and Literature**. Sana'a: Sana'a University.

*Anderson , Marti and larsen , Diane Freeman . (2011) **Teaching and Principles in Language Teaching** . (3rd nd). Oxford University Press.

*Armstrong, Thomas. (2000)**. Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom** . (2nd ed) . ASCD.

*Baum , Susan ; Viens , Julie and Slation , Barbara .(2005). **Multiple Intelligences in the Elementary Classroom** Teachers College , Columbia University . Newyork and Landon.

*Bearce, K.H. (2009). **Hand out intelligence .** Retrieved on 30/2/2018 at://www.mccc,edu/jenningh/courses/ docment.

*Berg, B .L. (2004) **Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Science**. Bosten :Pearson Education

*Chapman, C. (1993). **If the shoe fits… How to develop intelligences in the classroom** Glenview: Pearson.

*Cherry, Kendra .(2018) . **Gardener's Theory of Multiple Intelligences** . Retrieved on 25\4\2018 at ;\\www very well mind . com.

*Christison, M. A. (1996). **Teaching and learning languages through MI. TESOL Journal,** *6*(1), 10-14.

*Denig, S. (2005). **Multiple Intelligences and Learning Styles: Two Complementary Dimensions.** Retrieved Jan, 25th, 2014

Fromhttp://projects.cbe.ab.ca/central/altudl/FILES/ Multiple_Intelligences_Learning_Styles.pdf

*Freeman , Diane L. and Anderson , Marti . (2011). **Techniues and Principles in Language Teaching** . (3rd nd) . Oxford University Press . Newyourk

Gardner, H. (1999). **Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century.** New York: Basic Books.

*Gardner , Howard and Hatch, Thomas .2010 . **Educational   Implication of the Theory of Multiple Intelligences**. American Educational Research Association.

*Griswold, J.S., Harter, D.S., & Null, K.C. (2002). **Writing lessons using the multiple intelligences.** Westminster: Teacher Created Resources.

*Haley, M., H. (2001). **Understanding Leraner-Centered Instruction from the Perspective of Multiple Intelligences. Foreing Language Annals,** 34(4), 355-367.

*Hoerr , Thomas R .(2000)**. Becoming A Multiple Intelligences School** . Assoclation for Supervision and Curriculum Development .

*Howard Gardners Theory of Multiple Intelligences . n.d.   Retrieved on 2\3\2018 at :\\www.niu.edu\facdev.

*Kong, Y. (2009). **A study on multiple intelligences theory and English Language Teaching.** International Education Studies, 2(1), 133-138.

*Lahad,Afrah M ; Jebur , Muntaha S. and Jaboori , Hiba R. .   (2017). **Multiple Intellgence and Classroom   Activities in TEFL .** Translation and linguistic Semi-   Annual Refereed Journal on Translation, Linguistics and Literature Issued by Iraqi   Translators' Association .Baghdad.

*Mckenzie, walter .(2005)**. Multiple Intelligences and Instruction Technology** .(2nd nd) . Iste   publication.

*Mousavi, S.A. (1999). **A Dictionary of Language Testing.** (2nded). Tehran: Rahnama Publications

*Cherry, Kendra. (2018). **Gardener's Theory of** Multiple **Intelligence.** Retieved on 25\2\2018 at: :http:\\www.literacynet intro.

*Nicholson,Kristen N. (1998)**.Developing students Multiple Intelligences .** Scholastic Professional books.

*Neisser, U., Bouchard, T., Boykin, W., Brody, N., Ceci, S., Halpern, D., Loehlin, J., Sternberg., & Urbina, S. (1996**). Intelligence: Knowns and Unknown**s'. American Psychological Association*, 5* (2): 77-101.

Pirozzolo, F. (2002*).* **Multiple Intelligences and leadership.** Retrieved Jan, 28, 2014 from Taylor & Francis e- library http://www.tandfonline.com/

*Richards .Jack C and Rodgers, Theodore S. (2001).   **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching Second Editinou.** (1st nd). Cambridge University Press.

*Slah ,Nabaa Fadhil . (2013). **The Effect of Using Multiple Intelligences Activities to Develop Iraqi EFL Learners Reading Comprehension** . Unpublished MA Thesis, Collage of Basic Education at Al_Mustansiriyah University . Baghdad .

*Salman , Nahida Abdul Kadhum . (2012) **. An Assessment of Multiple Intelligences Strategies Employed by Iraqi EFL Students at Teachers Training Institutes .** Unpublished MA Thesis, Higher Arab Institute for Educational and Psychological studies.

*Willingham, D. (2004). *Reframing the Mind*. Retrieved Feb, 2, 2014 from http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/ednext20043_18.pdf

*Woolfolk, A (2013). **Educational psychology**. Pearson Twelfth   edition: New York.

Appendix 1
A letter to Jury Members

   The researcher intends to conduct a study entitled "Extent of Iraqi EFL Students' Multiple Intelligences at secondary schools".

This study aims at:

1. Identifying Iraqi EFL students multiple intelligences.

2. Investigating whether gender makes difference in the students' MI.

3. Identify the most frequent type of MI that most of Iraqi students interest .

   I would be grateful if you, as an expert in the field of teaching English as a foreign language and linguistics, pass judgment on the suitability of the tests items, and decide the face and content validity of the tests.

   Any comments, modifications or suggestions would be highly regarded and appreciated.

   Thank   you   in   advance   for   your assistance and cooperation.

<div align="right">

Asst.Instr. Hayder Abdulzahra
Researcher. Asmaa Abdul Nabi
</div>

NO	Items	Always	Often	Rarely	Some times	Never
1	Listening to music changes my mind.					
2	I know myself well.					
3	I prefer thinking and working alone.					
4	Listing to others helps me learning well.					
5	I can remember pieces of music easily.					
6	I can understand feelings and moods of others.					
7	I can imagine scenes of things when I remember them.					
8	I have good physical activities and good deal of balance.					
9	I think independently and I have my own thinking.					
10	I like to work with my hands.					
11	I learn things well when I have to do them for myself.					
12	Pollution makes me angry.					
13	Writing thing down is interesting for me.					
14	I have the ability to connect things together and pick out patterns easily					
15	I enjoy social events like parties.					
16	I enjoy working on my own.					
17	I enjoy making music.					
18	I can explain to others easily.					
19	I have a good sense of direction.					
20	I need to deal with things visually before I learn them.					
21	I always do things in steps.					
22	I can differentiate and distinguish between different types of animals and plants.					
23	I am interested in investigating the reasons why people do things they want to do.					
24	I like work with a team.					
25	When I walk or run, I am interested in thinking of problems.					

26	I can express myself in different words and ways.						
27	I enjoy games involving other people.						
28	I prefer using charts and diagrams when I am learning.						
29	I enjoy being outdoors when I learn.						
30	I am alert and usually see things that others miss.						
31	I am good at using numbers and mathematical problems.						
32	If I listen to a piece of music more than one time, I can repeat it.						
33	I like to think aloud.						
34	I can play musical instruments.						
35	I can solve problems and fix misunderstanding between friends.						
36	I get restless easily.						
37	I like arranging things as a list.						
38	I keep or like pets.						
39	I am interested in playing the intellectual games and solving problems that require logic.						
40	I can analyze things and synthesis them easily.						

Appendix 2
Names of the Jury Members

No.	Academic Rank	Name	College	Certificate and specialization
1	Professor	Hassan, Dhuha Attallah	University of Al- Mustansiriayh/ College of Basic Education.	Ph.D. in ELT
2	Instructor	Jassim, Azhar	University of Al-Mustansiriayh/ College of Basic Education.	Ph.D. in Literature.
3	Instructor	Lahad, Afrah M.	University of Al-Mustansiriayh /College of Basic Education.	M.A. in ELT.
4	Instructor	Sabbar, Muntaha	University of Al-Mustansiriayh /College of Basic Education.	M.A. in ELT.
5	Asst. Instructor	Rauf. Rafid	Ministry of Education	M.A. in ELT.
6	Asst. Instructor	Talib, Angham	University of Al-Mustansiriayh /College of Basic Education.	M.A. in ELT.

مستخــــــــلص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية الى التعرف على مستوى الذكاءات المتعددة لدى طلبة المدارس الثانوية في بغداد/الرصافة. ولتحقيق اهداف البحث اختار الباحث عينة عشوائية متكونة من (60) طالبا وطالبة من مدرسة الجمهورية للبنين ومدرسة الناصرة للبنات في الرصافة الاولى الثانية. استخدم الباحث المنهج الوصفي كونه يلائم طبيعة الدراسة الحالية. فيما يتعلق بأداة البحث فقد تبنى الباحث استبيان لقياس مستوى الذكاءات المتعددة متكون من 40 فقرة موزعة على ثمان ذكاءات. اظهرت النتائج ان طلبة المدارس الثانوية في بغداد لديهم مستوى جيد من الذكاءات المتعددة. وهناك فرق في مستوى الذكاءات المتعددة لدى الطلبة تبعا لمتغير الجنس لصالح الذكور.وجاء الذكاء البصري في المرتبة الاولى وفقا لنتائج البحث بينما جاء الذكاء الشخصي في المرتبة الاخيرة. وفي نهاية الدراسة تم عرض عدد من التوصيات والمقترحات التي من الممكن ان تحسن البيئة الصفية لتعلم اللغة الانكليزية.