# The Relationship between Verbal Intelligence and Speaking Competence among Third-year English Majors at Khenchela University

# العلاقة بين الذكاء اللغوي ومهارة التحدث لدى طلاب السنة الثالثة تخصص اللغة الإنجليزية في جامعة خنشلة

**ATIK Imane**
Larbi Ben M'hidi University of Oum Elbouaghi atik.imene@univ-khenchela.dz
Pr. HAMADOUCHE Mokhtar
Larbi Ben M'hidi University of Oum Elbouaghi m.hamadouche@univ-oeb.dz

**DECLIC research laboratory**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *submission date:28 /02/2025* | *Acceptation date: 12/03/2025* | *Published date: 15/03/2025* |

*******

***Abstract:*** Recognizing the value of intelligence in language learning/teaching context and that intelligence has many types and categories, multiple intelligences theory has evolved with many implications for second/foreign language teaching. The present study aims at providing a descriptive report about the relationship between the speaking and linguistic intelligence among third-year students of English at Khenchela University. Data has been gathered through McKenzie's (1999) inventory along with the oral expression exam marks so as to describe the extent to which speaking abilities are correlated with linguistic intelligence. Results reveal that since the r value is rated as 0.601, less than 0.001, which means that there is a strong relationship between students' speaking skill and their verbal intelligence. Although the study is concerned with third-year students of English, it is an inevitable fact that all the process of learning and teaching relies heavily on intelligence regardless to the level or age. Finally, taking into account students' different intelligences and abilities would make it easy for teachers to incorporate multiple ways and strategies to promote students' learning outcomes.

***key words****:* teaching; learning; speaking performance; multiple intelligences; verbal intelligence;

**ملخص باللغة العربية** :تطورت نظرية الذكاءات المتعددة مع العديد من التطبيقات في تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة ثانية/أجنبية. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تقديم تقرير وصفي حول العلاقة بين مهارة التحدث والذكاء اللغوي لدى طلبة السنة الثالثة تخصص لغة إنجليزية في جامعة خنشلة. من اجل اثبات وجود علاقة بين مهارات التحدث و الذكاء اللغوي، جمعت البيانات عن طريق مقياس ماكنزي (1999) بالإضافة الى علامات امتحان التعبير الشفهي. تكشف النتائج عن وجود تاثير إيجابي ذات أهمية احصائية بين المتغيرين، حيث بلغت قيمة معامل الارتباط r=0.601 وهي أقل من مستوى الدلالة p=0.001. وعلى الرغم من أن الدراسة تتعلق بطلبة السنة الثالثة إنجليزية، فإن الذكاء، لا سيما الذكاء اللغوي، يُعد عاملًا أساسيًا في نجاح عملية تعلم وتعليم اللغة الإنجليزية على مختلف المستويات والفئات العمرية. وأخيرًا، فإن مراعاة الذكاءات والقدرات المختلفة للطلاب من شأنه أن يسهل على المدرسين توظيف استراتيجيات وأساليب متنوعة لتعزيز نتائج تعلم الطلاب.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** تعلم؛ تعليم؛ مهارة التحدث؛ الذكاءات المتعددة؛ الذكاء اللغوي؛

## INTRODUCTION

The core purpose of second/foreign language learning is to achieve speaking fluency and proficiency for the sake of maintaining effective communication in different situations (Richards & Renandya, 2002); however, mastering the speaking skill is not an easy task due to many challenges that learners frequently come across. Shyness, risk of making mistakes, low participation, and the use of mother language are viewed as the prominent problems that occur in the process of learning speaking Ur (1996). These problems prevent learners from being fluent and professional speakers.

In the Algerian context, students of English face crucial challenges regarding the speaking skill. For example, Saidouni (2019) determines that students display low performance in the speaking skill, and they achieve an unsatisfactory level in their overall academic achievements. In keeping with this view, Khelloufi (2016) confirms that the majority of EFL students graduate from university with low communicative competences that they are not able to engage in a fluent, natural communication due to several inadequacies, like vocabulary and linguistic adequacy. Therefore, teachers keep complaining about the low grades of students in the oral exams, and they struggle to figure out these difficulties.

Actually, one of the most challenging situations that teachers of the oral expression course endure is uninterested and passive students, yet teachers are still using the same techniques in teaching the aforementioned course (that is topic class discussion and role plays or dialogues). As for students, they complain about

their weak communicative competence, which means inability to maintain a proficient communication. Teachers attempt to integrate different methods which are by nature teacher-centred (like the communicative language teaching etc.) as well as different materials (like authentic materials videos, songs etc.); however, there is still a gap existing between the teaching methods and learners' achievements. In other words, teachers of English do not take into consideration individual differences and abilities as Gunst (2004) assumes that teachers usually employ teaching technique associated to their own intelligences (often linguistic and logical); instead, teachers have to implicate different strategies in classrooms that involve students with different types of intelligences and capacities.

Moreover, teachers of English still consider learners as all the same, having the same abilities and intelligences, therefore, knowledge and information (course contents) are transmitted in the same way following the same techniques (for example, topic discussion, role plays in the oral expression course). In the Algerian context, teachers of English use one imposed philosophy that is 'one-size fits all' putting aside learners' needs, differences, intelligences, and capacities (Hammoudi, 2010)

Littlewood (1984) refers to some psychological factors that influence students' ability of speaking, like hesitation, motivation, and intelligence that is related to language aptitude (student's ability to learn); that is, intelligence is a mental competence that tightly related to the learning process. Additionally, understanding, thinking skills, and cognitive processing abilities are all included in intelligence, whereas learning is the process of picking up new information or abilities via study, training, or experience. High intelligence can help people learn by enabling them to understand ideas more quickly and thoroughly.

Ur (1996) claims that the speaking skill is intimately interrelated with multiple intelligences. This inevitably entails that teaching the speaking skill goes hand in hand with taking students' intelligences into account. Additionally, teaching the speaking skill through involving students' multiple intelligences requires involving different strategies and activities (that would trigger students' learning preferences) would create an enjoyable, comfortable learning atmosphere in which learners are to be be greatly involved in the success of the learning process, and in which no student would be left behind (Baum et al. ,2005)

Based on multiple intelligences theory, verbal-linguistic intelligence is defined as the capacity to use and understand both the written and the oral language appropriately; this is why, the speaking skill and linguistic intelligence are highly related, and eventually, a significant correlation exists between them Fariseh (2020). The present study is an attempt to figure out whether there exists a correlation between students' speaking competence and their verbal intelligence.

## Review of Related Studies

Spearman (1927) associates the speaking skill to intelligence claiming that an individual is called intelligent whenever she/he performs well in different intellectual tasks. This view is supported by Gottfredson (1997) who claims that intelligence involves many skills like, reasoning, problem solving, fast learning, and developing skills through real-life situations.

Spearman (1927) views speaking as an array of cognitive, critical thinking activities, and he assumes that intelligence and speaking are intimately interrelated. In other words, a proficient speaker is an intelligent one since she/he performs effectively the sub-skills of speaking (vocabulary, grammar etc.). The linguistic intelligence is explained as to the aptitude of using language efficiently. As for the relationship between linguistic intelligence and speaking, they both complement each other: engaging in activities that require verbal practices may enhance linguistic intelligence; conversely, linguistic intelligence activities (like reading, playing word games) may promote the speaking skill (Kafryawan et al., 2018)

The evolution of multiple intelligences theory, by Gardner, altered the universal consensus of intelligence. Before the emergence of this theory, intelligence was viewed as one entity that can be measured through the so-called intelligence quotient (IQ). This view received much criticism and disproval as IQ is not able to measure other concepts along with logical skills, like creativity, personality, and other social skill (like communication) (Gottfredson, 1997). Gardner (1983) assumes that intelligence can have different types (linguistic, logical, spatial, interpersonal, intrapersonal, existential, naturalistic, musical, and bodily-kinaesthetic), in this way, people are not said to be stupid, but rather, they are intelligent in different ways. However, each intelligence is complementary to the other one; intelligences cannot be operating in isolation, but rather "they are considered complementary (Gardner, 1999).

Davoudi and Chavosh (2016) view linguistic intelligence as the capacity to use language effectively; in other words, an individual is described as linguistically intelligent when he/she is able to communicate properly either in the written form or in the verbal/spoken form. Also, to be linguistically intelligent entails that one is capable to use words according to different situations or contexts. Therefore, it is important to ensure that students who are linguistically intelligent must have high proficiency of the speaking performance.

Practically, linguistic intelligence and the speaking competence are intertwined. In this regard, Gardner (1999) states that linguistic intelligence is highly interrelated to how proficient an individual is able to use language (both in

speaking and writing). Also, a person who is linguistically intelligence can be capable in problem solving and skilful in achieving effective communication as he is good at choosing words, playing with words and expressions, and also at transferring meanings skilfully in mother language and in foreign/second language.

Baum et. al. (2005) assume that linguistic intelligence encompasses both the use of mother language and also the mastery of foreign languages; hence, linguistic intelligent people are supposed to learn the speaking skill faster than people who do not have high linguistic intelligence. Accordingly, in the context of learning the speaking skill, students with high linguistic intelligence are to achieve high scores regarding speaking performance (Bahare & Shahla, 2015)

Research concerning the interrelation between multiple intelligences and learning/teaching the speaking skill is abundant. As an example, Bahare & Shahla (2015) carried out an experiment aiming at determining a valuable relationship between speaking and multiple intelligences of 60 EFL sophomore majoring in translation in Bandar Abbas Azad University. the students, as a first step, sat for multiple intelligences test, and then, they took an ability speaking test. Eventually, the findings uncovered the existence of a statistically strong positive correlation between speaking and verbal intelligence. Bahare & Shahla (2015) concluded that teachers, educators, and policy makers should take into consideration students' differentiation, and therefore, they learn in different ways, so incorporating several techniques that would develop students' speaking skills aligning with students' multiple intelligences is a necessity.

Another study that was conducted by Shelawati Rizqiningsih (2018) attempting to recognize the influence of multiple intelligences activities on learners' oral outcomes. Two groups were involved: the experimental group was learning via multiple intelligences-based activities, and the controlling group was learning without them. The difference between learning speaking through multiple intelligences activities and learning without them is very apparent Shelawati (2018). Eventually, the power of multiple intelligences theory was confirmed through the above-mentioned study.

In the Algerian context, multiple intelligences theory is gaining an increasing attention. Many studies investigated the role of the theory in the educational context. For example, Boulamiz (2017) and Hadj Said (2021) investigated how the Algerian textbooks represent the multiple intelligences theory (At the Crossroads, and Getting Through). Both researchers concluded that the linguistic intelligence is the one most appreciated while the other types (musical, logical, bodily-kinaesthetic etc.) are totally neglected. Moreover, both researchers assumed that teachers of English are not familiar with the theory yet

still view intelligence traditionally (as one entity relying on the IQ to assess intelligence), and also teachers are not aware of the variability and differentiation of learners' intelligences and abilities. What about MIT and speaking? You found no studies? If that is the case, you should conclude that multiple intelligences theory was applied to investigate aspects other than speaking proficiency

Another significant study was conducted by Hammoudi (2010) who carried out a study to investigate the role of teaching English through integrating multiple intelligences theory to secondary school pupils. Results revealed two important conclusions. First, pupils realized better achievements in learning English, and they demonstrated positive attitudes to the whole learning process; therefore, this proves the efficiency of multiple intelligences theory. Second, a significant relationship was found between verbal intelligence and the oral competence of learners. Consequently, the importance of linguistic intelligence in learning English is highlighted, so teachers should incorporate techniques to empower students' linguistic intelligence.

Basically, the theory was opted for explaining and dealing with psychometric issues like memory loss, language loss, traumas…etc. but, later on, the theory attracted the attention of educators and teachers. Therefore, the theory was considered as both psychological and pedagogical. Originally, pedagogy and psychology are intimately related i.e. teaching entails involving the psychological aspects of learners. Gardner (2011) classified intelligence types as follows :

| Intelligence | Description |
|---|---|
| -Verbal-linguistic intelligence | the ability to use languages properly. People who own this type of intelligence are good writers and orators. |
| Logical-mathematical | people who possess this type of intelligence are able to deduce reason and logic very quickly. They have scientific thinking. |
| Naturalistic intelligence | it consists of the ability to discriminate life of human being as well as nature. That is to say, a naturalistic intelligent is eager to discover life in nature (animals, insects, plants…etc.). |
| Interpersonal intelligence | refers to individuals who interact comfortably with people. This means that an interpersonal intelligent is extrovert, self-confident, and sociable: he/she is able to understand others' feelings. |
| Intrapersonal intelligence | this includes people who are able to understand their |

| | |
|---|---|
| | own feelings, needs, and behaviours. |
| Musical intelligence | it involves people with high understanding of music, tones, and voices. People who are musically intelligent can easily understand, compose, and interpret musical compositions. |
| Bodily-kinaesthetic | people who possess this type are those who can comfortably control their physical morphology. It means that they can use their body to perform harmonic and consistent body movements. |
| Spatial intelligence | this is specific for people who have the ability to manipulate images, pictures, maps, and spaces in general. |
| Existential intelligence | this is a ninth intelligence that Gardner did not genuinely consider as an intelligence because it deviates from the criterion of intelligences; however, he explained this type as the intention of knowing oneself, and asking philosophical questions like: who am I? why do I exist? |

**Table 1. Types of Intelligence Adapted from Gardner (2011)**

Gardner (2011) believes that there exist more than nine types of intelligence, depending on his criteria to identify different intelligences, that include:

-Potential isolation by brain damage.

-Susceptibility to encoding in a symbol system.

-The existence of idiots savants, prodigies, are other exceptional individuals.

Evidently, the principle types of intelligence are classified in the previous table Gardner (2011).

## Research Framework

For the sake of discovering the existence of relationship between learners' oral competence and their verbal intelligence, a correlational research framework is opted.

Schober et al. (2018) state that when variable 1 shifts along with variable 2, then there is a positive correlation, but if the opposite happens, it means there is a negative correlation. Pearson correlational measure is selected to reach the aim of the study. This measure labelled as "r" is viewed as reliable, possessing a value

ranging from -1.0 to +1.0. For instance, variable A increases together with variable B, then "r" is valued as +1.0, but if variable A increases while variable B decreases, then "r" is valued as -1.0 Cohen et al (2000).

Data is to be collected from a specific number of subjects who form a whole group sharing specific characteristics (Singh, 2006). Thus, 50 third-year students of English at Khenchela University, were chosen randomly as the sample of the study.

McKenzie inventory and the oral expression exams marks are the main data collection tools. The inventory is a kind of a questionnaire composed of nine sections. Each section of the nine sections contains 10 statements which corresponds to a particular type of intelligence. When students respond to the questions, they implicitly identify their type of intelligence. The inventory is reliable as many researchers used it as a research tool for assessing and discovering individuals' intelligence profiles (see Mokhtar et al., 2008, Al-Balhan, 2006). the inventory was created, during 1990, not to discriminate people or categorize them, but it was made for the sake of recognizing people's strengths and weaknesses in terms of intelligences and skills. The inventory is considered a pedagogical tool used in the teaching/learning context to facilitate the process for both teachers and learners.

First, McKenzie inventory of multiple intelligences is handed to students to be filled. Then, scores of the oral expression exam are to be collected. The researcher analyses the intelligences distribution among students through the inventory. At the end, the oral marks are compared to the distribution of intelligences by applying Pearson correlational statistical analysis and interpretation in order to identify the relationship between speaking and linguistic intelligence of learners.

## Data analysis

McKenzie inventory (1999) contains nine sections, and each section reflects one type of intelligence, for example, section one reflects naturalistic intelligence, section two reflects musical intelligence etc. Moreover, each section contains ten statements. These statements are composed in an easy and clear language that students can understand. As a first step, students read the statement, and if they agree or feel the statement represents and describes them, they put '1' in the space provided next to the space, but if students do not agree or feel the statement does not reflect or describe them, they leave the space blank. In the second step, students count numbers (number 1 put next to each statement) in every section and put the total number in the 'total' case. There are nine total cases corresponding to the nine sections. After that, looking at the scores, students

would recognize that their powerful abilities are represented through their highest scores, and the weakest abilities are represented through the lowest scores.

| Student | Nat | Log | Inter | Intra | Ling | Kines | Music | ex | Spa | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 01 | 03 | 05 | 02 | **08** | 07 | 01 | 01 | 05 | Ling |
| 2 | 03 | 06 | 05 | 03 | **07** | 04 | 04 | 06 | 02 | Ling |
| 3 | 02 | 06 | 04 | 02 | 06 | 09 | 03 | 04 | 07 | Kines |
| 4 | 02 | 01 | 06 | 02 | 06 | 03 | 05 | 02 | 07 | Spa |
| 5 | 05 | 09 | 06 | 08 | 03 | 01 | 04 | 06 | 07 | Log |
| 6 | 01 | 05 | 08 | 04 | **10** | 05 | 04 | 06 | 08 | Ling |
| 7 | 05 | 06 | 05 | 03 | **09** | 08 | 03 | 05 | 04 | Ling |
| 8 | 05 | 08 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 07 | 04 | 02 | 09 | Spa |
| 9 | 05 | 07 | 02 | 06 | **08** | 07 | 05 | 02 | 06 | Ling |
| 10 | 03 | 02 | 06 | 08 | 03 | 06 | 03 | 05 | 06 | Intra |
| 11 | 02 | 04 | 06 | 04 | **07** | 01 | 04 | 05 | 02 | Ling |
| 12 | 03 | 05 | 05 | 06 | **07** | 02 | 06 | 05 | 03 | Ling |
| 13 | 03 | 05 | 07 | 04 | 05 | 04 | 09 | 03 | 05 | Music |
| 14 | 05 | 03 | 06 | 07 | **08** | 03 | 01 | 07 | 06 | Ling |
| 15 | 02 | 01 | 05 | 04 | 03 | 02 | 07 | 03 | 03 | Music |
| 16 | 02 | 04 | 06 | 04 | **07** | 01 | 04 | 03 | 06 | Ling |
| 17 | 06 | 03 | 02 | 07 | **08** | 01 | 04 | 06 | 07 | Ling |
| 18 | 01 | 06 | 02 | 08 | 06 | 05 | 03 | 05 | 07 | Intra |
| 19 | 02 | 05 | 04 | 09 | **10** | 05 | 04 | 03 | 02 | Ling |
| 20 | 04 | 07 | 10 | 08 | 08 | 03 | 06 | 05 | 02 | Inter |
| 21 | 01 | 04 | 03 | 02 | **10** | 06 | 09 | 06 | 07 | Ling |
| 22 | 02 | 07 | 08 | 05 | 06 | 09 | 05 | 02 | 05 | Kines |
| 23 | 03 | 08 | 02 | 05 | **09** | 01 | 04 | 05 | 03 | Ling |
| 24 | 02 | 04 | 06 | 08 | **09** | 03 | 08 | 07 | 06 | Ling |
| 25 | 04 | 07 | 08 | 03 | 06 | 02 | 05 | 07 | 06 | Inter |
| 26 | 01 | 04 | 05 | 02 | **09** | 01 | 04 | 05 | 03 | Ling |
| 27 | 04 | 07 | 03 | 01 | 06 | 03 | 06 | 05 | 02 | Logic |
| 28 | 01 | 06 | 05 | 03 | 06 | 07 | 03 | 08 | 02 | Ex |
| 29 | 03 | 08 | 05 | 05 | 04 | 06 | 03 | 06 | 04 | Log |
| 30 | 06 | 06 | 03 | 02 | **07** | 05 | 04 | 03 | 01 | Ling |
| 31 | 04 | 03 | 06 | 06 | **07** | 04 | 05 | 05 | 03 | Ling |
| 32 | 04 | 05 | 02 | 07 | 06 | 03 | 01 | 09 | 06 | Ex |
| 33 | 04 | 03 | 05 | 06 | **08** | 07 | 04 | 05 | 01 | Ling |
| 34 | 02 | 04 | 03 | 08 | **09** | 04 | 08 | 05 | 04 | Ling |
| 35 | 06 | 07 | 09 | 05 | 03 | 02 | 07 | 04 | 01 | Inter |
| 36 | 07 | 06 | 04 | 03 | **08** | 06 | 05 | 05 | 07 | Ling |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 37 | 06 | 06 | 07 | 04 | **08** | 03 | 05 | 01 | 01 | Ling |
| 38 | 03 | 03 | 06 | 02 | 05 | 01 | 08 | 05 | 05 | Music |
| 39 | 07 | 06 | 09 | 04 | 06 | 03 | 02 | 05 | 06 | Inter |
| 40 | 08 | 04 | 02 | 07 | 04 | 03 | 06 | 02 | 07 | Nat |
| 41 | 05 | 06 | 04 | 04 | **07** | 02 | 01 | 05 | 05 | Ling |
| 42 | 03 | 08 | 07 | 08 | **09** | 05 | 04 | 06 | 04 | Ling |
| 43 | 01 | 01 | 05 | 07 | **09** | 07 | 08 | 05 | 03 | Ling |
| 44 | 04 | 04 | 01 | 02 | **07** | 06 | 03 | 06 | 05 | Ling |
| 45 | 04 | 01 | 07 | 07 | **08** | 06 | 06 | 03 | 02 | Ling |
| 46 | 05 | 06 | 01 | 03 | 06 | 08 | 02 | 07 | 05 | Kines |
| 47 | 02 | 04 | 06 | 02 | **07** | 01 | 05 | 04 | 04 | Ling |
| 48 | 04 | 01 | 05 | 06 | **07** | 02 | 01 | 01 | 05 | Ling |
| 49 | 05 | 03 | 03 | 06 | **09** | 06 | 05 | 02 | 06 | Ling |
| 50 | 03 | 02 | 01 | 06 | **09** | 07 | 05 | 03 | 06 | Ling |

**Table 2. McKenzie Inventory Analysis**

Intelligence types distribution among students are displayed through table 2, that assumes the differences in students' competences and intelligences; however, the highest percentage is that of verbal/linguistic intelligence (60%). The other intelligences are apparently represented with very low percentages. Naturalistic intelligence has 2%. Logical-mathematical intelligence has 6%. Interpersonal intelligence has 8% of students' answers while intrapersonal intelligence is represented only with 4% of students' answers. Also, 6% of students are bodily-kinaesthetic. Musical intelligence has 6% of students' responses. Finally, both existential and spatial intelligences have similar percentage which is 4% of the answers.

As a matter of fact, students can be linguistically intelligent at the same time they possess high score in other types of intelligence like musical. For example, student number 50 is linguistically intelligent at the same time he is bodily-kinaesthetically strong, which means that he is linguistically and bodily-kinaesthetically intelligent. Again, the inventory is not aimed at labelling or classifying students, but rather, it is aimed at discovering and self-evaluating one's dominant abilities and skills for the sake of investing in students' powers and attempting to empower their weaknesses.

| Intelligence | Percentage |
|---|---|
| Naturalistic | 2% |
| Logical-mathematical | 6% |
| Interpersonal | 8% |
| Intrapersonal | 4% |
| Linguistic/verbal | 60% |

| | |
|---|---|
| Bodily-kinesthetic | 6% |
| Musical | 6% |
| Existential | 4% |
| Spatial/visual | 4% |

**Table 3. Percentages of Intelligences**

In order to describe the relationship between linguistic intelligence and the oral performance, it is necessary to compare students' possession of linguistic intelligence, which is achieved through the inventory, and their marks in the oral expression exam. Students who have high linguistic intelligence represent 60% of the whole population, yet the percentage corresponds to 30 students out of 50, which is more than the half. The aforementioned statistics highlights and mainly focuses on the number of linguistically intelligent students, yet it is pertinent to assume that there are some students who have more than one type of intelligence, for instance, referring back to the table of the intelligences distribution, it is found that there are students who possess linguistic-kinaesthetic intelligence (04 students), other students have linguistic-intrapersonal intelligences (05 students), and also students own linguistic-logical intelligences (02 students). Therefore, the table of percentages of intelligences highlights the rates of linguistic intelligence as it is the main concern of the study. In this way, it is discovered whether students' oral exam marks match with their linguistic intelligence. The results are shown in the following table and figure.

| Student | Verbal intelligence | Oral expression mark |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 8 | 17.5 |
| 2 | 7 | 13.5 |
| 3 | 10 | 18.5 |
| 4 | 9 | 15 |
| 5 | 8 | 18 |
| 6 | 7 | 10 |
| 7 | 8 | 13 |
| 8 | 8 | 17 |
| 9 | 7 | 11.5 |
| 10 | 8 | 18 |
| 11 | 10 | 19 |
| 12 | 10 | 15 |
| 13 | 9 | 15.5 |
| 14 | 9 | 17 |
| 15 | 9 | 11 |
| 16 | 7 | 10 |
| 17 | 7 | 13 |
| 18 | 8 | 16 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 19 | 9 | 17 |
| 20 | 8 | 15 |
| 21 | 8 | 16 |
| 22 | 7 | 12 |
| 23 | 9 | 16 |
| 24 | 9 | 14 |
| 25 | 7 | 15 |
| 26 | 8 | 15 |
| 27 | 7 | 10 |
| 28 | 7 | 17 |
| 29 | 9 | 18 |
| 30 | 9 | 17 |

**Table 4. Comparison of Verbal Intelligence and Scores**

Apparently, the table reveals that most of students, who are linguistically intelligent based on the McKenzie inventory, are the ones who gained high scores in the oral expression exam rating from (12 to 19). The table below realizes Pearson correlational equation in order to understand the correlation between speaking and verbal intelligence of students.

| | | lingInt | Scores |
|---|---|---|---|
| lingInt | Pearson Correlation | 1 | ,601** |
| | Sig. (bilateral) | | ,000 |
| | N | 30 | 30 |
| Scores | Pearson Correlation | ,601** | 1 |
| | Sig. (bilateral) | ,000 | |
| | N | 30 | 30 |

**Table 5. Pearson Correlation Measure**

Basically, the coefficient r is a value that tells about the magnitude of the correlation between two variables. In this study the two variables are students' oral expression exam marks (the speaking skill) and students' linguistic intelligence outcomes. The table above displays a moderately positive and statistically strong correlation between linguistic intelligence (linInt) and speaking competence (scores) ($r = .601$, $p < .001$). It is positive because $r = .601$ (the size of correlation rates between .50 and .70), and it is significant as r is of 0.01. Consequently, it is proved that the speaking skill enhances whenever the linguistic intelligence is advanced.

## Findings Implications

The study at hand attempted to detect any possible association between speaking performance and verbal-linguistic intelligence among students of English. Third-year students of English have been purposefully chosen to take part in the study as they are supposed to having establishing a significant background of knowledge about the four language skills, specifically speaking. It is important to work with experienced learners as they would reflect an advanced level of speaking, which will facilitate inducing the relationship between linguistic intelligence and speaking performance.

Identifying students' types of intelligence was realized through McKenzie inventory, which approved the diversity in terms of abilities among students, insisting that the predominant intelligence type is the verbal-linguistic intelligence (60%). This demonstrates that linguistic intelligence is very important in language learning classes, and this is a strong reason that requires language teachers to create instructions that empower linguistic intelligence among students. Moreover, results displayed that students who possess linguistic intelligence achieved high scores in the oral expression exams. Actually, 83.33% of students with high linguistic intelligence succeeded in realizing very good marks rating from 13.5 to 19. This reflects that there is a strong relationship between linguistic intelligence and the oral proficiency. The low percentage 16.66% of students did not achieve good marks but rather average ones rating from 10 to 12. This may be explained by saying that those students are uninterested in learning the language itself, or maybe they are not working on their capacities and skills…etc.

Linguistic intelligence goes hand in hand with the other eight intelligences (mentioned above), and there is no possible way to consider each intelligence in isolation Armstrong (2009). Therefore, it is essential to design lesson plans based on multiple intelligences theory very carefully. Besides, language learning is based primarily on empowering linguistic intelligence. Thus, to achieve such goal, implementing specific activities would help learners to enhance their linguistic intelligence. For example, in the oral expression course, teachers can apply the following activities:

-the teacher put a set of things (like a fruit, scissors, ball, pen, candle…etc.) in a box, then each student picks randomly without looking into the box, and he/she starts speaking about it without even structuring the speech. This would enhance improvisation which is the nature of speaking.

-another activity is to distinguish between narration and description. This would enhance learners' imagination, and it would train them to use adjectives and adverbs in their conversations.

-moreover, to make learners watch a short movie, to narrate the story, and then create a different ending .

Additionally, As'ad (2019) declares that learners who are linguistically intelligent demonstrate special characteristics like to communicate effectively, to possess rich vocabulary, memorize new words…etc. Moreover, people who possess this kind of intelligence are basically journalists, authors, writers, novelists…etc.

Based on the study, it is confirmed that multiple intelligences theory plays a crucial role in the language teaching/learning context. For this reason, teachers, educators, and policy makers should indisputably take the individual differences that exist among students into account. In other words, since multiple intelligences theory has a relationship with the speaking skill, it means that the theory certainly has a relationship with the other three language skills (writing, reading, and listening). Implementing multiple intelligences theory along with other methods and techniques (for example technology) would establish a perfect language learning/teaching atmosphere.

## CONCLUSION

This article aimed at reporting whether there exists a substantial association between students' speaking skill and their linguistic intelligence. Linguistic intelligence was the central issue as learning a foreign language principally refers to enhancing and using linguistic intelligence. However, other intelligences should be taken into consideration as all the intelligences operate in a collective yet complicated manner. In the light of the findings, linguistic intelligence and the speaking skill are highly correlated since students who are linguistically intelligent achieved high marks in the oral expression exam. Therefore, teachers are recommended that they integrate linguistic intelligence-based activities along with multiple intelligences-based activities to empower learners' language mastery and comprehension.

*******

**Bibliography List :**

Al-Balhan, E.M. (2006). Multiple intelligence style in relation to improved academic performance in Kuwaiti middle school reading. *Digest of Middle East Studies, 15(1),* 18-34.

Armstrong, T. (2009). *Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom*. ASCD

As'ad, M. (2019). Exploring Students' EFL Learning through Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory S1 Thesis. Universitas Negeri Makassar.

Bahare, S., & Shahla, S. (2015). The relationship between multiple intelligences and speaking skill among intermediate EFL learners in Bandar Abbas Azad university in Iran.

*International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 4(2),* 43-56 https://105861/ijrsll.2014.861

Baum, S., Viens, J., & Slatin, B. (2005). Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom : A teacher's toolkit. Teachers College Press.

Boulmaiz, D. (2017). The place of multiple intelligences theory in the Algerian textbook: an evaluation of first-year secondary school textbook *At the Crossroads*. *Revues des Sciences Humaines, 8(1*). ISSN 1112-9255 https://1035395/1728-000-008-041

Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison K. (2000). Research Methods in Education: London and New York.

Davoudi, M., and Chavosh, M. (2016). The relationship between multiple intelligences and listening self-efficacy among Iranian EFL learners. *English Language Teaching, 9(6)* 199-208 https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n6p199

Fariseh, L. (2020). *The Effect of Linguistic Intelligence to Students' Speaking Achievement at MA Mambaul Ma'arif Montor* (Doctoral dissertation, INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI MADURA).

Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. *TESOL quarterly*, *25*(2), 261-278.

Gardner, H. E. (2011). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Basic books.

Gardner, H. E. (2000). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. Hachette Uk.

Gardner, H. E. (2011). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Basic books.

Gottfredson, L. S. (1997). Mainstream science on intelligence: An editorial with 52 signatories, history, and bibliography. *Intelligence*, *24*(1), 13-23. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/S0160-2896(97)90011-8

Hadj Said, M. (2021). The inclusion of Multiple Intelligences Theory in The Algerian EFL Textbook: a content analysis of 2nd year Secondary School Textbook "Getting Through". *اللسانيات التطبيقية*, *5*(1), 283-292.

Harmer, J. (1996). *How to Teach English*. London.

Kafryawan, W., Yassi, H., and Nasmilah, N. (2018). The influence of intelligence on students' speaking skill. *ESL Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies on Humanities, 1(2),* 145-152 http://dx.doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v1i2.4309

Littlewood, W. (1984). *Foreign and second language learning*. Cambridge university press.

Mckenzie, W. (1999). Multiple Intelligences Inventory Retrieved from http://www.surfaquarium.com/miinvent.htm

Khelloufi Sallam, A. (2016). *Anxiety in Algerian Students Speaking EFL: The Case of Third Year- Baji Mokhtar University, Annaba.* (Doctoral Thesis) Annaba University.

Mokhtar, I. A., Majid, S., & Foo, S. (2008). Teaching information literacy through learning styles: The application of Gardner's multiple intelligences. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, *40*(2), 93-109.

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press.

Rizqiningsih, S. (2018). *Multiple Intelligences (MI) on developing speaking skill of the 9th grade students of MTS AL-Ihsan Jakarta Barat.* Sarjana Pendidikan in English Education.

Saibani, B., & Simin, S. (2015). The relationship between multiple intelligences and speaking skill among intermediate EFL learners in Bandar Abbas Azad University in Iran. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, *4*(2), 43-56.

Saidouni, K. (2019). *The Effect of Mobile-assisted Language Learning on Developing Students' Speaking: the Case of Second Year Students of English at Batna-2 University*. (Doctoral thesis) Batna university.

Schober, P., Boer, C., and Schwarte, L. A. (2018). Correlation coefficients: appropriate use and interpretation. *Anesthesia & analgesia*, *126*(5), 1763-1768.

Singh, Y.K. (2006). *Fundamentals of Research Methodology and Statistics*. New Delhi: New Age International.

Spearman, C. (1927). *The Abilities of Man, Their Nature and Measurement*. New York: Macmillan.

Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.