Integrating Multiple Intelligences in the EFL Syllabus: Content Analysis

Salameh S. Mahmoud
Language Support Unit, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, KSA

Mamoon M. Alaraj
Language Support Unit, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, KSA

Abstract—This study aims at analyzing an EFL course book in terms of the availability of multiple intelligences (MIs)-based activities and their distribution among the four English language skills. To achieve this the researchers surveyed other experiences in this context and analyzed a unit in terms of the availability of MIs-based activities in Unlimited Series/Level Four/Unit Two/Cambridge University Press, their weight and distribution in each skill. The results showed unfair distribution of the four skills and the eight multiple intelligences. This is due to the nature of the English language unit where certain intelligences are more appealing. It is recommended that curriculum designers give nearly equal weight to the four skills especially in general English courses and include as many MIs-based activities as possible. This variety is of great importance to students as teachers guarantee that no learning styles among students are left behind.

Index Terms—multiple intelligences, EFL syllabus, content analysis, TPR

I. Introduction

According to Gardner (1983) intelligence is the natural ability to give variety of solutions to problems and to enable the learner to process information ready to be activated in culturally valuable products (Zarie and Mohseni, 2012) cited in Deracksham and Faribi (2015). This definition summarizes the ultimate goal of any teaching learning process. It also justifies the fact that educators and curriculum designers have special interest in Multiple Intelligences (MIs) and hope that they can find solutions for many challenges associated with linguistic and logical mathematical-based curricula and the traditional teaching and assessment strategies. Armstrong (2008) assured educators that each person possesses the eight intelligences which can be developed to work together in a complex way. When teachers are aware of the applications of MIs and the curriculum is designed to cope with the students individual differences, they can provide enough variety in the activities they use so that most of the pupils' learning potential can be addressed (Berman, 1998) cited in Bas (2008) and Saeidi (2009).

Teachers, educators and curriculum designers shouldn't be surprised to find students not responding to classroom activities, demanding further explanations or not involved in classroom interaction. The answer is simply because their interests and preferences are not taken into consideration. Gardner (1993) said that educational methods should be tailored to be more flexible to learners having different intellectual capacities and should be rearranged to integrate MIs so that these capacities would be addressed. Chapman and Freeman (1996) cited in Chen (2005) assured students who have low percentages of MIs that intelligence can be improved through teaching and is changing through life. In addition, the different learning styles and needs of the learners result in different intelligences. Gardner (1983) also thought that each person is able to develop all intelligences through education and training.

The MI theory has also been injected in English language teaching in an attempt to echo the innovations in the teaching strategies reflected by the learner-centered approach. Among the new teaching strategies are total physical response (TPR), suggestopedia, cooperative learning and communicative language teaching (Snider, 2001) cited in Botelho (2003). EFL and ESL books are also analyzed to identify the different types of activities and to see if they include MIs.

A. Statement of the Problem

Most EFL course books are designed with linguistic and logical interests in mind thinking that this is the shortest way to teach English language. Doing this educators and curriculum designers forget that students have different interests and various learning styles. Some students learn through diagrams, pictures, advanced organizers, role plays and singing. MIs theory came to cope with this challenge and help educators meet these peculiarities.

B. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze an EFL unit from Unlimited Series/Level Four/Unit Two/Cambridge University Press to see which of the eight MIs are integrated in the unit and their distribution in each language skill throughout the unit.

C. Questions of the Study

The study attempts to answer the following three questions:
1. What is the weight given to each language skill in Unlimited Series/Level Four/Unit Two/Cambridge University Press?
2. What is the weight given to each Multiple Intelligence in Unlimited Series/Level Four/Unit Two/Cambridge University Press?
3. What is the weight given to each Multiple Intelligence in each language skill?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This short review tried to revise the basic conceptions of the related literature of the MIs theory. It focused on the definition of this theory, its background and its applications in EFL syllabus and language learning/teaching.

A. Multiple Intelligences Definition and Background

"Multiple Intelligences" is a theory suggested by Gardner nearly thirty-five years ago. It states that every individual has a number of potentials that enable him/her to manage in the teaching learning process. These potentials vary in percentages among people and can be developed and improved through education and training (Gardner, 1993; Botelho, 2003)**.**

Gardner introduced the multiple intelligences theory as a response to the traditional view of teaching and testing. He supposed that each person has at least eight intelligences and these intelligences interact in different manners which make that individual a unique profile. Each person has the eight intelligences with varying percentages and a missing intelligence in one's profile is not the end (Boelho, 2003).

B. Multiple Intelligences and English Language Learning/Teaching

As a response to the solely linguistic based curricula and the traditional ways of assessment, MIs theory came to address students' different learning styles and to evaluate them according to their preferences. Visual learners are exposed to pictures, videos and films, auditory learners may be given aural texts and exercises and kinesthetic learners are allowed to move through activities like role plays, TPR and learning by doing (Berman, 1998) cited in (Bas, 2008). Spirovska (2013) conducted a study to describe the types of intelligences and how the theory of Mis can be applied in teaching foreign languages. She reminds educators that every individual can develop the eight intelligences. Thus, it is the teachers' job to help students develop the intelligences necessary in any learning situation. Derakhsan, and Freebi (2015) intended to review the effects of MIs on learning English as a foreign language. They pointed out that each multiple intelligence has an impact on a specific skill in language learning. They also mentioned some effects of MIs on teaching in terms of having implications for teachers. Among these are: helping students develop their understanding and appreciation of their own strengths and preferred way of learning, providing greater variety of ways for students to learn and demonstrate, and guiding teachers in preparing lesson plans that address the full range of students' needs, in addition to a better understanding of students intelligences. Saeidi (2009) inspired by the fact that all learners have at least eight intelligences that are proportionally different from one individual to the other, he reported a number of reasons why teachers respond positively to MIs theory. Botelho (2003) analyzed the MIs Theory in English language teaching with regard to texts and materials, in addition to teachers' perceptions of issues related to MIs theory. The study shows that English language teachers use MIs, but activities in books only respond to four intelligences. It is also recommended that more intelligences should be included, and learners' intelligence profiles should be considered.

Surveying the literature about MIs theory shows that it is a breakthrough for curriculum designers, educators and teachers in general and EFL/ESL teaching/learning in particular. It spreads new life in teaching materials and teaching strategies. A teacher who is aware of MIs and the activities they reflect will enjoy teaching because he will definitely see an interactive class free of de-motivation and boredom.

III. METHODOLOGY

To analyze the content of the targeted unit regarding the eight MIs, the researchers first clearly defined these intelligences and then investigated and specified almost every possible type of activity that matches each intelligence. They reached an agreement on the definitions of the eight intelligences and listed the related types of activities under each intelligence. Then they went through the activities in the targeted unit as stated in the course book (Student Book & Workbook), specified the language skill(s) each activity addresses and the type of intelligence it reflects. The results of the analysis were tabulated and analyzed. The occurrences were counted, and the percentages were calculated.

IV. RESULTS

This research article was an attempt to carry out a content analysis of unit two in Unlimited Series/Level Four/Cambridge University Press taught to preparation-year students at King Abdulaziz University in terms of the availability and comprehensiveness of MIs-based activities and language skills. The table below shows an analysis for that unit regarding the eight MIs types and the four language skills.

TABLE 1
MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES AND LANGUAGE SKILLS CONTENT ANALYSIS OF UNIT TWO IN UNLIMITED SERIES/ LEVEL FOUR/ CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Subtitle	Page No.	Activity No. and Title	Skill Addressed	Multiple Intelligence Type(s)
Keeping in touch	14	1- How do you keep in touch with your family and friends?	Speaking	Intrapersonal; Linguistic
		2- Listen to two conversations. What method of communication is each about? What do the people think about it?	Listening and Speaking	Logical; Interpersonal; Linguistic
		3- Listen again. Which sentences are true, and which are false?	Listening	Logical; Intrapersonal; Linguistic
		4- Discuss the questions. Give reasons. (personal questions)	Speaking	Interpersonal; Intrapersonal; Logical; Linguistic
		5- a- Look at some sentences from the conversation. Who says 1-6? b- Look at the highlighted expressions in 5a. Which expressions give: the speaker's opinion/other people's opinion? Which expression says: it's OK to do something/there's no reason to do something?	Listening	Logical; Intrapersonal; Linguistic
		6- a- Look at this sentence. Listen and notice which words are stressed. b- Look at sentences 2-6 in 5a. Mark the words you think are stressed.	Listening	Musical; Linguistic; Logical
		7- a- Write one or two sentences giving your opinions about these statements. You can include other people's opinions too. b- Look at each other's sentences. Talk about them using the expressions in 5a.	Writing and Speaking	Interpersonal; Intrapersonal; Linguistic
It's good to talk	15	1- Use the adjectives to complete the opinions from Graham and Murat's conversation.	Writing	Linguistic; Logical
		2- a- Put the words in order to make sentences. b- Talk together. Do you agree with the sentences in 2a? Why? Why not?	Writing and Speaking	Logical; Interpersonal; Intrapersonal; Linguistic
		3- a- Work alone. Tick (√) the things you think are a waste of time. b- Discuss all the ideas. Try to agree on three things that are a waste of time.	Speaking	Intrapersonal; Interpersonal; Linguistic
Online friendships	16	1- Answer the questions in groups. (Warm-up personal questions for the reading passage)	Speaking	Intrapersonal; Interpersonal; Linguistic
		2- a- Read the title of the article. Why do people use social networking sites? Can these sites be bad for friendships? Why? b- Read the article. Does it mention your ideas?	Reading and Speaking	Logical; Intrapersonal; Linguistic
		3- Read the article again. In Dr. Tyagi's opinion, why might young people: … (4 comprehension questions)	Reading and Speaking	Logical; Intrapersonal; Linguistic
		4- Talk together about the questions. (3 personal questions, why and how)	Speaking	Logical; Intrapersonal; Interpersonal; Linguistic
Speculating	17	1- a- Look at the sentences 1-7 from the article. Which modal verbs mean: - I'm sure about this? - This is a possibility? b- Listen to check and practice saying the sentences.	Listening And Speaking	Linguistic; Logical; Musical
		2- Which highlighted expression(s) A-G in the sentences below can you use: - to emphasize that you are sure? - to say you think there's a good change to something? - to say you think there's only a small chance? - to compare the chances of different things happening?	Speaking	Linguistic; Logical
		3- How likely are these things in the future? Write sentences with these words about: -online relationships/be/important -newspapers and books/disappear -most people/speak/Mandarin -I/contact old friends online -I/get my dream job -I/learn another language	Writing	Intrapersonal; Linguistic
		4- Discuss the ideas in 3 together. Do you have the same ideas?	Speaking	Intrapersonal; Interpersonal; Linguistic

Discuss an issue	18	1- Answer the questions together. (personal questions)	Speaking	Intrapersonal; Interpersonal; Linguistic
		2- Read this extract from an article and discuss the questions. (personal questions)	Reading and Speaking	Intrapersonal; Interpersonal; Linguistic
		3- Listen to Eric and Graham discussing a management decision. Answer the questions. (comprehension questions, why)	Listening	Logical; Intrapersonal; Linguistic
		4- a- Look at the sentences 1-7 from the conversation. Which are arguments for the internet ban? Which are against it? b- Listen to check.	Reading and Listening	Linguistic; Logical
		5- a- Your firm is banning smart phones in the office. Work in A/B groups. A, you are in favor of the ban. B, you are against it. Think of at least three reasons to support your argument. b- Think about the language you need to: -give your opinions -speculate about consequences	Speaking	Interpersonal; Logical; Linguistic
		6- Work in A/B groups. Discuss the issue with your colleagues.	Speaking	Interpersonal; Linguistic
Get it right!	19	1- Read the web postings. Who mentions these topics, Laila, Samira, or both?	Reading	Linguistic; Logical
		2- Complete the list with examples from the postings. We usually use *the* with: -superlatives…etc	Reading and Writing	Linguistic; Logical
		3- Add *the* to the correct place or places in each sentence.	Reading and Writing	Linguistic; Logical
		4- Tick (√) the words that are spelled correctly. Correct the wrong ones. Check your answers in the text.	Reading and Writing	Linguistic; Logical
		5- Write a web posting about a marriage tradition in your country or region.	Writing	Spatial; Linguistic
Explore Speaking	20	1- a- Listen to two conversations Eric has on the same day. Who's he talking to in each conversation? -a colleague -a stranger b- Listen again. What's each conversation about. c- Read conversations 1-2 to check.	Listening and Reading	Logical; Linguistic
		2- a- Which highlighted expressions do the speakers used to: 1- ask for clarification? 2- Clarify what they're saying? b- Add these expressions to group 1 or 2 above. c- Listen to check.	Reading and Speaking	Linguistic; Logical
		3- Practice having the conversations together. Replace some of the expressions in the conversations with expressions from 2b.	Speaking	Logical; Linguistic; Interpersonal
		4- Choose a question and make notes.	Reading	intrapersonal; Linguistic
		5- a- Talk in A/B pairs. -A, give your opinion about one of the questions in 4. -B, listen and ask for clarification. - A, clarify what you are saying. b- Then change roles and talk about another topic. c- Change pairs and have more conversations.	Speaking and Listening	Interpersonal; Intrapersonal; Linguistic; Bodily
Look Again	21	1- a- Make sentences about your family and friends. b- Talk about all the sentences together. Do you agree? Why? Why not?	Writing and Speaking	Interpersonal; Intrapersonal; Logical; Linguistic
		2- a- What do you think your country will be like in 10, 20 or 50 years? b- Compare your ideas.	Writing and Speaking	Naturalist; Linguistic; Interpersonal
		3- a- Listen and *underline* the letters in these words which make a /tʃ/ sound. b- In pairs, answer the questions. (about the use of *ch* and *tch* sound) c- Spellcheck. Close your book. Listen and write ten words. Then check your spelling on p 147.	Listening and Speaking	Logical; Musical; Interpersonal; Linguistic
		4- a- Complete the adjective-noun collocations from texts in the unit with these words. b- Match up the adjectives and nouns. Then write five questions to ask a partner using the collocations.	Writing	Linguistic; Logical

Workbook	9-12	1- Read the email and complete the expressions in bold in the conversation between two colleagues using the words in the box.	Reading and Writing	Linguistic; Logical
		2- Complete the people's opinions using the phrases in the box.	Writing	Linguistic; Logical
		3- Complete the questions. The same verb is used in each group of questions.	Writing	Linguistic; Logical
		4- Rewrite the underlined parts of the sentences using the modal verb in brackets.	Writing	Linguistic; Logical
		5- Read the website tips for good non-verbal communication and complete them using the phrases in the box.	Reading and Writing	Linguistic; Logical
		6- Use some of the expressions in the box to say how likely you are to do these things in the next 3-5 years.	Speaking and Writing	Linguistic; Intrapersonal
		7- Do the quiz. Choose the correct answers. How much do you know about "animal talk"?	Reading	Logical; Linguistic; Intrapersonal
		8- Read the instructions in a website article. How do you think we can make a good impression when we introduce ourselves online?	Reading and Speaking	Intrapersonal; Linguistic
		9- Match the headings (1-6) with the advice (a-f).	Reading	Linguistic; Logical
		10- Read this profile sent to a website for people learning and using English. How far has Mette followed the advice?	Reading and Speaking	Linguistic; Intrapersonal
		11- Write your self-description for the ESL website. Remember the first tip and don't write more than 200 words.	Writing	Intrapersonal; Linguistic

Table (1) above shows the subtitles, page numbers of 49 activities as stated in unit two in Unlimited Series/Level Four/Cambridge University Press. The other two columns displayed the language skill(s) addressed and the MIs type integrated. As shown in the table some activities integrated two skills (22 activities) and others covered only one skill (27 activities). As for the MIs integrated, the linguistic intelligence appeared in all activities. At least one or two types appeared side by side with the linguistic intelligence. And in five cases three intelligences accompanied the linguistic intelligence. In conclusion, 25 activities addressed two intelligences, 19 addressed three and 5 addressed 4.

To answer the first question of the study with regard to the weight given to language skills, the number of occurrences for each skill out of the total number (71) was counted and the percentages were calculated as shown in table 2 below.

TABLE 2
LANGUAGE SKILLS OCCURRENCES AND PERCENTAGES

Language Skill Type	No. of Occurrences	Percentage
Listening	10	14.1 %
Speaking	26	36.6%
Reading	17	23.9%
Writing	18	25.4 %
Total	**71**	**100%**

As shown in table 2 above, regarding the language skills occurrences, it was obvious that the heaviest weight was given to the speaking skill (26 occurrences, 36.6%) and this was at the expense of the listening skill (10 occurrences, 14.1%). The writing and reading skills were given almost equal weights, about 25% each.

To answer the second question of the study, which was about the weight given to multiple intelligences, the number of occurrences for each intelligence out of the total number (129) was counted and the percentages were calculated as shown in table 3 below.

TABLE 3
MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES AND PERCENTAGES

Multiple Intelligence Type	No. of Occurrences	Percentage
Linguistic Intelligence	49	38.3 %
Logical Intelligence	33	25 %
Interpersonal Intelligence	17	13.3 %
Intrapersonal Intelligence	24	18.8 %
Naturalist Intelligence	1	0.78 %
Musical Intelligence	3	2.3 %
Bodily Kinesthetic Intelligence	1	0.78 %
Spatial Intelligence	1	0.78 %
Total	**129**	**100%**

As shown in table 3 above, concerning the multiple intelligences occurrences, the heaviest weight was given to the linguistic intelligence (49 occurrences, 38.3%). The logical, intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences had relatively

heavy weights (33, 24 and 17 occurrences, 25%, 18.8% and 13.3%), respectively. The other four intelligences took very light weights.

To answer the third question of the study, which was about the weight given to each multiple intelligence in each language skill, the number of occurrences for each intelligence in each skill out of the total number (151) was counted and the percentages were calculated as shown in table 3 below.

TABLE 4
MULTIPLE INTELLIGECES FREQUENCY IN LANGUAGE SKILLS

Intelligence Type / Language Skill	Multiple Intelligences Frequency								Total & %
	Linguistic	Logical	Interpersonal	Intrapersonal	Naturalist	Musical	Bodily	Spatial	
Listening	10	7	0	3	0	2	0	0	22 14.5%
Speaking	26	8	16	13	0	1	1	0	65 43%
Reading	17	8	1	3	0	0	0	0	29 19.2%
Writing	18	10	0	5	1	0	0	1	35 23.3%
Total &Percentage	71 47.02%	33 21.85%	17 11.26%	24 15.9%	1 0.66%	3 1.99%	1 0.66%	1 0.66%	151 100%

It is worth noticing that there were 22 activities which included two language skills as appeared in table 1. The linguistic intelligence occurred in both skills of these 22 activities and this explained why there was a difference of 22 between the total number of skills occurrences (71) in table 2 and the number of linguistic intelligence occurrences (49) in table 3.

As shown in the table above the speaking skill was given the heaviest weight of multiple intelligences (65 occurrences, 43%). It was about twice as heavy as the weight given to the writing skill (35 occurrences, 23.3%). The lightest weights were given to the listening and reading skills (22 and 29 occurrences, 14.5% and 19.2%), respectively.

V. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

The theory of multiple intelligences emerged towards the end of the twentieth century in order to deal with the fact that students have different learning styles. Educators and curriculum designers respond to this by providing enough variety in the activities so that they can meet their students potential (Bermam, 1998) cited in (Bas, 2008). The variety of activities not only helps students understand, but also develops a cooperative atmosphere in the classroom, get rid of fear and embarrassment and get more motivation and interest (Scott and Ytrebeg, 1990) cited in (Bas, 2008). The theory of multiple intelligences has a number of educational implications (Armstrong, 1994). Each person has all eight intelligences with varying levels, intelligences can be enhanced with instruction and development, interact together and don't exist by themselves.

The assumptions above imply that teachers should expand their techniques and strategies beyond the typical linguistic and logical ones used in the classroom (Cambell, 1997). The eight intelligences put together and reflected in attractive learning experiences and applied to lesson planning and curriculum development are expected to solve problems like motivation and lack of interest. They help us understand the diversity in students and work as a springboard for addressing these differences while teaching (Christon,1998) cited in (Tawalbeh, 2016). Teachers should try to reach their students learning styles in order to cater for individual differences. This can be easily achieved through paying attention to MIs where teachers can take advantage of games, stories, music, images, role plays to add more interest and motivation and enhance students' performance (Maftoon and Sarem, 2012) cited in (Tawaleh, 2016).

In this study the researchers aimed at analyzing an EFL unit from Unlimited Series/Level Four/Unit Two/Cambridge University Press in order to investigate to what extent the authors have integrated the multiple intelligences throughout the activities in the unit. To do this they find it appropriate to analyze the unit in terms of using the four English language skills, and the availability of MIs in general and per skill.

The answer to question one concerning the number of activities reflecting the four English language skills shows that speaking got the biggest weight in the unit (26 activities) which represents 36% of the activities in the unit as shown in table (2) above. Then reading and writing came second in terms of their weight 17 and 18 activities, respectively. Listening was given the least weight 10 out of 71 activities. As this is a general English course it is expected that the four skills should be given equal weights (25% for each). The authors of the book might have given freedom for the teachers to add environment and culture-based activities as this book is mainly used outside Britain in the Middle East and the Gulf States in addition to some other countries.

With regard to the MIs used in the unit, which is the main goal of the research, the authors did their best to include as many multiple intelligences as they found appropriate. Linguistic, logical, interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences were apparently the luckiest as shown in table (1) above (49, 33, 17 and 24), respectively. This refers to the nature of

the unit taken from a general English language course where these intelligences can serve major objectives of the course book. Even though, a good unit is the one that meets most of if not all the students learning styles. According to Gardner, each person is unique and has a mixture of intelligences. People differ in the strengths and combinations of intelligences which can be improved through training and practice (Lei, 2004). Curriculum designers and teachers should respond to this by providing a variety of activities that match students' preferences. To be fair to the authors, they might have compensated the poorly included intelligences in the teacher's guide where they usually recommend certain tips and teaching strategies like TPR, drawing, miming, acting, role plays and field trips. Such activities can cater for the kinesthetic, musical, spatial and naturalist intelligences.

What applies to question one of the study also applies to question two in terms of the occurrences of MIs in the four English language skills. Linguistic intelligence occurred in the four skills with noticeable occurrence in speaking and less frequency in listening. Logical intelligence has fair distribution in all skills whereas speaking had the most occurrence of interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences as speaking usually involves two or more people and needs thinking and preparation in order to make fruitful talks. Naturalist, musical, kinesthetic and spatial intelligences almost disappeared in the four language skills. The absence of these intelligences may have negative effect on the students in two aspects. First, some students' learning styles may not be taken into consideration. Consequently, students will feel excluded unless their teachers pay attention to their lack of interest and respond to their individual needs. Second, all the activities that reflect the missing intelligences like video shows, illustrating, puzzles, games, role plays, drama, singing, dancing, outdoor activities, classifying, picnics, etc. will not be included in the syllabus (Lei, 2004). The result is fewer interesting materials that de-motivate students and affect their performance.

VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Upon surveying the literature about using MIs in the teaching/learning process in general and in EFL classroom in particular, it becomes clear that using multiple intelligences not only help teachers meet their students learning styles, but also provide a variety of activities that add interest and motivation to the classroom. EFL teachers are expected to respond to this by updating themselves with the right mechanism to discover students' MIs. In addition, they should be aware of the activities that reflect each MI (Christison, 1998). Learning vocabulary items and using them in meaningful context which reflect linguistic intelligence is considered invaluable in reading and writing skills. Learning by doing which is the core of kinesthetic intelligence is a very important teaching strategy in the EFL classroom. Pair work and group work that reflect interpersonal intelligence are the teachers' tool for promoting speaking skills (Morgan & Fonesca, 2004). On the one hand it is recommended that curriculum designers include a variety of activities that reflect a fair distribution of MIs in the four English language skills. On the other hand, teachers should attend workshops and training sessions to familiarize themselves with these activities and make sure that every student's interests and intelligences in the class are taken into consideration.

REFERENCES

[1]   Bas, G. (2008). Implementation of Multiple Intelligences Supported Project-Based Learning in EFL/ESL Classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal,* 14.5, 1-5.
[2]   Campbell, L. (1997). Variations on a Theme: How Teachers Interpret MI Theory. Educational Leadership, 55.1. [Online] Available: http://www.ascd.org/pubs/el/sept97/campbell.html. Retrieved May. 20, 2019.
[3]   Christison, M. A. (1996). Teaching and Learning through Multiple Intelligences. *TESOL Journal,* 46.9, 10-14.
[4]   Derakhshan, A. & Faribi, M. (2015). Multiple Intelligences: Language Learning and Teaching, *International Journal of English Linguistics,* 5.4, 63-72.
[5]   Morgan, J. & Fonseca, M. (2004). Multiple Intelligence Theory and Foreign Language Learning. *IJES,* 4.1, 119-136.
[6]   Saeidi, M. (2009). The Implementation of Multiple Intelligences Theory in the Classroom: Different Ways of Learning and Teaching, *Journal of Teaching English as a Foreign Language and Literature,*1.1, 103-116.
[7]   Spirovska, E. (2013). Integrating Multiple Intelligences in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. *The Journal of South East*, 9.1, 1-12.
[8]   Tawalbeh, T. (2016). Investigating EFL Learners' Multiple Intelligences in the Preparatory Year at Taif University. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies,* 6.7, 1347-1356.
[9]   Armstrong, T. (2008). Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom. California: Alexandria.
[10] Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences. New York: Basic Books.
[11] Gardner, H. (1993). Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice. New York: Basic Books.
[12] Lei,   S.   (2004).   Applying   Multiple   Intelligences   Theory   in   Undergraduate   Classroom.   [Online] Available:https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org. Retrieved April. 12, 2019.
[13] Botelho, M. R. (2003). Multiple Intelligences Theory in English Language Teaching. An Analysis of Current Textbooks, Materials and Teachers' Perceptions. MA Thesis, College of Art and Sciences: Ohio University.
[14] Chen, S. (2005). Cooperative Learning, Multiple Intelligences and Proficiency: Application in College English Language Teaching and Learning. PhD Dissertation, Faculty of Education: Trescowthick School of Education.

Salameh S. Mahmoud was born in Palestine, got BA in General English from Nablus/Palestine, high diploma, MA and PhD in Curriculum and Instruction from Amman/Jordan. All his experience is in teaching and coordination at public and private schools in Jordan. In 2005 he moved to KSA as a language instructor in King Abdulaziz Uni. in Jeddah/KSA. During this period, he participated in many committees in addition to teaching. Concerning publishing, in the last four years, he has already published five articles, and this is his sixth and currently working on the seventh. Finally, Dr Mahmoud has given many workshops and seminars about teaching methods in Jordan and in KSA. ESP has been one of the author's concerns; he has already finished a book "English for Art and Design" which is now used in a big college in Jeddah.

Mamoon M. Alaraj was born in Irbid, Jordan, in 1966. He is a PhD holder in curricula and methods of instruction/English language, graduated from Amman Arab University for Graduate Studies, Amman, Jordan, in 2005. He got his master's degree in the same field of study from Yarmouk University in Irbid, Jordan in 1997. And from the same university he got his BA in English Language and Literature in 1992. He has been teaching English as a Foreign Language for more than 26 years. Now he is an associate professor at King Abdulaziz University (KAU) where he teaches English for Specific Purposes to engineering students. In Jeddah, KAU, in 2012 he published his first research study titled "Vocabulary Acquisition: Connecting Learning to Real Life Situations" at the Journal of KAU: Arts and Humanities. This study "Integrating Multiple Intelligences in the EFL Syllabus: Content Analysis" is his seventh study. His research interests are language learning difficulties and strategies and vocabulary acquisition.