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ABSTRACT
This study sought to investigate: a) the relationships between the Yemeni EFL students’ linguistic intelligence and their affixation awareness, b) to what extent the students are aware of the analytic and synthetic word formation rules, c) to what extent the students’ affixation awareness differs according to gender, and d) to what extent the students’ linguistic intelligence differs according to gender. The participants of this study were one hundred and three student teachers. They were fourth-year student teachers enrolled at the Bachelor in Education program at the University of Sana’a in Yemen in the academic year 2014 /2015. To answer the questions of this study, it was necessary to collect two types of data: data related to the participants’ linguistic intelligence and data related to their affixation awareness. Data were collected via two instruments: a questionnaire and a test. The results of the study indicate that a relationship exists between the students’ linguistic intelligence and their affixation awareness. Moreover, the results of the study show that there is no difference between the students’ affixation awareness and their gender. However, there exists a relationship between the students’ linguistic intelligence and their gender in favor of the male students over their female counterparts.
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INTRODUCTION
Several research studies have focused on the individual differences among second and foreign language learners and their relationships to language performance. The language learners’ skills and abilities such as their vocabulary knowledge, their speed in reading comprehension or writing are assumed to be related to their linguistic intelligence. Several researchers have suggested different views and scales for measuring the concept of intelligences.

Gardner’s (1983) theory of Multiple Intelligences is based on the concept of “intelligence”. In Gardner's point of view, intelligence is a combination of different abilities. His theory states that all human beings have a combination of nine types of intelligences which work together to make them different and unique people, (Hajhashemi et al., 2012, Koura and Al-Hebaishi, 2014). Accordingly, Gardener classified human intelligence into linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, naturalistic and existential intelligence.

Accordingly, the inception of Gardner’s (1983) Multiple Intelligence theory resulted in several research studies in second and foreign language research (Ahmadian and Hosseini, 2012; Purnamasari, 2013; Birta et al. (2014); Koura and Al-Hebaishi, 2014). The emergence of Linguistic Intelligence also motivated researchers to realize its role in the development of language abilities and skills such as the speed in reading comprehension, the speed and quality of writing and vocabulary knowledge. The
main objective of the present study is to investigate the relationship between the students’ linguistic intelligence and their affixation awareness.

Linguistic Intelligence

Linguistic Intelligence is one domain of those nine domains that the learners employ to express themselves (Mohammadi and Mousalou, 2012). It is also called the intelligence of words or verbal intelligence. Furthermore, Azarmi et al. (2012) point out that the linguistic intelligence enables people to use the words of language effectively in their oral and written forms. In other words, those with linguistic intelligence are able to master the language and pay special attention to vocabulary and grammar. They have the ability to think in words, analyze language and understand clearly what other people mean when using words. Furthermore, they have the ability to memorize and retell stories (Purnamasari, 2013). They enjoy and learn best by reading, taking notes and going to lectures (Varghese, 2013; Purnamasari, 2013). Poets, public speakers, writers and lawyers possess high levels of Linguistic Intelligence, Skourdi et al. (2012).

Due to the important role of linguistic intelligence in foreign and second language learning, a number of research studies were conducted to highlight the importance of linguistic intelligence in language learning.

Within the EFL pedagogical context, the reading comprehension component has been investigated in relation to the linguistic intelligence. Purnamasari (2013) studied the relationship between the linguistic intelligence and the reading ability of the first grade of SMA Islam Yakin Tutur Pasuruan. Her sample were 37 students and she collected her data through a reading test and questionnaires. The researcher concluded that there was a positive correlation between the linguistic intelligence and the reading ability of the students. She concluded that the alternative hypothesis which says that there is a correlation between the linguistic intelligence and the reading ability of the students is accepted and the correlation of the two variables is significant.

In another study, Rahimi et al. (2011) explored the effect of linguistic intelligence and emotional intelligence on the reading comprehension ability of 135 senior English majors in an Iranian university. The data were collected through two questionnaires and a reading test. Their results indicated that the linguistic intelligence influenced the reading comprehension performance of Iranian EFL learners and was a relatively strong predictor of this skill. Their results also showed that the emotional intelligence does not have any impact on the students’ reading performance.

Ahmadian and Hosseini (2012) studied the relationship between the students’ linguistic intelligence and their writing ability. Their subjects were 33 female EFL learners. To collect their data, they used the Multiple Intelligence Developmental Assessment Scales designed by Shearer (1996), and the participants’ average scores on two writing tasks. Their results showed a significant relationship between the students' linguistic intelligence and their performance on writing. They also claimed that vocabulary showed higher correlation with linguistic intelligence.

Focusing on the relevance of linguistic and emotional intelligences to vocabulary learning, Skourdi and Rahimi (2010) investigated the relationship between linguistic intelligence, emotional intelligence and vocabulary learning of 103 junior university students studying in three fields of language learning: English Language Teaching, English Language Translation, and English Language Literature. The participants were chosen from Shiraz Azad University and Shiraz State University in Iran. The findings indicated that there is a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and linguistic intelligence, between emotional intelligence and Vocabulary Knowledge and between linguistic intelligence and Vocabulary Knowledge. Emotional intelligence was found to be a potential predictor for linguistic intelligence and vice versa. Furthermore, multiple regressions showed that linguistic intelligence is a better predictor of receptive vocabulary knowledge than emotional intelligence.
In another study, Zahedi and Fallah (2011) studied the relationship between vocabulary knowledge, linguistic intelligence and affixation awareness among EFL learners and recommended that educational programs should be planned in order to enhance EFL learners’ linguistic intelligence.

The vocabulary learning process has also been considered as one of the most significant aspects that need to be investigated regarding the application of Multiple of Intelligence theory. Biria et al. (2014) explored the relationship between multiple intelligences and male and female Iranian EFL learners’ level of vocabulary knowledge. The results of their study showed that there was a very small positive correlation between the participants’ multiple intelligences scores and their vocabulary knowledge, which was not statistically significant. Furthermore, they concluded that the linguistic intelligence was a better predictor of students’ vocabulary knowledge.

Another interesting topic for researchers is to investigate the relationship that exists between the students’ linguistic intelligence and their affixation awareness. Despite the importance of the topic, however, to the best knowledge of the researcher, there is no study that has been conducted so far on the relationship between the linguistic intelligence and the affixation awareness among Arab EFL learners.

**Affixation Awareness**

Affixation is one of the main ways of enriching the vocabulary of the English language. In fact, it is one of the most productive ways of word building in the English language. Its main function is to form one part of speech from another. Another function is to change the lexical meaning of the same part of speech.

Affixation awareness refers to the students’ knowledge of morphemes and their structure, allowing them to reflect and manipulate morphological structure of words (Yahya et al., 2012). It enables learners to learn morphemes and morphemic boundaries by disassembling complex words into meaningful parts (e.g. childhoods = child + -hood + -s), learning the meanings of roots, affixes (child= baby, -hood= the state of being, -s= to indicate plural nouns), and reassembling the meaningful parts into new meanings (motherhood, fatherhood, brotherhood). The practice of this dissembling-reassembling method is called morphological analysis (Kuo and Anderson, 2006; Yahya et al., 2012). Furthermore, Chang et al. (2005) state that affixation awareness refers to the ability to distinguish and manipulate the structures of morphemes, the smallest meaning bearing units in language (e.g., ir and regular in irregular), and includes knowledge of inflectional and derivational morphemes. Some research studies have reported that awareness of inflectional forms is gained earlier than awareness of derivational forms (Al Farsi, 2008; Yahya et al., 2012).

Affixation awareness is used in this study to refer to the learners’ knowledge of morphemes that enables them to recover the meaning of new words by means of morpheme identification or decomposition (analysis) and to recombine morphemes to construct new meanings by means of morphological structure (synthesis). Therefore, in this study, two main aspects of affixation awareness will be investigated: analytic and synthetic word formation. Analytic words formation refers to breaking words down into their meaningful components. On the other hand, synthetic word formation refers to bringing the morphemes together to form words (Yahya et al., 2012).

Little research to date has focused on the linguistic intelligence and its relationship to affixation awareness. The only study to the best knowledge of the researcher is Zahed and Fallah (2011) who studied the relationship between vocabulary knowledge, linguistic intelligence and affixation awareness among Iranian EFL learners.

**Gender Differences in Relation to Linguistic Intelligence**

The common belief is that female students often have higher ability than males in language and arts, while male students have higher ability than females in mathematics and science. Biria et al. (2014) explored the relationship that exists between the multiple intelligences and male and female Iranian EFL learners’ level of vocabulary knowledge. Their subjects were 24 male and 64 female
undergraduate students majoring in translation at Islamic Azad University in Iran. Their findings revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the genders. That is the male students showed superiority over the females in their performances on the vocabulary level test.

Hanafiyeh (2013) explored the relationship between students’ gender and intelligence types. Her subjects were 140 students from Islamic Azad University in Iran. She asked her subjects to fill in the Multiple Intelligences Inventory for Adults. Her results revealed that differences between gender and the intelligence types of the participants were not statistically significance except the difference between gender and linguistic intelligence which was positive.

To sum up, the previous research studies on gender differences indicate that gender can have an impact on the students’ academic achievement. These studies claim that female students often have higher ability than males in language and arts while male students have higher ability than females in mathematics and science.

THE STUDY
To the best knowledge of the researcher, there is no study that has been conducted so far on linguistic intelligence and its relationship with affixation awareness among Arab EFL learners. Therefore, this research study reports some findings related to some aspects of the Yemeni EFL students’ linguistic intelligence and its relationship to their affixation awareness, using a word segmentation task and a synthesis task.

AIMS OF THE STUDY
This study aims to:

1. Understand the relationships, if any, between students’ Linguistics Intelligence and their affixation awareness.
2. Highlight the students' analytic and synthetic awareness of word formation rules.
3. Investigate whether the student teachers’ affixation awareness and their linguistic intelligences differ according to their gender.

QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY
The present study will try to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship, if any, between the Yemeni EFL students’ linguistic intelligence and their affixation awareness?
2. To what extent are the students aware of the analytic and synthetic word formation rules?
3. To what extent, if any, does students’ affixation awareness differ according to gender?
4. To what extent, if any, does students’ linguistic intelligence differ according to gender?

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY
The scope of the present study is limited in terms of the following aspects. It measures the linguistic intelligence as expressed in response to the 20 items of the questionnaire and its relationship to the affixation awareness using a word segmentation task and a synthesis task. Furthermore, the population of this study is limited to the Fourth Grade student teachers in the Department of English at the Faculty of Education at Sana’a University in Yemen during the first semester of the academic year 2014-2015. The participants were not chosen randomly, and therefore, caution should be taken in making generalizations from the results to other contexts.
METHODOLOGY

Participants

The participants of this study were one hundred and three student teachers. They were fourth-year student teachers enrolled at the Bachelor in Education program at the University of Sana’a in Yemen in the academic year 2014/2015.

The participants in this study were three groups of students in the fourth year of the Department of English at the Faculty of Education at Sana’a University in Yemen. There were about 35 students in each group. A total of 103 students participated in the study.

Out of the (103) participants of the study, 20 (19.4%) were male students and 83 (80.6 %) were female students with the average age of 22.43.

The participants of this study are homogenous in terms of language proficiency.

All the participants are enrolled in a four year degree program course and have studied in the university for over three and a half years. They have studied three linguistic courses that involve affixation awareness. In their second year, they took two Introduction to Language courses and in their third year, they took one Morphology and Syntax course. Therefore, it was assumed that the participants should enjoy some affixation awareness. Furthermore, they studied English for about six years prior to their joining Sana’a University.

Instruments

To answer the questions of this study, it was necessary to collect two types of data: data related to the participants’ linguistic intelligence and data related to their morphological awareness. Therefore, a test and a questionnaire were used.

Linguistic Intelligence Questionnaire

The questionnaire of this study was developed by reviewing several existing instruments. Shearer’s (1996) Multiple Intelligence Developmental Assessment Scale (MIDA) is a case in point. Other relevant instruments were used as sources of inspiration for the researcher to construct the instrument.

The Linguistic Intelligence questionnaire consisted of 20 items that deal with different aspects of the linguistic intelligence. The questionnaire utilized a Likert scale format with response categories of: strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree. For the sake of clarity and avoidance of misunderstanding, the researcher translated the items of the questionnaire into the learners’ mother tongue, Arabic. These items were meant to obtain data regarding the participants’ abilities, skills, interests and activities related to their Linguistic Intelligence. The participants were requested to respond to statements that aim to measure their own linguistic intelligence, based on a five point Likert scale ranging from (strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree or strongly disagree). The scores for each item ranged from 1 to 5. The following is an example of the items of the questionnaire: “It is easy for me to remember names”

Affixation Awareness Test: The affixation awareness test is adapted from Change et al. (2005). Some modifications are made by the researcher. The test is divided into two sections: the Morpheme Identification Test and the Morphological Structure Test.

Morpheme Identification Test: This test measures the student’s skill in segmentation of English words into meaningful morphemes. However, some modifications were made to the test. The original version of Change et al. (2005) is composed of 14 items and the total score is 33 whereas in this study it consists of 10 items and the total score is 27 points representing the maximum number of possible morphemes in the test items. In total this test contains 11 roots, 13 derivational affixes and 3 inflectional affixes. This section aims to test the students’ ability to segment a set of 10 complex words out of context into their smaller components (morphemes). The following example was
provided to guide the students: Example: Childhoods: child= little human being, -hood= the state of being, -s = to indicate plural.

**Morphological Structure Test:** The Morphological Structure Test measures the students’ morphological productivity which is the ability to synthesize morphemes to create new meanings. It tests the students’ ability to create literal compounds, inflected and derived words. It consists of 10 items that include 13 roots, 4 derivational affixes and 8 inflectional affixes and the total score of the test is 25 points with one point for each correct morpheme. The students are given a frame sentence that contains the usage of the target morpheme and then asked to complete another sentence. Below are the instructions presented in English and one sample item: Using only one word, come up with names for the objects or actions that are described below, as in the example. Example: Ahmed lived longer than Ali. Ahmed outlived Ali. Fatima performed better than Arwa in the test. Fatima …………….. Arwa.

**Instrument Validity and Reliability**

For validity purposes, the researcher translated the English version into Arabic. Then he translated the Arabic version back into English and made the necessary changes. After that the final version was given to some experts in translation to check the construct validity of the instrument. Reliability refers to the consistency of the results obtained from a research study. Therefore, in order to know that the data obtained for answering the research questions were interpretable, it was necessary to obtain a reliability score for the instrument of this study. The test reliability for the instrument was assessed using Cronbach’s Alpha. The reliability of the total test, containing 20 items was 0.76 which indicates high reliability.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

The collected data of the linguistic intelligence questionnaires and the tests of the affixation awareness were coded using SPSS. To analyze the data, the means, standard deviations and One-Way ANOVA were used in this study. To check the correlation, Pearson correlation coefficient was run.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The present study investigated the relationship between affixation awareness and linguistic intelligence among Yemeni EFL student teachers. Four research questions were raised for examination at the beginning of this study. Therefore, the results of the analysis of the items of the linguistic intelligence questionnaire and the items of the affixation awareness test were used to answer the research questions of this study as outlined below.

**Answering the First Research Question**

The first research question asks if there is any significant relationship between the Yemeni EFL students’ affixation awareness and their linguistic intelligence. Therefore, a Pearson correlation was run to investigate any significant relationship between the students’ affixation awareness and their linguistic intelligence. The results show that there is a significant relationship between the dependent variable which is the affixation awareness and the independent variable which is the linguistic intelligence. Table (1) below displays the results of Pearson Correlation between the two variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Person Correlation between the Affixation Awareness and Linguistic Intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affixation Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affixation Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Table (1) above, the Person Correlation between the affixation awareness and the linguistic intelligence of the student teachers at Sana’a University is 0.209 which is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Consequently, it can be concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship between the Yemeni students’ linguistic intelligence and their affixation awareness. As such, the first research question has been answered.

**Answering the Second Research Question**

The second research question aimed at investigating to what extent the students are aware of the analytic and synthetic word formation rules. This question is answered on the basis of the students’ performance on the Affixation Awareness Test with two subsets of Morpheme Identification (Analysis Section) and Morphological Structure (Synthesis Section). Table (2) below presents the means, standard deviations and percentages of the students’ scores in the Morpheme Identification section and the Morphological Structure section.

**Table 2. Mean Standard Deviation and Percentages of the Students’ Scores of the Analytic and Synthetic Aspects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytic Aspect</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>76.28 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Aspect</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>20.62</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>76.37 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Affixation Awareness</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>76.33 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (2) shows that the average score of the Synthetic Aspect of affixation awareness is higher among the student teachers (M = 20.62, SD = 5.06) compared to the Morpheme Identification section (The Analytic Aspect) (M = 19.07, SD = 4.40). The student teachers score better in the Synthetic Aspect Test (76.37 %) than they do in the Analytic Aspect Test (76.28 %). The Table also shows that the Overall Affixation Awareness among the student teachers is 76.33 %.

**Answering the Third Research Question**

The third research question asks to what extent the students’ affixation awareness differs according to gender. Considering the third research question, the One Way ANOVA was used to estimate the assumed relationship that exists between the students’ affixation awareness and their genders. The results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) are displayed in Table (3) below.

**Table 3. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytic</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>20.62</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By looking at Table (3) above, it becomes clear that the average mean of the male students on the Analytic aspect of the affixation awareness was 19.10 while the average mean of their female counterparts was 19.07. The mean scores of the male student teachers and the females were compared using an F- test. This analysis resulted in an F- score of 0.001 (P< 0.980). This means that the difference between the two samples was not statistically significant at P < 0.05. Similarly, the average mean of the male students on the Synthetic aspect of the affixation awareness was 20.45 while the...
average mean of their female counterparts was 20.66. Thus, the analysis resulted in an F value of 0.028 ($P < 0.867$). This means that the difference between the male and female student teachers was not statistically significant at the $P < 0.05$. These results imply that the male and female students’ performance on the affixation awareness was more or less the same. Accordingly, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Answering the Fourth Research Question**

Finally, the fourth research question asks to what extent the students’ linguistic intelligence differs according to gender. In other words, the last question sought to explain the possible difference between male and female students in terms of their Linguistic intelligence scores. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was run to statistically examine the intended difference. The results of the analysis are displayed in Table (4) below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. One Way ANOVA between Linguistic Intelligence and Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic Intelligence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table (4), the results indicate that the male students’ scores in the Linguistic Intelligence questionnaire were statistically significant. The average mean of the male students’ Linguistic Intelligence scores was 73.05 while that of their female counterparts was 65.49. The F value was 9.53 and the P value was 0.003. This indicates that the difference between the two samples was statistically significant at $P < 0.05$. The results clearly demonstrate that the male students scored higher on the linguistic intelligence factor than the female students. Accordingly, the null hypothesis is rejected.

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

Through the analysis of the subjects’ responses to the statements of the instruments and based on the answers to the research questions of the present study, the findings of this study can be summarized as follows:

1. The results of this study show that there is a positive relationship between the student teachers’ linguistic intelligence and their affixation awareness. That is the student teachers’ linguistic intelligence can be a predictor of their affixation awareness.

2. The results reveal that the student teachers displayed a good overall affixation awareness of word formation rules: morpheme identification (the analytic aspects) and the morphological structure (the synthetic aspects). They performed better in the synthetic section than in the analytic one. Therefore, the availability of affixation awareness among the Yemeni EFL student teachers is good. The mean score of the overall affixation awareness is (39.69) which represents (76.33 %). This level can be interpreted as a good standard.

3. The results of the current study also report that there is no statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05 between the students’ affixation awareness and their gender.

4. The results of the study show that there was a statistically significant difference between the students’ linguistic intelligence and their gender. That is the male students scored higher on the linguistic intelligence questionnaire than their female counterparts.

5. The present study is limited to the Yemeni teacher preparation program at Sana’a (State) University which is preparing future EFL teachers for preparatory and secondary schools. The student teachers are not chosen randomly, and therefore, caution should be taken in making generalizations from the results to other contexts.
The findings of the present study merit replication and, if confirmed in larger samples, have implications for the people concerned in Yemeni TEFL, and more specifically for teacher-training programs. In other words, since the present study was based on data collected from the student teachers of only one state university in Yemen, generalizing the results of the study is limited. Therefore, a similar study with a large sample size from different universities in Yemen including the private ones should be replicated using both qualitative and quantitative methods in order to ascertain whether the results are consistent among different samples of students. The findings of such a study will be useful for both EFL student teachers and their trainers in Yemeni universities who are responsible for providing effective English training for their students.

In conclusion, the findings of the present study suggest some future research directions. It would be a good idea to survey a larger sample of student teachers and to expand the scope of the study to other private universities in Yemen. Furthermore, future studies should include the practical factors affecting affixation awareness and its relationship to the overall language proficiency. Future research studies should examine the relationship between the linguistic intelligence and the academic achievement.
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