



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

***INTEGRATION OF MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES THEORY BY
FORM FOUR ESL SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS
IN MALAYSIA***

SENAM KAUR D/O SARJIT SINGH

FPP 2015 48



**INTEGRATION OF MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES THEORY BY
FORM FOUR ESL SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS
IN MALAYSIA**

By

SENAM KAUR D/O SARJIT SINGH

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,
in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

October 2015

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



DEDICATION

Daddy, this was your dream, and the rest too, Mum, Kiren, Gurmeet, Manmant, Harvinder, Ravinder, Vickermajeet, Elizabeth, Maria, Annabelle, Simran, Anmol and Darshan



© COPYRIGHT UPM

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**INTEGRATION OF MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES THEORY BY
FORM FOUR ESL SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN MALAYSIA**

By

SENAM KAUR D/O SARJIT SINGH

October 2015

Chair : Arshad B. Abdul Samad, PhD
Faculty : Educational Studies

The Multiple Intelligences theory is stipulated in the Curriculum Specification of the New Integrated Secondary School Curriculum as it advocates personalized learning because it takes into consideration the varying human intelligences and all the combinations of intelligences. Hence, by having lessons that catered to the students' differing combinations and levels of intelligences, teachers will be able to reach individual students and help them hone their dominant intelligences and at the same time strengthen the weaker intelligences.

The purpose of the study was to explore and describe the integration of the Multiple Intelligences theory by Form Four ESL Secondary School teachers. The study was guided by three research questions: (1) Is the Multiple Intelligences theory reflected in the teachers' English as a Second Language lessons? (2) What are the most frequently used intelligences in the English as a Second Language classroom? (3) What are the challenges of integrating the Multiple Intelligences theory in the English as a Second Language classroom? Three Form Four ESL teachers were purposefully selected to participate in this study. The participants were trained secondary school teachers teaching in a day school in Cameron Highlands, Pahang. The study employed a qualitative methodology and the data were collected through a Multiple Intelligences Checklist, interviews and classroom observations to obtain the teachers' perceptions, experiences and practices related to the study. 5 principles derived from the literature review were used as a guide to explore the integration of the Multiple Intelligences theory in these teachers' classrooms. They were (1) recognizing the multiple intelligences in teachers and students, (2) integrating multiple intelligences in the lesson, (3) providing opportunities to use multiple intelligences, (4) assessments that enable students to use their multiple intelligences to portray their understanding of the lesson instead of the paper-and-pencil test, (5) encourage apprenticeship to enable students to master a valued skill gradually under the tutelage of a professional.

The study revealed that (1) two of the teachers recognized their students' multiple intelligences aptly, (2) students' multiple intelligences were engaged especially during the set-induction but the verbal-linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligences were dominantly used during the while and post-learning stage as the teachers were bound to the text book, (3) only one teacher provided her students opportunities to use their multiple intelligences for student projects, (4) drama was used as a multiple intelligences assessment by one teacher, and (5) all three teachers used apprenticeship to enhance their students' multiple intelligences. Based on these findings, recommendations for the integration of the Multiple Intelligences theory and further studies are provided.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**MENGINTEGRASIKAN TEORI PELBAGAI KECERDASAN DALAM
PENGAJARAN BAHASA INGGERIS SEBAGAI BAHASA KEDUA DI
KALANGAN GURU TINGKATAN 4 DI MALAYSIA**

Oleh

SENAM KAUR A/P SARJIT SINGH

Oktober 2015

Pengerusi : Profesor Madya Arshad Abdul Samad, PhD
Fakulti : Pengajian Pendidikan

Teori Pelbagai Kecerdasan merupakan satu elemen yang diberi penekanan di dalam Huraian Sukatan Pelajaran Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Menengah kerana ia menggalakkan pembelajaran yang memberi fokus kepada kepelbagaian kecedasan pelajar. Dengan cara ini, guru-guru dapat menyediakan pembelajaran efektif yang berpusatkan pelajar dengan mengambil kira kepelbagaian kecerdasan pelajar.

Kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji cara bagaimana guru-guru Tingkatan 4 mengintegrasikan Teori Pelbagai Kecerdasan dalam matapelajaran Bahasa Inggeris Sebagai Bahasa Kedua. Kajian telah dijalankan berasaskan tiga soalan: (1) Adakah Teori Pelbagai Kecerdasan diintegrasikan dalam pengajaran guru dalam Bahasa Inggeris sebagai Bahasa Kedua? (2) Apakah kecerdasan yang sering digunakan dalam pengajaran Bahasa Inggeris sebagai Bahasa Kedua? (3) Apakah cabaran yang dihadapi oleh guru dalam menggunakan Teori Pelbagai Kecerdasan dalam pengajaran Bahasa Inggeris sebagai Bahasa Kedua? Pendekatan kualitatif digunakan sebagai pendekatan penyelidikan kerana dianggap paling sesuai dengan soalan dan tujuan kajian. Tiga guru Tingkatan 4 telah dipilih melalui proses persampelan purposif berkriteria. Peserta merupakan tige guru terlatih yang mengajar di sebuah sekolah harian di Cameron Highlands. Data dikumpulkan melalui senarai semak, sesi temubual dan pemerhatian guru dalam kelas untuk mendapatkan persepsi, pengalaman dan praktis yang berkaitan dengan kajian ini. 5 dapatan dari tinjauan literatur di guna sebagai panduan dalam mengkaji pengintegrasian teori ini dalam pengajaran Bahasa Inggeris sebagai Bahasa Kedua. Mereka adalah (1) mengenal pasti kepelbagaian kecerdasan dalam guru-guru dan pelajar-pelajar, (2) mengintegrasikan teori pelbagai kecerdasan dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran, (3) menyediakan peluang kepada pelajar untuk menggunakan kepelbagaian kecerdasan mereka, (4) menjalankan pentaksiran kepelbagaian kecerdasan untuk membolehkan pelajar menunjukkan kefahaman pengajaran selain dari ujian bertulis, (5) menggalakkan 'apprenticeship' untuk memperkukuhkan kekuatan kecerdasan pelajar dibawah penyeliaan seorang professional.

Dapatan menunjukkan (1) dua orang guru dapat mengenal pasti kepelbagaian kecerdasan pelajar mereka secara tepat, (2) kepelbagaian kecerdasan pelajar digunakan semasa set induksi tetapi aktiviti-aktiviti semasa dan 'post-learning' menunjukkan dominasi kecerdasan linguistic dan logical matematik kerana guru-guru menggunakan buku teks sebagai aktiviti mereka, (3) hanya seorang guru sahaja yang menyediakan peluang untuk pelajar-pelajar menggunakan kepelbagaian kecerdasan menerusi projek pelajar, (4) drama digunakan sebagai pentaksiran kepelbagaian kecerdasan, dan (5) ketiga-tiga guru menggunakan 'apprenticeship' untuk memperkasakan kepelbagaian kecerdasan pelajar. Berdasarkan dapatan kajian ini, cadangan pengintegrasian secara efektif dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran dan juga cadangan untuk kajian seterusnya juga telah diajukan.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you Waheguruji for blessing me the courage, the energy and the patience to complete this thesis as You know this was a strenuous and emotional journey for me. Losing daddy was the biggest stumbling block in my life and picking up pieces after his death was an emotional turmoil by itself. Being the sole caregiver for Mummy was a challenge and an uphill task that I had to endure. However, Waheguruji, you were there to ensure that I had the mental strength to pick the pieces and move ahead in this long journey. Thank you Waheguruji, and I pray that you watch over me at all times.

I would like to thank my family for their continuous support and encouragement. My late father was the biggest influence in my life and I was very close to him. His constant encouragement made me persevere even at times when the boat was helplessly drifting in the storm. I would also like to thank my sister, Gurmeet, and her daughters because they were my pillars behind me. To my siblings who reside overseas, Kiren, Manmant, Harvinder, Ravinder and Vickermajeet, you encouraged me to complete my thesis at times when things were bleak and depressing. Mum, your words of wisdom steered me on course and this thesis is meant especially for you.

Lastly, I would also like to thank PM Dr Arshad Abdul Samad, PM Dr Malachi Edwin Vethamani, Dr Shamsuddin Ahmad and Dr Tajularipin Sulaiman who have given me invaluable assistance and guidance. My supervisor, Dr Arshad Abdul Samad is a gem of a person and his excellent mentorship and comprehensive feedback guided my studies.

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Arshad Bin Abdul Samad, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Shamsudin Bin Ahmad, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Tajularipin Bin Sulaiman, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

BUJANG BIN KIM HUAT, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any other institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in theUniversiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name and Matric No.: Senam Kaur a/p Sarjit Singh (GS13842)

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) are adhered to.

Signature: _____

Name of
Chairman of
Supervisory

Committee: Associate Professor Arshad bin Abdul Samad

Signature: _____

Name of
Member of
Supervisory

Committee: Dr. Shamsudin bin Ahmad

Signature: _____

Name of
Member of
Supervisory

Committee: Associate Professor Tajularipin bin Sulaiman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
APPROVAL	vi
DECLARATION	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Pedagogical Approach to Teaching the English Language	2
1.3 Multiple Intelligences in Malaysia	4
1.4 Statement of the Problem	6
1.5 Purpose of the Study	10
1.6 Research Questions	11
1.7 Significance of the Study	11
1.8 Scope of the Study	12
1.9 Limitations of the Study	12
1.10 Definition of Terms	13
1.11 Summary	14
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
2.1 An Overview of Intelligence Research	15
2.2 Multiple Intelligences Theory	16
2.2.1 Definition of Multiple Intelligences	16
2.2.2 The Eight Multiple Intelligences	18
2.2.3 The Principal Claims of the Multiple Intelligences Theory	20
2.3 Multiple Intelligences Theory in Education	21
2.3.1 Application of Multiple Intelligences Theory in Education	22
2.3.2 Classroom Implication of the Multiple Intelligences Theory	26
2.3.2.1 Recognizing Multiple Intelligences	26
2.3.2.2 Integrating Multiple Intelligences into the Lesson	26
2.3.2.3 Providing opportunities to use Multiple Intelligences	27
2.3.2.4 Variety of Assessments	28
2.3.2.5 Apprenticeship	29
2.4 Previous studies on the Integration of the MultipleIntelligences Theory in Educational Settings	31
2.4.1 Project Zero	31
2.4.2 Classroom Lessons	32

2.4.3	English as a Second Language (ESL) /English as a Foreign Language Education (EFL)	34
2.4.4	Multiple Intelligences Schools	35
2.4.5	Teacher Education	36
2.5	Psychological Benefits of the Multiple Intelligences Theory	36
2.6	The Theoretical Framework	37
2.7	Summary	41
3	METHODOLOGY	42
3.1	Overall Research Design	44
3.2	Context of the Study	45
3.3	The Participants	43
3.4	Data Collection Instruments	46
3.4.1	Multiple Intelligences Checklist	46
3.4.2	Teacher Interviews	46
3.4.3	Observations	47
3.4.4	Documents	48
3.5	Data Collection Procedures	48
3.6	Piloting	50
3.7	Data Analysis	50
3.8	Trustworthiness	51
3.9	Validity and Reliability	52
3.10	Summary	53
4	FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	
4.1	Introduction	54
4.2	The participants	54
4.2.1	The Biographical Description of the Participants	54
4.2.2	Jayanthi	55
4.2.3	Vimala	56
4.2.4	Wendy	56
4.3	Teachers' Exposure to the Multiple Intelligences Theory	57
4.4	Research Question 1: Reflection of the Multiple Intelligences Theory in the teachers' ESL lessons	58
4.4.1	Teachers' Perceptions on the Integration of the Multiple Intelligences Theory	58
4.4.1.1	Teachers' Perceptions on their Multiple Intelligences profile	59
4.4.1.2	Teachers' Perceptions on their Students' Multiple Intelligences Profile	59
4.4.1.3	Teachers' Perceptions on the Benefits of the Multiple Intelligences Theory	61
4.4.1.4	Teachers' Perceptions of the Integration of the Multiple Intelligences Theory in the Classrooms	62
4.4.2	Checklist for Assessing Teachers' and Students' Multiple Intelligences	64
4.4.3	Teachers' Integration of the Multiple Intelligences Theory in the Classroom	66

4.4.3.1	Integrating the Multiple Intelligences Theory in the Lesson	66
4.4.3.2	Creating Opportunities for Students to use their Multiple Intelligences	71
4.4.3.2.1	Interdisciplinary Curriculums	72
4.4.3.2.2	Student Projects	72
4.4.3.3	Multiple Intelligences Assessments	77
4.4.3.4	Apprenticeship	80
4.4.4	Summary of Findings of Research Question 1	82
4.5	Research Question 2: The most frequently used intelligences in the ESL lesson	84
4.5.1	Vimala's frequently used Multiple Intelligences	86
4.5.2	Jayanthi's frequently used Multiple Intelligences	87
4.5.3	Wendy's frequently used Multiple Intelligences	88
4.5.4	Teachers' Personal Learning Experiences	89
4.5.5	Teachers' Perceptions of their Roles in the Classroom	90
4.5.6	Summary of Findings of Research Question 2	95
4.6	Research Question 3: The challenges in integrating the Multiple Intelligences theory into the ESL lesson	97
4.6.1	Lack of Knowledge	97
4.6.2	Lack of Support	98
4.6.3	Stakeholders' Aspirations	99
4.6.4	Scheme of Work	102
4.6.5	Perceptions of Colleagues	103
4.6.6	Personal Beliefs	104
4.6.7	Teachers' Workload	104
4.6.8	Class Size	105
4.6.9	Inadequate Time	107
4.6.10	Summary	108
5	CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
5.1	Introduction	109
5.2	Summary of the Findings	110
5.3	Conclusion	114
5.4	Implications	115
5.5	Recommendations	117
5.6	Recommendations for future studies	118
5.7	Limitations	118
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	120
	APPENDICES	143
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	149

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	The eight criteria and the derivation from the relevant discipline	17
2	Biographical Sketch of Participants	55
3	Students' Predominant Intelligence based on the Teachers' Observations and Checklist for Assessing Students' Multiple Intelligences by Armstrong 2000	65
4	Multiple Intelligences utilized as entry points by the three teachers during their lessons	67
5	Multiple Intelligences exploited via student project	74
6	Intelligences used during different stages of the lessons by three selected teachers	85

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	The Theoretical Framework for the Integration of the Multiple Intelligences Theory BY Form 4 ESL Secondary School Teachers	40
2	Vimala's frequently used Multiple Intelligences	86
3	Jayanthi's frequently used Multiple Intelligences	87
4	Wendy's frequently used Multiple Intelligences	88



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The English language was brought into the then Peninsular Malaya by the traders of the British East India Company in the early nineteenth century (Vethamani, 2007:1). Since then, the English language had established itself in Malaysia. During the British colonialism, the English language was used extensively. It was used in administration and commerce as well as the medium of instruction in English-medium schools. Thus, English played the role of an official language during the British reign.

However, after Malaysia gained its independence in 1957, the importance of the English language changed gradually (Parilah Mohd Shah, 1999:273). The use and standard of the English language declined while the Malay language was upgraded. The Malay language is now the country's official and national language where it is used as the medium of instruction in schools and universities as well as administration. Yet, the English language remained an important language because of its position as an international and global language (Crystal, 1997; Pennycook, 1994). As such, the English Language has been accorded the status of the second most important language in Malaysia. It is being taught in Malaysian primary and secondary schools. The students are taught "300 minutes of English per week in Phase I, 270 minutes in Phase II in primary schools and 175 minutes per week in secondary schools" (Asiah Abu Samah, 2001: 236).

The position of the English language in Malaysia was determined by the government's policies. The National Educational Policy saw the renaming of former Malay-medium schools as national schools and schools using other media of instructions were known as national-type schools (Razak Report, 1956). This policy ensured that the English language will be taught in Malaysia (Asmah Haji Omar, 1992). It became the second language in Malaysia. However, the position of the English language was at stake with the implementation of the Rahman Talib Report (1960). This report recommended that the English language as the medium of instruction was to be phased out and replaced with the national language (Foo and Richards, 2004). Hence, the English language was taught as a single subject and students were exposed to the language only during the English language lessons (Asiah Abu Samah, 1984). This policy also resulted in a common content syllabus for English for the primary and secondary schools in the country (Ali Ab. Ghani et al., 2007). This was facilitated by a common examination paper for the country.

1.2 Pedagogical Approach to Teaching the English Language

The Malaysian English Language Syllabus has changed over the years to meet “the trends, visions, needs of the nation and the theory of language explicitly underlying the language teaching method” (Ali Abd Ghani, et. al, 2007). The Malaysian English Language Syllabus began with the grammar-based syllabus prior to 1975. It has then moved from the structural syllabus to a communicational syllabus to a skill-based syllabus and now the language based syllabus.

The Structural Syllabus was basically rule-governed and it emphasized on accuracy. Thus, it focused on grammatical structures as the underlying units of the language system. The aim of the structural syllabus was for students to “understand how sentences were used to create meaning, to master the underlying rules forming sentences from lower-level grammatical units as phrases and clauses, and to practice using them as basis for written and spoken communication” (Teacher’s Handbook KPM, 1973).

In 1976, the government introduced the Third Malaysian Plan (1976-1980). The focus was on trade and commerce. The government realized the importance of English in international trade and commerce as well as the language used in science and technology (Foo and Richards, 2004). This led to the implementation of the Communicational Syllabus.

Unlike the Structural Syllabus that focused on accuracy, the Communicational Syllabus focused on fluency. This was to prepare the students to participate in international trade and commerce as well as to keep abreast with science and technology. In this syllabus, the starting point was communication. Forms were then selected for carrying out the particular act of communication, which was realized in terms of function (Ali Ab. Ghani, et al., 2007). This syllabus was keen on exploring real life communication in the classroom by exposing students with the tools for generating unrehearsed language performance.

In the 1980’s, the government’s policy shifted to developing holistic students. The National Educational Policy focused on the spiritual, emotional, physical and intellectual development of the students (MOE, 1983). Thus, the New Integrated Primary School Syllabus (Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Rendah) and the New Integrated Secondary School Syllabus (Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Menengah) were implemented in 1983 and 1987 respectively.

This thematic syllabus saw the shift from communication to the teaching of oracy skills (listening and speaking) as well as literacy skills (reading and writing). The aim was to prepare students for life and living (MOE, 1983). These syllabi had three main aims. The first was to reflect on authentic language use, where more than one skill was employed. Secondly, they were meant to lead to more effective learning because it was conducive to the inclusion of variety in language teaching. Thirdly,

they facilitated the reinforcement of learning since a particular sub-skill could be taught by using more than one mode (MOE, 1983). Another interesting aspect of this syllabus was the inclusion of the Class Reader Project (Subramaniam, 2007). The aims of this programme were to: (1) expose learners to materials written in English, (2) motivate learners to read and inculcate in them the reading habit, (3) help learners increase their language proficiency through teaching materials that can enrich and consolidate learning, and (4) generate interest in and prepare students for the study of literature (MOE, 1993)

In the late 1990's, Malaysia embarked on a transformation in its classrooms and school practices in the form of the Smart School. This meant that the school system was to undergo a fundamental shift towards a more technologically literate workforce in line with the demands of the global work environment (Siti Suria Salim & Sharifah Md Nor, 2001). Therefore, the shift was necessary to meet the changes and challenges occurring in areas of communication technology, higher education, commerce and industry (Mahathir, 1999). Hence, the school culture needed to be transformed "from one that is memory-based to that is informed, thinking, creative and caring" (Smart School, Conceptual Blueprint, May, 1997: 12).

In addition, the Ministry of Education had reviewed the role of English as a second language in Malaysia. The following were the areas where English language was deemed necessary for students when they leave school: (1) in higher education, they needed to be able to read academic materials in order to broaden their knowledge, (2) the majority of information was gathered through ICT and they were in English. So, they needed a certain competency of English to gather the information, (3) in international relations, the language of communication was always in English, (4) English was an asset to any individual's growth and development in term of recreation and knowledge, and (5) in the workplace, professional materials tend to be in English and were very specific to the job description (Ali Abd. Ghani, 2007:19).

Hence, there was a need for a change of syllabus to meet the changes and needs. The skills based syllabus was replaced by the language use syllabus in the year 2003. It has three domains of using language. They are interpersonal, informational and aesthetic. This will require the students to interact with others, understand them and interpret their behavior in particular changes in modes, motivation and intentions. The informational domain requires the students to gather information from a variety of sources, process the information and present the information to a variety of audiences (MOE, 2003). The aesthetic domain requires learners to appreciate and respond to literary texts and express their ideas, thoughts, beliefs and feelings creatively and imaginatively (MOE, 2003). In addition, the literature in English Component was incorporated into the English language subject and it is tested in the English language paper (Subramaniam, 2003).

This syllabus emphasizes the importance of learner centeredness. The learners are the centre of the learning process. Teaching approaches, lessons and curriculum materials for learning must be adjusted to suit the differing needs and abilities of

students” (MOE, 2003). The teachers are also urged to emphasize thinking skills and apply the principles of the Multiple Intelligences theory.

To prepare students for the real world, this syllabus has outlined seven educational emphases. They are (1) thinking skills, (2) learning how to learn skills, (3) information and communications technology (ICT) skills, (4) values and citizenship, (5) multiple intelligences, (6) values and citizenship, and (6) preparations for the real world (MOE, 2003).

This syllabus marked the emphasis of the Multiple Intelligences theory in the Malaysian Education system. The Revised Curriculum for Secondary Schools (2000) introduced Multiple Intelligences as one of its Educational Emphasis. It stated that:

The learning outcomes also reflect the incorporation of the theory of Multiple Intelligences. This is illustrated, for example, in the interpersonal use of the language among people in social interaction, kinesthetic intelligence in the dramatization of texts, and spatial intelligence in the interpretation of maps and other such activities (Ministry of Education, 2003).

The MOE (2003) realized the benefits of incorporating the Multiple Intelligences theory in the classroom. Teachers are urged to incorporate the Multiple Intelligences theory in their lessons by using interpersonal skills in social interaction, the application of kinesthetic intelligence in the dramatization of texts, and spatial intelligences in the interpretation of maps (MOE, 2003: 4)

1.3 Multiple Intelligences in Malaysia

The Multiple Intelligences theory was founded by Howard Gardner in 1983. This is a psychological and educational theory of intelligence that expanded the concept of intelligence to also include such areas as music, spatial relations and interpersonal knowledge in addition to mathematical and linguistic ability (Gardner, 1983). Gardner defined intelligence as the capacity to solve problems or to fashion products that are valued in one or more cultural settings (Gardner & Hatch, 1989). Thus, Gardner saw intelligence as a human competence that must entail a set of skills of problem solving which enables a person to resolve genuine problems or difficulties that he or she encounters and, when appropriate, to create an effective product. It must also entail the potential for finding or creating problems and thereby lay the groundwork for the acquisition of knowledge (Armstrong, 1994). This is a paradigm shift from the traditional view that recognizes only two intelligences, linguistic intelligences as well as logical-mathematical intelligences (Armstrong, 1994).

Gardner (1983) posits that each individual has varying levels of intelligences and each individual has a unique cognitive profile. He stated that there are eight intelligences that are quite independent of each other. These intelligences are verbal-linguistic intelligence, logical-mathematical intelligence, visual-spatial intelligence,

musical intelligence, bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence and naturalist intelligence.

The Multiple Intelligences theory is not widely practiced in Malaysia. According to the CDC (2000), this theory was first introduced into the country by the Art and Health Department, Curriculum Development Centre in the 1990s through its Integrative Learning Workshop System. This was followed by some lecturers from Institut Aminuddin Baki who introduced this theory during a course on school administration. This influenced the Kedah State Education Department personnel who introduced the Multiple Intelligences theory in the teaching and learning of the Year Four English language and came up with a handbook for teachers in 1998. The Bureau of Learning Disabilities (BOLD) used this theory to facilitate learning for children who have learning disabilities. They also organized awareness courses to interested parents and school authorities.

The success of these institutions inspired the Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum or the Curriculum Development Centre (2002) to carry out a project on the 'Application of Multiple Intelligences' or 'Projek Aplikasi Teori Multiple Intelligences' (PATMI). The general purpose of this project was to help improve the standard of English. There were two goals of this project. They were (1) to develop the individual's understanding and usage of the language in general; and (2) to upgrade the results of the English language. The objectives of this project were: (1) to help improve the standard of English among students; (2) to instill an interest in the language; and (3) to create situations where the English language must be used (PPK, 2000). The teachers were then exposed to the Multiple Intelligences theory and demonstration of lessons using this theory by local and foreign experts. With this knowledge, the teachers integrated the Multiple Intelligences theory in their English lessons in the English as Second language (ESL) classrooms in Malaysia. The findings of the project revealed that: (1) the teachers were comfortable and confident in inculcating the Multiple Intelligences theory in the teaching and learning process despite the fact that preparing the lessons were time consuming, (2) the lessons were student-centred and the teachers played the role of facilitators; (3) students participated actively in the activities and enjoyed the lessons; and (4) continuous assessment was conducted throughout the lesson (PPK, 2000, 2001, and 2002). These findings suggested that the Multiple Intelligences theory is a feasible pedagogical approach to teaching ESL in the classrooms in Malaysia.

To further accentuate the benefits of the Multiple Intelligences theory, C. Parameswary (2005) examined the process of implementing the Multiple Intelligences theory into classroom practice by the teachers who were involved in the PATMI project. She observed seven teachers from three elementary schools in Batang Berjuntai, Selangor. The teachers confided that before the PATMI project they were basically using the chalk and talk method in their English lessons. However, after the exposure to the Multiple Intelligences theory, the teachers often implemented Multiple Intelligences instruction that included verbal linguistics, logical-mathematical, visual-spatial, bodily-kinesthetic and interpersonal strategies. The teachers were also able to recognize the strengths of the students in the class.

They believed the students were all smart in their own ways. The findings showed that the Multiple Intelligences strategies enhanced the students' engagement in the classroom. The teachers were effective in engaging the students as the students found meaning and purpose in their work. Also, the students were actively involved as the teachers prepared interesting activities for the students to participate in. The teachers also encouraged individual and group activities in the class that encouraged active participation. This emphasized that the Multiple Intelligences theory is a feasible pedagogical approach to teach ESL.

1.4 Statement of Problem

One of the most significant current discussions in the 21st century is that:

Education plays a central role in any country's pursuit of economic growth and national development. There is no better predictor of a nation's future than what is currently happening in classrooms. In today's global economy, a nation's success depends fundamentally on the knowledge, skills and competencies of its people. It is no surprise that nations with higher education levels tend to enjoy greater economic prosperity. (MOE, 2013, p.E-1.)

The quote above is a stark reminder of the importance of teaching and learning in an effort to establish the country's economic development in this 21st century. How has Malaysia progressed in terms of an education that provides its students with the knowledge and skills required for success in life? According to the MOE (2013, p. E-4), the Malaysian education system is at risk as the students were not performing well at international assessments, namely, Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). In the PISA 2012, Malaysia was ranked 52nd out of 65 countries with a reading score of 398 while the average point was 396. This score showed a drop from the previous PISA 2009 report where the reading score was 414. Although the Mathematics score did improve from 404 (2009) to 412 (2012), it was still below the average score of 421 points. Scientific literacy also showed a decline from the previous score of 422 (2009) to 420 (2012). This was also below the average score of 501 points. On the international scale, Malaysian students' performance in these international assessments was described as poor. This is indeed a source of concern for Malaysian educators.

Gardner (1998, p.28) had already drawn attention to the challenges educators would face in the 21st century. He said:

Today's education is challenging and demanding. To have successful education, educators need to rethink and re-conceptualize students' abilities and talents because the students are important for the creation of the future of our country. We must provide the students the best education possible in order to prepare them for the 21st century. The future work force will require students of tomorrow to do more than read, write, speak, listen and perform Mathematical computations.

This concern was also raised by the MOE (2013, p: E-4) as it was clearly stated that “There is, however, increasing global recognition that it is no longer enough for a student to leave school with the three Rs (Reading, wRiting & aRithmetic).”

Gardner (1995) stated that in order to prepare students to survive in the changing world of tomorrow, teachers have to develop a wide range of capacities in each person. This will enable them to reach their potential and to utilize as well as exploit their potentials to achieve success. Gardner (1993: 9) stated that “In my view, the purpose of school should be to develop intelligences and to help people reach vocational and avocational goals that are appropriate to their particular spectrum of intelligences.” Gardner (1993) describes a vision of schooling far removed from the current system of curriculum overload, standardization and national testing. He proposes an individual-centred system in which different types of specialists assessed the learning needs of individual pupils, identify appropriate curriculum experiences and draw on the range of learning opportunities available within the wider community. The MOE shared the same vision and ultimately brought about an overhaul in the education system via the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2015 which aimed at (1) understanding the performance and challenges of the Malaysian education system, with a focus on improving access to education, raising standards (quality), closing achievement gaps (equity), fostering unity amongst students, and maximizing system efficiency; (2) establishing a clear vision and aspirations for individual students and the education system as a whole over the next 13 years; and (3) outlining a comprehensive transformation programme for the system, including key changes to the Ministry which will allow it to meet new demands and rising expectations, and to ignite and support overall civil service transformation (MOE, 2013, p: E-2).

With reference to the first objective with the focus on raising standards, one of the initiatives stressed by the MOE is to tailor support to the needs of students’ of varying abilities (MOE, 2013). The Ministry has always emphasized on tailoring the lessons to meet the students’ varying abilities. The revised curriculum for secondary school in Malaysia (KBSM) recognizes that learners differ from each other in the way they learn as each learner has his or her own strength and unique intelligence, and where possible, individual needs should be taken into account in the teaching process (Sukatan Pelajaran KBSM, 2001). The Ministry of Education in its ongoing efforts towards the quality of education, has introduced the Multiple Intelligences Theory as one of the seven educational emphases in the revised curriculum. The seven emphases are (1) thinking skills, (2) learning how to learn skills, (3) information and communications technology skills, (4) values and citizenship, (5) multiple intelligences, (6) knowledge acquisition and (7) preparation for the real world (HSP, 2003). The HSP (2003, p:4) stated that:

The learning outcomes also reflect the incorporation of the theory of Multiple Intelligences. This is illustrated for example, the use of interpersonal skills in social interaction, the application of kinesthetic intelligence in the dramatization of texts and spatial intelligence in the interpretation of maps.

The importance of planning lessons to tailor to students needs is again emphasized in 'The Pedagogy Standards for the English Language Teaching in Malaysia' (2011, p.37):

The standard covers the requirements for planning and adapting lessons to meet the varied needs of different learners taking into account their learning styles, language abilities and background, and for providing flexible and innovative learning experience for the learners.

It can then be concluded that a successful lesson is a lesson that is tailored to meet the students' needs. This is stressed in the HSP (2003, p: 5) which stated:

In order to bring about effective learning, learners must be given every opportunity to engage in real or simulated activities that require them to use the language i.e. lessons should be activity-based and learner-centred and revolve around real-life tasks...

The Malaysian curriculum thus stresses on the importance of the learner as central in the learning process. However, students are uniquely different from each other due to biological proclivity and cultural nurturance (Gardner, 1993). Gardner, (1993: 15) stated that:

It is of the utmost importance that we recognize and nurture all of the varied human intelligences, and all of the combinations of intelligences. We are all so different largely because we have different combinations of intelligences. If we recognize this, I think we will have at least a better chance of dealing appropriately with the many problems that we face in the world.

Therefore, a standardized lesson plan used in a classroom is not learner-centred as the students have different intelligences. White, Blithe and Gardner (1992) noted that a standardized approach to education faces the serious problems of inevitably neglecting many students.

Gardner (1997:2) stated that the Multiple Intelligences theory is most useful for two educational ends: (1) it allows us to plan educational programs that will enable children to realize desired end states (for example, the musician, the scientist, the civic-minded person); (2) it helps us to reach more children who are trying to understand important theories and concepts in the disciplines. Gardner's theory offered a wide variety of practical applications to teachers and educators in order to improve language classroom practices and match intellectual profiles with educational opportunities (Saphier & Gower, 1987; Chapman, 1993, Armstrong, 1994/1995; Campbell, Christison, 1996/1998; Campbell and Dickinson 1996/1999; Kohn, 1996; Brougher, 1997; Checkley, 1997; Emig, 1997; Berman, 1998; Gibson and Govendo, 1999; Altan, 2001)

Are Malaysian classrooms addressing different intelligences in language classrooms to enhance effective language teaching and learning? One indicator of the effectiveness of language teaching and learning is PISA. If the language teaching and learning is effective, our students would be performing well in this international assessment. However, students' performance in the reading component of PISA has dropped from a score of 414 in 2009 to 398 in 2012. This indicates that the language teaching and learning needs more emphasis. Also, some researchers have revealed that rote learning still reign in classrooms and teachers use the same materials and teaching strategies in classrooms despite differences in students' abilities (Sadaseevan, 1995, Norazlina, 2000; Shantini, 2000; Krishnasamy & Abdullah, 2001; Seliman, 2001). This would inevitably make the lessons boring (Mohd Nazri Latif Azmi, 2003; C. Parameswary, 2005; K. Kemalatha et al., 2006; K. Kemalatha et al., 2007; Mangalam & Thurairaj, 2009; Lee Ming Foong, et.al, 2012; Siti Nurul Mahfuzah Mohd et al., 2014).

Mahathir Mohammad, the fourth Prime Minister of Malaysia cried foul over the seeming decline in the English language (in Asiah Abu Samah, 2001) especially in connection with Science and Technology. As the country faces changes and challenges in areas of communication, higher education, commerce and industry, there is a need for "Malaysian students to improve their English language proficiency and also to help them use English for future needs in the workplace" (Vethamani, 2007:5).

Asiah Abu Samah (2001: 236) also showed great concern when she stated that:

The first thing worth noting is the fact that English is taught to all children in all types of schools, whether national-type or private. If one takes into account that Malaysian children do 300 minutes of English per week in Tahap/Phase 1, 270 minutes in Tahap/Phase II in primary schools, and 175 minutes per week in secondary schools – meaning that all Malaysian children in national schools would have at least done some 100,000 minutes of English by the time they leave school – one cannot help but wonder why in the world some of them cannot even utter a coherent sentence at SPM oral English!

Although English is a compulsory subject in the Malaysian curriculum, it is however, not compulsory to pass it. Therefore, students are not taking the learning of English seriously (Awang, 1994). Hence, university students lack the linguistic competence to facilitate the reading of English reference materials despite being exposed to the language for more than ten years (Arnie, 1982; Asmah, 1987; Awang, 1994).

It is obvious then that the Malaysian learners are not progressing well in the English language. Pandian (2000) had outlined six issues raised for the decline in the standard of the English language. They were (1) teacher and methodology, (2) authority and policy making, (3) parents' attitude, (4) society's actual needs for certain language skills, (5) curriculum materials, and (6) patterns of social relations

that prevail in the educational process itself. Pandian's study (2001) on major problems faced by English language teachers revealed that 35% stated insufficient resources, 67% stated students are not motivated while 46% stated the inability to implement ideas.

The Malaysian Education Blueprint is earnest in its effort to raise the education standard of the country. Tan Sri Abd Ghafar B Mahmud, Director-General of Education Malaysia stressed that schools must be able to provide quality teaching, guidance and support for students so that Malaysia will rise from the bottom-third to the top-third of countries in international assessments like PISA and TIMSS in 15 years (MOE, 2013).

It is apparent then that teaching methodology and students' interest are two factors that would help improve the English language proficiency in the Malaysian ESL classroom. However, most of the Malaysian ESL lessons use the same materials and teaching strategies in all classrooms despite differences in students' abilities (Sadaseevan, 1995). Hence, it is necessary for the teachers to identify students' abilities and this is in line with the Multiple Intelligences theory as it recommended educationists to detect human strengths and use them as a basis for engagement and learning (White, Blithe and Gardner, 1992).

It is possible then that the Multiple Intelligence theory may be the feasible pedagogical approach to raise the standard of proficiency in the English language among Malaysian students as it advocates an individualized learning process. Therefore, it is the aim of this study to explore and describe the integration of Multiple Intelligences theory in the Malaysian ESL classroom.

1.5 Purpose of the Study

Educators deemed the Multiple Intelligences theory as the ideal approach to individualize the learning process to ensure educational excellence for every student (Blythe and Gardner, 1992, Armstrong, 1994, Jones, 1996, Campbell, 1997; Kagan & Kagan, 1998, Sweet, 1998; Kezar, 2001). Local researchers have also established the significance of integrating the Multiple Intelligences theory to enhance educational excellence (Mohd Nazri Latif Azmi, 2003; C. Parameswary, 2005; K. Kemalatha et al., 2006; K. Kemalatha et al., 2007; Mangalam & Thurairaj, 2009; Lee Ming Foong, et.al, 2012; Siti Nurul Mahfuzah Mohd et al., 2014).

With this perception in mind, the purpose of this study was to examine and explore the manner by which the Multiple Intelligences theory was integrated in selected Malaysian ESL classrooms. The research focused on teachers' practices which entailed pedagogical instructions, teaching approaches and planning of the lessons. To this aim, firstly, the teachers were interviewed to find out their perceptions of the Multiple Intelligences theory. Secondly, the teachers' and students' intelligences profiles were identified using Armstrong's (2000) Checklist for Assessing Students'

Multiple Intelligences. Thirdly, the study aimed to find out if the teachers' activities corresponded to the students' multiple intelligences. The study also aimed to investigate the intelligence(s) most frequently used by the teachers and what were some of the challenges faced by the teachers with regards to integrating the Multiple Intelligences theory. The findings would allow the researcher to make recommendations and show how to teach the English language to cater to students' needs.

1.6 Research Questions

This research was guided by the following research questions:

1. Is the Multiple Intelligences theory reflected in the teachers' English as a Second language lessons?
2. What are the most frequently used intelligences in the English as a Second language classroom?
3. What are the challenges of integrating the Multiple Intelligences theory in the English as a Second language classroom?

1.7 Significance of the Study

The study explored the wealth of experience that would be revealed through practice which entailed pedagogical instruction, teaching approaches and lesson plans involved by the teachers. It was hoped that through this enriching experience would emerge a methodology involving the Multiple Intelligences theory that motivates and appeals to all students.

This exploration would also benefit the Teacher Training Colleges and those involved in other higher education institutions in determining the curricular constructs of teacher-related programmes and training in ESL.

The findings will be a rich source of information for the Curriculum Development Centre on the effectiveness of Multiple Intelligences as an Educational Emphasis in secondary schools. The findings would also guide them in organizing and planning programmes for in-service courses for teachers to help them improve their pedagogical and professional skills.

The benefits of integrating the Multiple Intelligences theory in the ESL classrooms abound as it caters to the students' predominant intelligences and they would attain success as the activities appeal to them. Hence, they would be motivated to learn. Thus, this study would provide opportunities for the researcher to suggest how best to integrate the Multiple Intelligences theory into ESL lessons so that students would be stimulated to learn the language in a pathway that appeals to them and is conducive to their own learning.

1.8 Scope of the Study

This study examined English language teachers' teaching approaches in integrating the Multiple Intelligences theory in their ESL classrooms. Thus, the scope of this study lay within the boundaries of English language teachers, their content knowledge, their pedagogical knowledge, experiences and interpretation of the Multiple Intelligences theory. Since this study was explorative in nature, a qualitative research paradigm was most suited to answer the research questions.

This study was carried out in a regular public secondary school or Sekolah Menengah Kebangsaan (SMK) in the East Coast of the Peninsular Malaysia. The participants of this study were trained English language teachers who had a minimum of three years experience teaching the English language. The teachers had a varied and diversified educational background.

The framework of this study was bound by the Multiple Intelligences theory. This study intended to explore teachers' understanding of the Multiple Intelligences theory and how they interpreted this theory into the teaching and learning of ESL in the classroom. Finally, the researcher would like to investigate the teaching approaches used by the teachers to incorporate the Multiple Intelligences theory in the ESL classroom. Five principles were derived from the literature review. The researcher was keen to investigate which of these five principles were commonly used in the Malaysian ESL classrooms. These five principles were to: (1) recognize the multiple intelligences in teachers and students, (2) integrate multiple intelligences in the lessons, (3) create opportunities for students to use their multiple intelligences to enhance learning, (4) carry out assessments that enable students to use their multiple intelligences to portray their understanding of the lesson instead of the paper-and-pencil test, (5) encourage apprenticeship to enable students to master a valued skill gradually under the tutelage of a professional. A triangulation method would be used to collect the qualitative data. They were interviews, observations and documents (record books and reflection grids). Glesne and Peshkin (1992) wrote about the importance of participant observation, interviewing one person and listening to small groups. Also, Denzin and Lincoln (1994) discussed case study as personal experience, and observational, historical and visual texts.

1.9 Limitations of the Study

The present study did not seek generalizability but profundity and depth in its findings and interpretation. Thus, there are delimiting variables that need to be clarified. The research design permitted a small number of teachers as samples. Since the focus was on teachers, the study did not partially look at learners although the researcher did observe learners' responses through their gestures, facial expressions and spoken and written products.

Due to time constraints, the study was conducted in a school over a limited period of time. The researcher could only carry out class observations within a three-month

period. The findings and conclusions were derived through analysis of the data and supported by examples drawn from the data itself.

1.10 Definition of Terms

(a) Multiple Intelligences

Multiple Intelligences is a psychological and educational theory of intelligence developed by Howard Gardner in 1983. According to him, there are eight intelligences which are independent of each other. These intelligences are verbal-linguistic intelligence, logical-mathematical intelligence, visual-spatial intelligence, musical intelligence, bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence and naturalist intelligence. Linguistic intelligence is the capacity to use the language, your native language, and perhaps other languages, to express what's on your mind and to understand other people while those with logical-mathematical intelligence understand the underlying principles of some kind of causal system, the way a scientist or logician does; or can manipulate numbers, quantities, and operations the way a mathematician does. (Gardner, 1997). He defines spatial intelligence as the ability to represent the spatial world internally in one's mind-the way a sailor or airplane pilot navigates the large spatial world, or the way a chess player or sculptor represents a more circumscribed spatial world. Gardner (1997) defines bodily-kinesthetic intelligence as the capacity to use your whole body or parts of your body-your hand, your fingers, your arms-to solve a problem, make something, or put on some kind of a production while musical intelligence is defined as the capacity to think in music, be able to hear patterns, recognize them, remember them, and perhaps manipulate them. He states that interpersonal intelligence involves understanding other people while intrapersonal intelligence is defined as having an understanding of yourself, of knowing who you are, what you can do, what you want to do, how you react to things, which things to avoid, and which things to gravitate toward. According to Gardner (1997), naturalist intelligence designates the human ability to discriminate among living things (plants, animals) as well as sensitive to other features of the natural world.

b) ESL classroom

This referred to the teaching of the English Language in countries where the English language is not the official language or the native language. The English language is taught in Malaysian classrooms to teach pupils to use the language for communicational purposes as well as to utilize the language at higher levels of education.

c) Integrating of the Multiple Intelligences theory into the ESL classroom

For the purpose of this study, this term referred to how teachers use this theory to facilitate the teaching and learning process by preparing activities that catered to the eight intelligences and also how these teachers utilized the multiple intelligences beyond the classroom.

1.11 Summary

This chapter put forward the introduction to the framework of the study. It gave a description of the background of the study which entailed a brief overview of learning theories, Multiple Intelligences theory and the teaching of ESL in the Malaysian classrooms. The statement problem was also discussed. The purpose of the study, the objective of the study and the scope of the study were also stated. The next chapter will discuss the literature review which would substantiate the theoretical foundation of the study. It would discuss the development of intelligence research from the different perspectives including the development of the Multiple Intelligences theory. It would discuss the five principles to integrate the Multiple Intelligences theory into ESL lessons and discuss previous researches followed by the discussion on the theoretical framework of the study.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (2005). Project Zero. Retrieved from: <http://www.pz.harvard.edu/research/Research.htm>
- Akbari, R., & Hosseini, K. (2007). Multiple intelligences and language learning strategies: Investigation possible relations. *System*, 36, 141-155.
- Albero, P., Brown, A., Eliason, S. and Wind, J. (1997). *Improving Reading through the Use of Multiple Intelligences*. Master's Action Research Project, Saint Xavier University and IRI/Skylight.
- Ali Ab. Ghani, Mohamed Abu Bakar, Diana Fatimah Ahmad Sahani, Jagdeesh Kaur Gill, Rabindra Dev Prasad and Arni Zainir. (2007). *Developments in English Language Curricula and Syllabuses*. In Teaching English in Malaysia – A Special 25th MELTA Anniversary Publication. Sasbadi.
- Armstrong, T. (1987). *In their own way: Discovering and encouraging your child's multiple intelligences*. New York: Tarcher/Putnam.
- Armstrong, T. (1989). *In their own way: Discovering and encouraging your child's personal learning style*. New York. Penguin.
- Armstrong, T. (1994). *Seven Ways to Approach Curriculum*. Educational Leadership, 52(3), 26-28.
- Armstrong, T. (1994). *The Foundations of the Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. ASCD. Chapter 1, 1-15.
- Armstrong, T. (1995). *The Myth of the ADD Child*. New York: Dutton.
- Armstrong, T. (1999). *7 kinds of smart: Identifying and developing your multiple intelligences*. New York: Plume/Penguin
- Armstrong, T. (2000). *Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Armstrong, T. (2000). *In their own way: Discovering and encouraging your child's multiple intelligences*. New York: Tarcher/Putnam.
- Armstrong, T. (2003). *You're Smarter Than You Think: A Kid's Guide to Multiple Intelligences*. Edited by Jennifer Brannes, Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit Public.
- Armstrong, Thomas. Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom 3rd ed. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2009.
- Arnie, A. (1982). *Attitudes of Malay Learners towards the Learning of English as a Second Language*. M.A. Dissertation. National University of Singapore.

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C. & Razavieh, A. (1990). *Introduction to Research in Education*. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Asiah Abu Samah. (1984). 'The English Language (Communicational) Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools in Malaysia: Rationale, Design and Implementation.' In Read, J.A.S.. (ed.) *Trends in Syllabus Design*. Singapore: Singapore: University Press, 1984.
- Asiah Abu Samah. (2001). *The English Issue, Revisited*. In Reflections, Visions & Dreams of Practice, Selected papers from the IEC 2001 International Education Conference.
- Asmah, Haji Omar. (1987). *Malay and its sociocultural context*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Asmah, Haji Omar. (1992). *The Linguistic Scenery in Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Awang, H. S. (1994). 'Multiple Dimensions for Policy and Pedagogical in English language Education in Malaysia.' In S.K. Gill and A.A. Idris (Eds.). *Proceedings of the International English Language Education Conference*. Kuala Lumpur: National University of Malaysia.
- Bakić-Mirić. N. (2010). MIT - a milestone innovation in English language teaching at University of Niš Medical school. *Acta Medica Mediana*. 49(2), 16-19.
- Baney. M.E. (1998). *An examination of the Process of Implementing Multiple Intelligences into Classroom Practice: A team approach*. Temple University. PhD thesis. Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI:AAT 9838458).
- Bailey, K. M. (1983). *Competitiveness and anxiety in adult Second Language Learning: Looking at and through the diary studies*.
- Bellanca, J., and Foggarty. (1989). *Patterns for Thinking, Patterns for Transfer*. Palatine, Ill.: The IRI Group.
- Bellanca, J., Chapman C., and Swartz, E. (1994). *Multiple Assessments for Multiple Intelligences*. Palantine, IL: Skylight Publishing.
- Biondi, L.A. (2001). *Authentic Assessment Strategies in Fourth Grade Students*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED460165.
- Blythe, T. and Gardner, H. (1992). *A School for all Intelligences*. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 33-37.
- Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S.K.(1992). *Qualitative research for education. An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Brand and Jeanne M. Donato. (2001). *Storytelling in Emergent Literacy: Fostering Multiple Intelligences*. Delmar: Thomson Learning.

- Brecher, D., Gray, M., Price, S. and Sayles, K. (1998). *Improving the Spelling of High Frequency Words in Daily Writing across the Curriculum through the Use of Multiple Intelligence*. Master's Action Research Project, Saint Xavier University and IRI/Skylight.
- Brougher, J. Z. (1997). Creating a nourishing learning environment for adults using multiple intelligences theory. *Adult Learning*, 8(4), 28-30.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. USA: Prentice hall Regents.
- Brualdi, Amy C. (1996). *Multiple Intelligences: Gardner's Theory*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation, Washington DC.
- Burhorn, G. E., Harlow, B.A., Van Norman, J.F. (May 1999). *Improving Student Motivation through the Use of Multiple Intelligences*. Master's Action Research Project. Saint Xavier University and IRI/Skylight.
- Campbell, B. (1992). *The Multiple Intelligences in Action*. Childhood Education, 68, 197-201.
- Campbell, B. (1994). *The Multiple Intelligences Handbook: Lesson Plans and More*. Stanwood, Wash: Campbell and Associates, Inc.
- Campbell, B. (1995). *The Multiple Intelligences Handbook*. Tucson, AZ: zephyr Press, 1994.
- Campbell, B. (1995). 'Multiple Intelligences in Action' in R. Fogarty and J. Bellanca (eds). *Multiple Intelligences: A Collection*. Illinois: IRI/Skylight Publishing Inc.
- Campbell, B. (Sept. 1997). *Pursuing Intellectual Diversity in an Elementary Classroom*. Classroom Leadership Newsletter. 1(1). (1 - 2)
- Campbell, L. (Sept. 1997). *Variations on a Theme: How Teachers Interpret MI Theory*. Educational Leadership Magazine. 55(1). (14 – 19)
- Campbell, L and Campbell, B. (1999). *Multiple Intelligences and Student Achievement: Success Stories from Six Schools*. Alexandria VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Campbell, L ,Campbell, B and Dickinson, D. (1999). *Teaching and Learning through Multiple Intelligences*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Campbell, L. (2000). *The Unspoken Dialogue: Beliefs about Intelligence, Students and Instructions held by a Sample of Teachers Familiar with the Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. PhD Thesis. The Fielding Institute. Dissertation Abstracts International (UMI: AAT 9980445)

- Campbell, P.S., Scott-Kassner, C. (2002). *Music in Childhood From Preschool Through The Elementary Grades*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Carreiro, P. (1998). *Tales of thinking: Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom*. Columbus OH: Stenhouse Publications.
- Chamberlain, V. Hopper, B. and Jack, B. (1996). *Starting Out MI Way: A Guide to Multiple Intelligences in the Primary School*. Bolton: D2.
- Chen, P. S. (2007). *The multiple intelligences and common leadership*. Taipei, Taiwan: Sanmin.
- Chen, J., Moran, S., & Gardner, H. (2009). *Multiple Intelligences around the World*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Christison, M.A. & Kennedy, D. (1999). Multiple Intelligences: Theory and Practice in Adult ESL. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/adultesl/resources/digests/multiple-intelligences.php>
- Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in education (4th ed.)* London: Routledge.
- Collins, J. (1998, October 19). Seven kinds of smart [Electronic version]. *Time*, 152 (16), 94- 97.
- Chapman, C. (1993). *If the Shoe Fits: How to Develop Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom*. Arlington Heights, IL: IRI. Skylight Training and Publishing, Inc.
- Charbonneau, N.L., and Ribar, L.L. (May 1999). *Increasing Student Motivation through the Use of Multiple Intelligences and Cooperative Learning Techniques*. Master's Action Research Project, Saint Xavier University and IRI/Skylight.
- Checkley, K. (1997). *The First Seven...and the Eight: A Conversation with Howard Gardner*. *Educational Leadership*, 55(1), 8-13.
- Chen, J. and Gardner, H. (1997). *Alternative Assessments from a Multiple Intelligences Theoretical Perspective*. In D. P. Falangen J.L. Jenshall and Harrison (eds).
- Christison, M.A. (1996). *Teaching and Learning Languages through Multiple Intelligences*. *TESOL Journal*, 6(1), 10 – 14.
- Christison, M.A. (1998). *MI: Teaching the Whole-Student*. *ESL Magazine*, 2, (5), 10-13.
- Cogan, D. (1995). 'Using a Counselling Approach in Teacher Supervision.' *The Teacher Trainer*. 9 (3), 3-6.

- Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1985). *Perspectives on Classrooms and schools*. Holt Saunders: Eastbourne.
- Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1997). *Research Methods in Education*. Routledge: London
- C. Parameswary Chelliah. (2005). *The Implementation of Multiple Intelligences in the Teaching of English in Primary Schools*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Universiti Malaya.
- Craft, A. (Report) (1997). *Proceedings: Creativity in Education Network Colloquium on Multiple Intelligences and Creativity with Professor Howard Gardner of Harvard University*. Milton Keynes: The Open University.
- Cresswell, J. W. (1992). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cresswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Cresswell, J. W. & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in a qualitative inquiry. *Theory into practice*, 39, 3, 124-130.
- Crompton, M.A. (1999). Learning from the Experts. A Qualitative Study of Two Dual Age Primary teachers. EDD Dissertation. Proquest. Dissertation abstracts.
- Crystal, D. (1977). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Curriculum Development Centre (2000). *Sukatan Pelajaran Bersepadu Sekolah Menengah: Bahasa Inggeris*. Kuala Lumpur. Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- Dare, M., Durand, S., Moeller, L., and Washington, M. (1997). *Using Multiple Intelligences Cooperative Learning, and Higher Order Thinking Skills to Improve the Behaviour of At-Risk Students*. Master's Action Research Project, Saint Xavier University and IRI/Skylight.
- David, M.K. and Kochappan, G. (2001). 'Reflection as a language Learning and Teaching Device.' In Reflections, Visions & Dreams of Practice, Selected papers from the IEC 2001 International Education Conference
- De Louth, T. N. (2001). *Intelligences Theory the Ages*. <http://wizard.ucr.edu/~kmeneill/psy575/tara.htm>.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Drawbaugh, D. W. (2002). *An investigation of the impact of focused leadership professional development on the professional lives of selected North Carolina elementary and secondary school personnel.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, USA.
- Duval, J., and Mark, T. (1994). *The Pawlett Project: Application of Howard Gardner's multiple intelligences theory in a rural Vermont elementary school.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of ASCD, Chicago, IL.
- Emig, V.B. (1997). *A Multiple Intelligences Inventory.* Educational Leadership, 55 (1), 47-50.
- Eisner, E.W. (1991). *Qualitative Inquiry and the Enhancement of Educational Practice.* New York: MacMillan.
- Eisner, E. (1994). 'Commentary: putting multiple Intelligences in context.' *Teachers' college records.* 95(4), 555-560.
- Engstorm, E. (1998). *Teachers' Perceptions of their Professional Growth Needs in Translating Multiple Intelligences theory into Practice.* University of South dakota. EDD Thesis. Dissertation abstracts International. (UMI:AAT 9958714).
- Erozan, F. & Shibliyev, J. *Multiple Intelligences Theory in action: Profiles and preferences.* Paper presented at the 10th International INGED ELT Conference, 06-09 May 2008, Eskişehir.
- Failoni, J.W. (1993). Music as a means to enhance cultural awareness and literacy in the foreign language classroom. *Mid-Atlantic Journal of Foreign Language Pedagogy.* 1, 97-108.
- Finnegan, P.R. (1999). *The Effects of Learning Options Based on the Theory of Multiple Intelligences in the College Classroom.* Arizona State University. EDD Thesis. Dissertation Abstracts International (UMI: AAT 995817).
- Flick, U. (2002). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research.* (2nd ed). Sage Publication.
- Fogarty, R. and Stoehr, J. (1995). *Integrating curricula with multiple intelligences: teams, themes and threads.* ED 383435.
- Fogarty, R. (2005). Understanding the theory of multiple intelligences. *Early Childhood Today,* 20, 12-14.
- Foo, B. and Richards, C. (2004). 'English in Malaysia.' In *RELC Journal.* 25.2 229-240.
- Fraenkel, J. R., and Wallen, N.E. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4th ed.) Boston: McGraw Hill.

- Fraenkel, R. J., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Franzen, R. (1999). *The Self-Perceptions of Multiple Intelligences among Students from a Middle School in the Midwest University of South Dakota*. EDD Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI: AAT 995817).
- Gahala, E., & Lange, D. (1997). Multiple Intelligences: Multiple ways to help students learn foreign languages. Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Newsletter (41).
- Gaines, D., & Lehmann, D. (2002). Improving student performance in reading comprehension through the use of multiple intelligences. Retrieved From ERIC
- Gardner, H. (1979, March). *The child is father to the metaphor*. Psychology Today, 12 (10), 81-91.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Beyond the Education and Human Development. Developing the spectrum of human Intelligences*. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 187-193.
- Gardner, H. (1987, May). *Beyond IQ: Education and human development*. Harvard Educational Review, 57(2), 187-193.
- Gardner, H. (1989). *To open minds: Chinese clues to the dilemma of contemporary education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. & Hatch, T. (1989). *Multiple Intelligences go to school: Educational implications of the theory of Multiple Intelligences*. Educational Researcher, 18(8), 4-9.
- Gardner, H. (1991). *The Unschooled Mind: How Children Learn, and How schools Should Teach*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1993a). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences / tenth anniversary edition*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1993b). *Multiple Intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1994). *Creating Minds*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1995, November). *Reflections on multiple intelligences: Myths and messages*, Phi Delta Kappan, 198-209.
- Gardner, H. (1995). *Multiple Intelligences as a catalyst*. English Journal, 16-18.

- Gardner, H. (1995a). *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*. USA: HarperCollins.
- Gardner, H. (1995b). 'Machines of the brain'. *Times Educational Supplement*, March 17, 1995.
- Gardner, H. (1995c). 'Implications of the Theory of Multiple Intelligences' in R. Fogarty and J. Bellanca (eds). *Multiple Intelligences*. Illinois: Skylight Publishing Inc.
- Gardner, H. & Hatch, T. (1995). *Multiple Intelligences go to school: educational implications of the Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. In Fogarty, R. (Ed), *Multiple Intelligences: a collection* (p: 147-168). Arlington Heights, IL: IRI/Skylight Training and Publishing Inc.
- Gardner, H. (1996). *Intelligences in seven steps*. <http://www.newhorizons.org/crfut-gardner.html>.
- Gardner, H. (1996). *Probing more deeply into the theory of multiple intelligences*. NASSP Bulletin, 80 (583), 1-7. Gardner, H and Kornhaber, M.L. and W.K. Wake. (1996). *Intelligence: Multiple Perspectives*. New York: Harcourt and Brace.
- Gardner, H. (1997). *Multiple Intelligences as a Partner in School Improvement*. *Educational Leadership*, 55(1), 20-21.
- Gardner, H. (1997). *An Interview with Howard Gardner*. Mindshift Connection: Multiple Intelligences, Tucson, Arizona: Zephyr Press.
- Gardner, H. (1998, November 9). *Letter to the editor in reply to Collins; "Seven Kinds of Smart"* (Oct 19, 1998). Time.
- Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligences for the 21st Century*. Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1999). *Who Owns Intelligence?* <http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/99feb/intel.html>.
- Gardner, H. (1999b). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (2000). *Intelligence Reframed*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H (2006). *Multiple intelligences new horizons*. New York, New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (2006). The science of multiple intelligences theory: a response to Lynn Waterhouse. *Educational Psychologist*, 41, 227-232.

- Gay, L. R. (1981). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (2nd ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Gibson, B.P. and Govenda, B. L. (1995). 'Encouraging Constructive Behaviour in Middle school Classrooms. A Multiple Intelligence Approach.' *Intervention in School and Clinic*. 35; 16.
- Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine.
- Glesne, C., and Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction*. New York: Longman.
- Gohlinghorst, N. and Wessels, B. (2001). *Enhancing Students Achievement in Social Studies through the Use of Multiple Intelligences*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED456087).
- Greenhalgh, P. (1994). *Emotional growth and Learning*. London: Routledge.
- Greenhawk, J. (Sept. 1997). *Multiple Intelligences Meet Standards*. Educational Leadership Magazine. 55(1). (62 – 64).
- Griswold, J.S., Harter, D.S., & Null, K.C. (2002). *Writing lessons using the multiple intelligences*. Westminster: Teacher Created Resources.
- Guba, E. G. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Guignon, A. (1998). Multiple Intelligences: A Theory for Everyone. *Education World*. Online Posting. Retrieved from <http://www.educationworld.com/a_curr/curr054.shtml>
- Gunst, G. A. (2004). *A Study of Multiple Intelligences among Teachers in Catholic Elementary Schools in the Archdiocese of Detroit (Michigan)*. Wayne State University. EDD Proquest – Dissertation Abstracts.
- Haley, M., H. (2001). Understanding Leraner- Centered Instruction from the Perspective of Multiple Intelligences. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(4), 355-367.
- Halley, M.H (2004). Learner-Centred Instruction and the Theory of Multiple Intelligences with Second Language Learners. *Teachers College Record*, Volume 106, Number 1, pp163-180.
- Hansen, S.A. (1998). *Distribution, Dispersion and Application of Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory with Pre-service Teacher Education Students*. University of Idaho. EDD dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI: AAT 9902685).

- Harms, G.D. (1998). *Self-perceptions of Multiple Intelligences among Selected Third, Seventh, Eleventh grade Students in South Dakota*. University of South Dakota, Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI:AAT 9902685).
- Hatch, T. (1997). *Getting Specific about Multiple Intelligences*. *Educational Leadership*, 54(6), 26-29.
- Healy, J. (1990). *Endangered mind: Why children don't think and what we can do about it*. New York: Touchstone.
- Herbe, R, Thielenhouse, M & Wykert, T. (2002). *Improving student motivation in reading through the use of multiple intelligences*. Dissertations/Theses. ED 471 576 (ERIC)
- Highlands, S., McNally, P., and Peart, M. (April 1999). *Improving Student Behaviour through the Use of the Multiple Intelligences*. Master's Action Research Project, Saint Xavier University and IRI/Skylight.
- Hilgard, E. (1963). *Motivation in learning theory*. In Koch. (1963).
- Hirsch, R. (2000). "The Impatient Gardener." *Young Children*. (May, 2000, Vol. 55, No. 3, p. 81).
- Hirsch, R. (2004). *Early Childhood Curriculum: Incorporating Multiple Intelligences, Developmentally Appropriate Practice, and Play*. Boston: Pearson, Allyn, and Bacon.
- Hoerr, T. R. (Nov. 1994). *How The New City School Applies The Multiple Intelligences*. *Educational Leadership Magazine*. 52(3). (29 – 33).
- Hoerr, T. R. (2000). *Becoming a multiple intelligences school*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Holly, M.L. & Whalley, C. (1989). *Teachers are professionals*. In M.L. Holly & C.S. Mc Laughlin (eds). *Perspectives on teacher professional development* (pp 285-307). London: The Falmer Press.
- Hopper, B. (2000). Learning the MI way: the effects on students' learning of using the theory of multiple intelligences. *Pastoral Care*, 26-32.
- Huberman, A. M., and Miles, M. B. (1994). *Data management and analysis methods*. In N.K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (p: 428-444). California: Sage.
- Human Intelligences. (2007, July 25). *Charles Spearman*. Retrieved from <<http://www.indiana.edu/~intell/Spearman.shtml>>
- Hurry, P. (ed.) (1998). *Using Multiple Intelligence Theory in the Classroom*. Ormskirk: School of Education. Edge Hill University College.

- Jack, B., Hopper, B. and Chamberlain, V. (1996). *Moving on MI Way: A Guide to Multiple Intelligences in the Secondary school*. Bolton: D2.
- Jensen, A. (1969). *How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement*. Harvard Educational View (Vol. 39, p: 1-123).
- Jensen, A. (2001). *Arts with the brain in mind*. Alexandria, VA: Association for the Supervision of Curriculum Development.
- Chen, J., Moran, S., & Gardner, H. (2009). *Multiple intelligences around the world*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Johnson, A. and Kuntz, S. (Sept. 1997). *How Teachers Use the Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. Classroom Leadership Online. 1(1).
- Jones, V. M. (1996). *Exploring the Theory of Multiple Intelligences in Inclusive Elementary Classrooms*. School of Saint Louis University. Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI: AAT 9718134).
- Kagan, S. & Kagan, M. (1998). *Multiple Intelligences: The Complete Multiple Intelligences Book*. California: Kagan Cooperative Learning.
- Kallenbach, S. & Viens, J. (2001). *Multiple intelligences in Practice: Teacher Research reports from adult Multiple Intelligences study*. National Centre for the study of Adult Learning and Literacy, Boston.
- Kallenbach, S., & Viens, J. (2004). *Open to interpretation: Multiple intelligences theory in adult literacy education: Findings from the adult multiple intelligences study*. Cambridge, MA: National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy.
- Kassell, C. (1998). "Music and the Theory of Multiple Intelligences." *Music Educators Journal*, 84, 29-32 and 60.
- Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia. (1973). *Teacher's Handbook for the Post-1970 Primary School English Syllabus*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia (1975). *Teacher's Handbook for the Post 1970. Primary School English Syllabus*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia (2003). *Huraian Sukatan Pelajaran, Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Menengah*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Kemlatha Krishnasamy, Sai Peck Lee & Sellappan Palaniappan. (2003). *Effective Design of E-learning Application Incorporating Multiple Intelligences*. In 6th Conference of Digital Libraries, Technology and Management of Indigenous Knowledge for Global Access, ICADL, 2003, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, December 8 -12.

Kemlatha Krishnasamy, Sai Peck Lee, Sellappan Palaniappan & Ananda Kumar. (2006).

Alternative learning approaches for electronic learning environment in smart schools. *The International Arab Journal of Information Technology*. 3 (2). Pp.149-156.

Kemlatha Krishnasamy & Sai Peck Lee. Development of an E-learning System Accommodating Multiple Intelligences and Adhering to Pedagogy. Retrieved from: coesa.ums.edu.my/rccst_2007/paper/kemalathaUTAR

Kezar, A. (Winter 2001). Theory of Multiple Intelligences: Implications for Higher Education. *In Innovative Higher Education*, Vol.26, No.2.

Kirschenbaum. (1990). *An Interview with Howard Gardner in R. Fogarty and J. Bellanca (eds). Multiple Intelligences: A Collection (32-34)*. Palantine, IL: IRI Skylight: Publishing Inc.

Knodt, J. S. (Sept. 1997). *A Think Tank Cultivates Kids*. Educational Leadership Magazine. 55(1). (35 – 37)

Kohn, A. (1996). *Beyond discipline: From Compliance to Community*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

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

Kornhaber, M and Gardner, H. (1993). *Varieties of Excellence: Identifying and assessing children's talents. A series of authentic assessment and accountability*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, national Centre for restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching. ED 363396.

Kornhaber, M. and Krechevsky, M. (1996). *Multiple Intelligences Schools*. Harvard University Graduate School of Education Project Zero Homepage. <http://pzweb>.

Krechevsky, M., & Seidel, S. (1998). Minds at work: Applying multiple intelligences in the classroom. In R. Sternberg & W. Williams (Eds.), *Intelligence, instruction, and assessment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Krishnasamy and Abdullah (2001). *Teaching of the English Language*. The Star, p:6.

Ksicinski, J.M. (2000). *Assessment of a Remedial Community College. Cohort for Multiple Intelligences*. University of La verne, California. EDD Thesis. Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI: AAT 9963250).

Kujawski, C. L. (2000). *Teachers' Perceptions of Collaboration and Engagement in the Twenty-first Century*. Western University. PhD Dissertation. Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI: AAT 9991664).

- Kuzniewski, F., Sanders, M., Smith, G.S., Swanson, S., and Urich, C. (1998). *Using Multiple Intelligences to Increase Reading Comprehension in English and Math*. Master's Action Research Project, Saint Xavier University and IRI/Skylight.
- Lazear, D. (1991). *Seven Ways of Knowing: Teaching for Multiple Intelligences*. Palatine, Ill.: Skylight Publications.
- Lazear, D. (1992). *Teaching for Multiple Intelligences*. Fastback 342. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation.
- Lazear, D. (1994). *Seven Pathways of Learning, Teaching Students and Parents about Multiple Intelligences*. Tucson, A.Z. Zephyr.
- Lazear, D. (1995). *Multiple Intelligences approach to assessment: Solving the assessment conundrum*. Arizona: Zephyr Press.
- Lazear, D. (1999). *Eight Ways of Teaching: The Artistry of Teaching with Multiple Intelligences*. Palatine Ill. Skylight Publications.
- Leeper, J.E. (1996). *Early Steps towards the Assimilation of the Theory of Multiple Intelligences into Classroom Practice: Four Case Studies*. Temple University. EDD Thesis. Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI: AAT 9623778).
- Lee, Ming Foong, Sharifuddin, Rio Sumarni & Mislán, Nora. (2012). *Pattern and relationship between multiple intelligences, personality traits and critical thinking skills among high achievers in Malaysia*. In 3rd International Conference on e-education, e-Business, e-management and e-Learning, 5 -7 January 2012, Hong Kong.
- Liess, E. and Ritchie, G.V. (1995). 'Using Multiple Intelligences Theory to Transform a First Grade Health Curriculum.' *Early Childhood Education Journal*. 23(2): 71-79.
- Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. London: Sage Publications.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah: NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mahathir Muhamad. (11 September, 1999). *The Sun*, 4.
- Maker, C. J. (1993). *Intelligence and Creativity in Multiple Intelligences*. *Educating Able Learners*. 17(4), 12-19.
- Malaysia. (1976). *Third Malaysia Plan 1976-1980*.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1995). *Designing qualitative research (2nd Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Marshall, C., and Rossman, G.B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research (3rd Ed.)* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mason, J. (1997). *Qualitative researching*. London, Sage Publications Ltd.
- Maxwell, J.A. (1996). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- May, T. (2002). *Social Research. Issues, methods and process. (3rd ED.)* open University Press.
- Maykut, P. & Morehouse, R. (2000). *Beginning Qualitative Research. A Philosophic and Practical Guide*. Routledge: Falmer.
- McClaskey, J. 1995. Assessing student learning through multiple intelligences. *English Journal*, 56-59.
- McCracken, G. (1988). *The Long Interview*. Newbury Park CA: Sage.
- Melton, L., Pickett, W., and Gail, S. (1999). *Improving K-8 Reading Using Multiple Intelligences*. Fastback 448. Author Affiliation: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, IN.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative Research in Practice: Examples for Discussion and Analyses*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mettetal, G. Jordan, C., & Harper, S. (1997, Nov./Dec.). Attitudes toward a multiple intelligences curriculum. *Journal of Educational Research*, 91(2), 115-122.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Trandformation Dimension of Adult Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1996). *Contemporary paradigms of learning*. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 46, 3, 158-172.
- Mindy, K. (2005). *Living usage ingeniously on the multiple intelligences*. Taipei, Taiwan: Yuan-Liou.
- Miles, M.B., and Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis:*
- Miles, M.B., and Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an extended sourcebook of new methods*. (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.
- Ministry of Education. (1997). *The Malaysian Smart School, Smart School Conceptual Blueprint*. Kuala Lumpur.

- Ministry of Education Malaysia. (1983). *Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Rendah*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Ministry of Education Malaysia. (1983). *Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Menengah*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Ministry of Education Malaysia. (2003). *Bahasa Inggeris Tingkatan 4*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Mondale, S., Patton., Cuban, L., Andersen, J., Ravitch, D., & Kaestle, C., eds. (2001). *School: The story of American public education*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Moran, S., Kornhaber, M., & Gardner, H. (2006, September). Orchestrating multiple intelligences. *Educational Leadership*, 64 (1), 22-27.
- Morgan, H. (1996). 'An Analysis of Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligence.' *Roeper Review* 18 (4).
- Morris, C. (2001). *How Can We Teach Kids the Way They Learn? Use the Multiple Intelligences of Howard Gardner*. <http://www.igs.net/~cmorris/eight.html>.
- Morris, R.V. (2001). *Drama and Authentic Assessment in a Social Studies Classroom*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO EJ636199).
- Morse, J. M. (1995). Is qualitative research complete? *Qualitative Health Research*, 6, 3-5.
- Morse, J. M. & Richards, L. (2002). *Read me first. For a User's Guide to Qualitative Methods*. Sage Publications.
- Moskowitz, G. (1978). *Caring and sharing in the Foreign Language Class; A Sourcebook on Humanistic Techniques*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Mussen, K. S. (2007). *Comparison on the Effect of Multiple Intelligences Pedagogy and Traditional Pedagogy on Grade 5 students' Achievements and Attitudes towards Sciences*
- Neville, A.L. (2000). *Native American Students' Self-perceptions Regarding Gardner's Multiple Intelligences*. University of South Dakota. EDD Thesis. Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI: AAT 9957810).
- Nolen, J.L. (2003). Multiple intelligences in the classroom. *Education*, 124, 131-142.
- Norazlina bt Mohd Noor. (2000). *Effectiveness of Vocabulary Activities in Improving the Speaking Ability of Young Learners*. University Malaya Masters Thesis. LB 7 UM.

- Nunan, D. (1987). *The learner-centred curriculum: a study in second language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Connor, A.T. and Callahan, Y. S. (1994). *Seven Windows to a Child's World: 100 Ideas for the Multiple Intelligences Classroom*. Palatine, Ill. IRI. Skylight.
- Osmon, D. C., & Jackson, R. (2002). Inspection time and IQ: Fluid or perceptual aspects of intelligence? *Intelligence*, 30(2), 119-127.
- Osterman, K.F. and Kottamp, R.B. (1993). *Reflective Practice for Educators: Improving Schooline through Professional Development*. Newburg Park, Ca: Corwin Press.
- Özdemir, P., Güneysu, S., & Tekkaya, C. (2006). Enhancing learning through multiple intelligences. *Journal of Biological Education*, 40(2), 74-78.
- Pandian. (2000). *English Language Teaching and Learning: Some Recent Findings*. Report, Penang State Curriculum Meeting, 14 December, RECSAM Penang.
- Pandian. (2001). *Does Methodology Matter? Teachers' Reflections on Teaching English in the Malaysian Classroom*. In Reflections, Visions & Dreams of Practice, Selected papers from the IEC 2001 International Education Conference.
- Parilah M. Shah. (1999). Perceptions of Malaysian ESL Low Achievers about English language Learning. University of Connecticut. EDD Thesis. Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI: AAT 9926291).
- Parker, C. (2007). An Examination of the Interrelationship between Social Demographic Factors and Multiple Intelligences among College Students. Masters Dissertation. Morgan state university. AAT 3300827.
- Patton, M. 1987. *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.)* Newbury Park, CA:Sage.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. New York: Longman.
- Pisa Results. Retrieved from: <http://www.scientificmalaysian.com/2014/18/pisa-2012-deteriorating-education-performance-malaysia/>
- Plotnik, R. (2002). *Introduction to Psychology*. Belmont, CA. Wadsworth/Thompson Learning

- Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum. (2001). PATMI - Projek Aplikasi Teori Multiple Intelligence. Ministry of Education: PPK.
- Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum. (2002). PATMI - Projek Aplikasi Teori Multiple Intelligence. Ministry of Education: PPK.
- Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum. (2003). PATMI - Projek Aplikasi Teori Multiple Intelligence. Ministry of Education: PPK.
- Radford, J. D. (1994). *The Impact of Multiple Intelligences Theory and Flow in the School Lives of Thirteen Children*. PhD Thesis. Indiana University, Proquest – Dissertation Abstracts.
- Rahman Talib Report*. (1960). Report of Education Review Committee. Kuala Lumpur: Government Printers.
- Razak Report*. (1957). Report of Education Review Committee. Kuala Lumpur: Government Printers.
- Reamer, B. (1998). *Beyond the Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. Paper Presented at Seashore Symposium.
- Reidel, J, Tomaszewski, T & Weaver, D. (2003). *Improving student academic reading achievement through the use of multiple intelligence teaching strategies*. Dissertations/Theses. ED 479 204 (ERIC)
- Retting, M. (2005, February). Using the multiple intelligences to enhance instruction for young children and young children with disabilities [Electronic version]. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32, 255-259.
- Richards, J. & T. Rodgers. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riveria, D.B. (1997). *An Investigation into the Validity and Reliability of the Multiple Intelligences Inventory for Teachers in New Orleans*. University of New Orleans. PhD Thesis. Dissertation Abstracts International (UMI: AAT 9717087).
- Rockwood, A. C. (2003). Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence as praxis: A test of its instructional effectiveness. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). State University of New York at Buffalo, USA.
- Rosenthal, M.L. (1999). *The Impact of Teaching to Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences on Students' Self-Esteem*. Saint Louis University. PhD Thesis. Dissertation Abstracts International (UMI: AAT 9911985).
- Roth. I. (ed). (1990). *The Open University's Introduction to Psychology, vols 1 and 2*. Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum in association with the Open University.

- Rudduck, J. (1982). 'The Ownership of Change as a Basis for Teachers' Professional Learning.' In Calderhead (1988a), 205-22.
- Sadaseevan, L. (1995). *Factors Influencing the Academic Achievement of Pupils in the National Type Primary (Tamil) School*. University Malaya Masters Thesis. LB 15345.
- Safi, A. *Ditch the dictionary: Finding a vocabulary comfort zone. Vocabulary, reading and multiple intelligences in an English as a second language classroom*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of TESOL, Chicago, IL. March, 1996.
- Salmani-Nodoushan, M. A. (2006). Research in the Language Classroom: State of the Art. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 2(2), 63-72.
- Sanders, J. R. (1981). *Case study methodology: A Critique*. In W.W. Welsh (ed.) *Case Study methodology in education Evaluation (87-100)* Proceedings of the 1981 Minnesota Evaluation Conference. Minneapolis: Minnesota Research and evaluation Center.
- Saphier, J. and Gower, R. (1987). *The Skillful Teacher*. Carlisle, MA: Research for Better Teaching, Inc.
- Saricaoglu, A. & Arikan, A. (2009). A study of multiple intelligences, foreign language success and some selected variables. *Journal of Theory and Practice Education*, 5(2), 110-112.
- Sattler, J. (1982). *The development of intelligence*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Scherer, M. (1999). *The Understanding Pathway: A Conversation with Howard Gardner*. *Educational Leadership*, 57(3), 12-16.
- Scherer, M (2006). Celebrate strengths, nurture affinities: a conversation with Mel Levine. *Educational Leadership*. 64, 8-15.
- Schwartz, W. (1997). *Strategies for Identifying the Talents of Diverse Students*. Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, NY
- Seefchak, C. (2008). Factors that influence achievement and self-efficacy in developmental university students. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Northcentral University.
- Selinger, H. W. & Shohamy, E. (1995). *Second language research methods*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Seliman, L. (2001). Students' Interest in Learning English. *The Star*, p.6.

- Shamsuddin, Ahmad (1995). *Contextual factors associate with evaluation practices of selected adult and continuing education providers in Malaysia*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Graduate Faculty, University of Georgia.
- Shantini, P. (2000). *A Study of the Teaching and Learning of English in a Primary School*. University Malaya, Masters Thesis LB 7 UM Shat.
- Shearer, C. B. (1997). *Development and Validation of a Multiple Intelligence Assessment Scale for Children*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association. 105th, Chicago, IL, August 15-19, 1997).
- Shearer, B. (2004). Multiple intelligences theory after 20 years. *Teachers college record*, 106, 2-16.
- Shepard, J. S. (2004). Multiple ways of knowing: fostering resiliency through providing opportunities for participating in learning, *Reclaiming children and youth*, 12, 210-216.
- Shore, J. R. (2004). Teacher Education and Multiple Intelligence: a case study of multiple intelligence and teacher efficacy in two teacher preparation courses. *Teacher College Record*, 106(1), 112-139.
- Silver, H, Strong, R. & Perini, M. (1997). Integrating learning styles and multiple intelligences. *Educational Leadership*, 55(1). 2: 2-9
- Siti Nurul Mahfuzah Mohammad, Sazilah Salam. (2013). A Self-Perceived Analysis of Students' Intelligence and Academic Achievement. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*. 7 (3), 51-55.
- Siti Nurul Mahfuzah Mohammad, Sazilah Salam, & Norasikin Bakar. (2014). Students' perceptions towards the Usage of Online Multiple Intelligences Teaching Tools in Learning. *Journal of applied Science and Agriculture*. 9 (11), 49-52.
- Siti Suria Salim and Sharifah Md Nor. (2001). 'The Problem of Change and Teacher classroom Practices.' *In Reflections, Visions & Dreams of Practice, Selected papers from the IEC 2001 International Education Conference*.
- Smagorinsky, P. (1995). *Multiple intelligences in the English class: an overview*. *English Journal*. 84 (8), 19-26.
- Smagorinsky, P. (1995). *Multiple intelligences, multiple means of composing: an alternative way of thinking about learning*. NASSP Bulletin. 80 (583).
- Small, C. (1977). *Music-society-Education*. London: John Calder (Publishing) Ltd.
- Smart School Project Team. (1997). *The Malaysian Smart School. An MSC flagship application. A conceptual blueprint*. Kuala Lumpur. Government of Malaysia.

- Smerchousky-Metzger, J. (1995). *Basics of Qualitative Research. Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Smith, L.M. (1978). *An Evolving Logic of Participant Observation, educational Ethnography and Other Case Studies*. In L. Shuman (Ed.), *Review of research in Education*, (pp 36 – 47). Itasca, IL.: Peacock.
- Smith, A. (1997, 2nd edn) *accelerated Learning in the classroom*. Stafford: Network Educational Press.
- Smith, J. L. (2007). *Engaging the Unmotivated Student*. Pacific Lutheran university. AAT 1447861.
- Smyth, J. (ed.) (1987). *Educating Teachers: Changing the Nature of Pedagogical Knowledge*. London: Falmer Press.
- Stake, R.E. (1994). *Case Studies*. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds). *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (P: 236-247).
- Stager, G. (2008). Teach the kids you have. *District Administration*, 44,54.
- Stanford, P. (2003). Multiple intelligence for every classroom. *Intervention in School and Clinic*. 39(2), 80-85.
- Stenhouse, L. (1980). *What is Action Research?* Norwich CARE, University of East Anglia, Norwich.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1985). *Beyond IQ*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1986). *Intelligence Applied*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1986). *The Future of Intelligence Testing*. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 5, 19-22.
- Sternberg, R.J. and Detterman, R. K. (1986). *What is Intelligence? Contemporary Viewpoints on Its Nature and Definition*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex..
- Sternberg, R.J. and Wagner, R. K. (1993). *The g-centric view of intelligence and job performance is wrong*. *Curriculum Direction Psychology Science*. 2. 1-4.
- Sternberg, R.J. and Lubart, T.L. (1995). *Defying the Crowd: Cultivating Creativity in a Culture of Uniformity*. New York: Free Press.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1996). *IQ Counts but What Really Counts is Successful Intelligence*. *NASSP Bulletin*. 80(583), 18-23.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1996). *How Intelligent is Intelligence Testing?* *Scientific American Presents*, 9 (40), 12-17.

- Sternberg, R.J. and Grigorenko, E.L. (1997). *Intelligence, Heredity and Environment*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R.J. and Kaufmann, J.C.. (1998). *Human Abilities*. Annual Review of Psychology, 49, 479-502.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2001). *Educational psychology*. Boston,USA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Subramaniam, G. (2003). 'Literature Programmes in Malaysian Schools: A Historical Overview.' In Subramaniam, G. (edt.). *Teaching of Literature in ESL/EFL Contexts*. Petaling Jaya: Sasbadi.
- Subramaniam, G. (2007). 'Literature Programmes in Malaysian Schools: Then and Now.' In Subramaniam, G. (edt.). *Teaching English in Malaysia: A Special 25th MELTA Anniversary Publication*. Petaling Jaya: Sasbadi.
- Sweet, S. (1988). *A Lesson Learned about Multiple Intelligences*. Educational Leadership, 56(3), 50-51.
- Sweeney, D.E. (1999). *MI Profiles: Enhancing Self-Esteem and Improving Academic Achievement*. Walden University. EDD Thesis. Proquest-Dissertation Abstract.
- Taylor-Powell, E., & Renner, M. (2003). *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System. Madison.
- Teele, S. (1994). *The Relationship of MI to the Instruction Process*. University of California. PhD Thesis. Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI: AAT 9501918)
- Teele, S. (1996). *Redesigning the Educational System to Enable All Students to Succeed*. NaSSP Bulletin, 80, (583), 65-70.
- Teele, S. (2000). *Rainbow of Intelligence: Exploring How Students Learn*. Sage Publications.
- Thomsen, E. (2003). *MI Theory in Practice. A Case Study of Two Teachers Taking Ownership of the Theory*. University of Alberta. PhD Dissertation. Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI: AAT NQ 82174)
- Ulrey, D. and Ulrey, J. (1992). *Developmentally Appropriate Practices meet MI*. Intelligences Connections 2, No. 1 (1992): 4-6.
- Underhill, A. (1992). 'The Role of Groups in developing teacher Self-awareness.' In *English Language Teaching Journal*. 46(1), 71-80.

- Vethamani, Malachi Edwin. (2007). *The Ebb and Flow of English Language Education in Malaysia – A Special 25th MELTA Anniversary*. Petaling Jaya: Sasbadi.
- Vialle, W. and Perry, J. (1995). *Nurturing Multiple Intelligences in the Australian Classroom*. Hawke Brown.
- Vialle, W. (1997). *In Australia: Multiple Intelligence in Multiple Settings*. Educational Leadership, 55(1), 65-67.
- Wallace, C. (1994). *Getting Started in the Classroom with MI*. In Faculty of the New York City School Celebrating MI: Teaching for Success (4th ed.) (p:255-258). St. Lois, MO: Faculty of the New City School.
- Wallen, N. E. (1974). *Educational researcher- A guide to the process*. (Experimental ed.) California: Wadsworth Publishing Company Ltd.
- Watkins, D., Biggs, J., and Regmi, M. (1991). 'Does Confidence in the Language of Instruction Influence a students' approach to Learning?' *Instructional Science*. 20:331-339.
- Weber, E. (2000). *One Size Intelligence Doesn't Fit All*. Mensa Canada Communications. 33, (1), 1-13.
- Weinreich-Haste, H. (1985). *The varieties of intelligence: An interview with Howard Gardner*. New Ideas in Psychology, 3,44,p:47-65.
- Weiss, R.S. (1994). *Learning from Strangers: The art and method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York: Free Press.
- Whalen, S. (1998). *Flow and the Engagement of Talent: Implications for Secondary Schooling*. Education for the Gifted and Talented. February, 22-37.
- White, N., Blythe, T., and Gardner, H. (1992). *MI: Creating the Thoughtful Classroom*. In R. Fogarty and bellanca. (Eds). MI: A Collection (p:179-193). Palantine, IL:IRI Skylight Publishing Inc.
- White, J. (1998). *Do Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligences add Up?* London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- White, R. (1998). What is Quality in English Language Teacher Education? *ELT Journal*. 52(2), 78-86.
- Wildermuth, B. (1993). *Post-positivist research: The examples of methodological pluralism*. Library Quarterly, 63, 450-468.
- William, B., and Woods, M. (1997). *Building on Urban Learners' Experiences*. Educational Leadership 54, 29-32.

- Willis, S. (1994). *The Well-Rounded Classroom: Applying the Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. ASCD update newsletter. 36(8), 1, 5 – 6, 8.
- Yan, J. (2006). *It is in daily life that the multiple intelligences for children was cultivated*. China: China Textile.
- Yang, S., & Sternberg, R. J. (1997b). Taiwanese Chinese people's conceptions of intelligence. *Intelligence*, 25, 21-36.
- Yekovich, F.R.. (1996). *Multiple Intelligences: Gardner's Theory*. Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation, Washington, DC.
- Yin, R. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- York, W. (2008). World's first multiple intelligence school. From Key learning community Website: www.616.ips.k12.in.us/default.aspx
- Young, D.J. (1991). 'Creating a Low anxiety Classroom Environment: What Does Language Anxiety Research Suggest? *Modern Language Journal*, 75; 426-439.