

Multiple Intelligences Speech Engagements for Oral Language Proficiency

Evelyn T. Bagoood
Ed.D.

English Instructor, College of Teacher Education

Surigao del Sur State University- Main Campus, Surigao del Sur, Tandag City, Philippines
Email address: dragoneve32064@gmail.com.

Abstract

To respond to the needs of the teachers and especially also of the language students, this study was conceived to experiment the use of multiple intelligences-based instructions in speech class. The study was intended to discover the oral language proficiency of the students through multiple intelligences speech engagements. The experiment was done in the whole semester class in Speech. There were 40 students subjected to experimental Multiple Intelligences speech engagements and another 40 to the typical speech instruction as control group. Oral language proficiency level was pre-post tested. It is discovered that Multiple Intelligences and Form-Focused speech engagements both develop oral language proficiency. Thus, there was a significant raise in the oral language proficiency of the students in the posttest. The raise of oral language proficiency among the Multiple Intelligences engaged and those under the Typical Speech engaged did show significant difference.

Key words: *Multiple Intelligences, Speech Engagements, Oral Language Proficiency*

INTRODUCTION

The global challenge of today to the academic sector is to produce graduates who are employable. Most graduates that have the oral language proficiency have an edge in the competitive job interviews. These realities are bases enough to say that language is an essential tool in the delivery of education and in alleviating poverty. There had been so many efforts to address the deteriorating English proficiency of the

graduates and even some teachers themselves. Feedbacks reaching the academic community on the low English proficiency of teachers and graduates (The Philippine Star) December 09, 2009) had in one way or another challenged the academic leaders to exhaust all efforts to improve the English proficiency among Filipino students.

The complexity of the language teachers' task in the classroom has increased as discoveries of new teaching methods come one after another. It had been the ideals of critics in teaching expertise that a teacher is expected of not merely delivering the exact coverage of the lesson; but also think that he caters different types of students. In many groups of students at Surigao Del Sur State University: English classes especially, teachers had observed students who are attuned to music, others to numbers , sports, dancing, and other extra-curricular activities . In fact, they spend more time excitedly in these activities more than in their classes . The different likes are no other than the special characteristics each human being was born with and traits of the different kinds of intelligences that should have been tapped and given attention in the varied Language classrooms, and maybe be even in other classes other than language class.

Observations of these explorations are challenges to answer a compelling question “ What if multiple intelligences will be applied in the Speech Classroom?” “Would it help improve oral language

proficiency ?” Having these questions in mind, this study desired to respond to the needs of the teachers and especially also of the language students . This study has been conceived to experiment the use of multiple intelligences speech engagements in speech class. This is to see what happens to the oral language proficiency after its engagement.

The results of the study give benefits to the curriculum planners, language teachers, language teaching trainers, instructional materials designers and most of all language students. It was determined to carry out innovations and new theories for oral language instruction.

It specifically sought answers to the queries on the level of oral language proficiency of the speech students before and after the multiple intelligences speech engagements ; the significant difference of the oral language proficiency before and after the experiment and; speech instruction design recommended based on the results of the study .

The study involved only two classes of Speech Communication students that comprised of 45studentseach. The conduct of the study covered July-September 30, 2010, of the first Semester of AY 2010-2011. Lessons covered were on Phonology specifically the segmental and supra-segmental phonemes and; the varied communication functions. It covered only English 3 course offered in second year teacher education students. It is only the oral proficiency of the students that was measured to find out the effects of multiple intelligences speech instruction. The application of intelligences in each lesson was limited since there were speech lessons which cannot fit with other MI activities.

METHODOLOGY

This is a quantitative research that used the experimental method of investigation to find out the effects of multiple intelligences speech instruction in

the Oral Proficiency of students . In order to obtain a group of students to be subjects to experimentation, the researcher used separate classes of English 3 (Speech and Oral Communication) students.

The experimental group was subjected to the MI Speech Instruction while the control group was subjected to the Typical Speech Instruction, An Oral Proficiency Test was conducted to the experimental group of students before the MI –based instruction and Non MI-based instruction to the control group.

The experimental group was subjected to the MI Speech Instruction while the control group was subjected to the Typical Speech Instruction. An Oral Proficiency Test was conducted to both the experimental group and the control group before the speech instruction was started.

The(<http://www.worldeducationcenter.eu/index.php/wclta/wclta2011/paper/view/7344>

(<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811029673>) result of such pretest was compared to the result of the post test on oral proficiency given after the MI –based instruction and the non-MI –based instruction in Speech and Oral Communication. One of the instruments used was the lesson design

The activities given in the MI Speech Instruction mostly spread according to the dominant intelligences developed among the students under the MI Speech Instruction. Since many of the students are inclined to bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, there were18 activities that were applied under such intelligence. This intelligence got the highest in number of applications. The least in number of applications is the existential intelligence which got also the least in number of students identified in the intelligence.

Below is the format of the lesson in the given to both MI group and Typical Speech Instruction group

Table 1
Lesson Design in the Conduct of Experiment

MI Speech Instruction	Typical Speech Instruction
I – Objectives II – Subject Matter III – Materials	Procedure: A - Identification B - Teacher production C - Student Production D - Discussion
E – Application Activities (MI Speech Class) There were two activities assigned that are with emphasis and special consideration of Multiple Intelligences. Activities on speech production may apply two or more of the following intelligences in each lesson: Verbal – Linguistic Logical – Mathematical Visual – Spatial Bodily - Kinesthetic Musical Interpersonal Intrapersonal Naturalistic	E- Application Activities (Typical Speech Class) There were two assigned activities that may select from these typical speech production activities: Poem reading Tongue twister’s production Role playing Conversational presentation Communicative Reading Group Interaction Debate Speech delivery Choral reading Speech choir presentation

Table 2
Number of Activities Given Per Intelligence

Intelligences	No. of Activities	Percent	Rank
Verbal/linguistic	48	100	1
Bodily-kinesthetic	18	38	2
interpersonal	15	31	3
musical	12	25	4
Visual-spatial	10	21	5
Logical-mathematical	6	13	6
naturalistic	4	8	7
intrapersonal	3	6	8
existential	2	4	9

Table 2 shows the distribution of activities per Intelligence. All of the activities were obviously linguistic in nature. Since there are 48 activities done all in all there were also 48 activities that were verbal/linguistic in nature. Activities other than verbal/ linguistic were given.

The instrument to test the oral proficiency of the speech communication students is adapted from the University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations. Only the speaking test was extracted since the study focused only on the oral proficiency of the students.

The test lasted for 15 minutes. This speaking test contains 4 parts. It follows an interaction pattern where there are 2-3 students to take and three raters to assess. One rater will act as the interlocutor and manages the interaction either by asking questions or providing cues for the student examinees. The other two raters will do the assessment but does not join in the conversation. Short exchanges with the interlocutor and with the other student examinee will last 1 minute. The task is collaborative involving two student examinees in a discussion.

Part 1 of the speaking test has the task type and format of a conversation between the interlocutor and each student through spoken questions. The focus of the conversation is the general interactional and social language it will last for a maximum of three minutes.

Part 2 has task type format of an individual “long turn” talk of a student with a brief response from the second student. In turn, the students are given three pictures to talk about. The focus of the test is on organizing a larger unit of discourse; comparing, describing, expressing opinions and, speculating. Timing is set as 1-minute for ‘long turn’ for each student, plus a 30-second response from the second student.

Part 3 of the test gives a task type and format of two-way conversation between the students. The students are given spoken instructions with written and visual stimuli, which are used in a decision-making task. The focus is on sustaining an interaction, exchanging ideas, expressing and justifying opinions, agreeing and/or disagreeing, suggesting, speculating, evaluating, reaching a decision through negotiation and others. It has set time of 4 minutes.

Part 4 gives a task type and format of discussion topics related to the collaborative task (spoken questions). It focused on expressing and justifying

opinions, agreeing and or disagreeing. It lasts for 4 minutes.

The rubric in scoring the oral language proficiency of the students contains four criteria namely: **Grammar and Vocabulary, Discourse Management, Pronunciation and Interactive Communication.**

Statistical tool used: Weighted Mean, and t-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Students’ Oral Language Proficiency Level Before Exposure to MI Speech Instruction and Typical Speech Instruction.

1.1 The Oral Language Proficiency Level of the Experimental Group before the Multiple Intelligences Speech Instruction.

The result of the oral test showed the following Oral Proficiency of the students before they underwent multi-intelligences based instruction. It can be gleaned on Table 3 that English 3 (Speech and Oral Communication) students got their pretest ratings after being rated by the invited raters who are also English instructor.

Table 3
Pretest Results of the Experimental Group (Multiple Intelligences Speech Instruction)

Oral Language Proficiency Components	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
Grammar and Vocabulary	2.75	Good
Discourse Management	2.85	Good
Pronunciation	2.89	Good
Interactive Communication	2.88	Good
TOTAL	2.84	Good

Legend: .20-5.00 – excellent
 3.40-4.19 – very good
 2.60-3.39 – good
 1.80-2.59 – poor
 1.00-1.79 – very poor

The level of oral proficiency as shown in the mean rating mark is described only as **good**. Such description of the experimental group in their oral proficiency only implies that they have not enriched yet their oral proficiency despite their experiences in English courses they have taken as they entered tertiary education. With such description in their oral proficiency their speech instruction was challenged to carry out the task of enhancing their oral proficiency.

1.2 The Oral Proficiency Level of the Control Group before the Typical Speech Instruction

Table 4 shows the description of the control group students in their oral proficiency during pre-experimental period. The Typical Speech Instruction group or control group had a rating mark of 2.90 in general which is just the same with the MI group or experimental group. It shows also that the lowest mean rating is in grammar and vocabulary. The findings reveal that the oral proficiency level of the control group was just the same with the experimental group. They all were described in their oral proficiency as **good**. It further revealed that there is an equal footing of the two groups in the oral proficiency level since they all got a description of good in their oral proficiency in the pretest.

Table 4
Pretest Results of the Control Group
(Typical Speech Instruction)

Oral Language Proficiency Components	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
Grammar and Vocabulary	2.80	Good
Discourse Management	2.90	Good
Pronunciation	2.95	Good
Interactive Communication	2.90	Good
TOTAL	2.90	Good

This implies that both the experimental and the control group had the same need and profile of oral proficiency in

English. Both the two groups had grammar and vocabulary as the lowest in mean rating. In this case, the two groups had also the same needs and attention in their oral proficiency

In order to see whether the MI group or the Typical Speech Instruction group has an advantage over the other, the pretest results of both were submitted for statistical test of significant difference. What follows is the presentation of the computation showing the difference.

Table 5
The Difference between Control Group and Experimental Group in Pretest Oral Proficiency Level Paired Sample Test

	Paired Differences		t	do	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 MI pretest-TSI pretest	-.39411	.59856	.415	44	.680

***not significant**

Looking into the test of significant difference, it is seen here that the t value is smaller than the 2 tailed significance. It simply means that there is no significant difference of the experimental group and the control group in terms of their oral proficiency level before the instruction in speech and oral communication was done. It is therefore established that there is no bias in the selection of the control (<http://ictl.intimal.edu.my/proceedings/Parallel20Sessions204/4E/4E-05-P192.docx>) group and the experimental group of students. They have been identified to belong to experimental and control group with equal level of oral proficiency.

There is an established measure that proves the equal footing of the MI group and the Typical Speech Instruction group. It

means that there is fair selection of the subjects used in the study.

Students' Oral Proficiency Level after Exposure to MI Speech Instruction for the experimental group. It is in Table 6 that the result is presented.

Table 6
Post test Result of the Experimental Group (MI group)

Oral English Proficiency Components	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
Grammar and Vocabulary	3.93	Very good
Discourse Management	4.18	Very good
Pronunciation	3.95	Very good
Interactive Communication	4.69	Excellent
TOTAL	4.19	Very good

Grammar and vocabulary resource component is the lowest which only implies that the students did not have much competence and performance in the use of forms of language structures. It had shown also not a high competence and performance in the use of range of functional words in speaking. It had an excellent competence and performance in the strategies to maintain interaction and development of discussion. This is also true to their competence and performance in the pronunciation component. This weakness of the MI group in two particular components may be negligible but it entails a struggling nature of a speaker to be able to produce the correct sound of the language.

In this case where interactive communication component is the highest in proficiency rating, there is much to note since language has succeeded in its purpose which is to be instrumental in man's interaction as a social being. Interaction is the primary channel of the social individual in order to be understood and feel belongingness. The overall description of the oral proficiency of the MI group

students after MI Speech instruction is very good and very nearly reached the mark of **excellent**. It only showed that the oral proficiency of the students was improved to a high degree given the multiple intelligences instruction. To think that application activities given in the multiple intelligences instruction were really very demanding of time, effort and much thinking, it is then remarkable to find that the oral competence and performance of the students were increased to a high degree.

2.2 Typical Speech Instruction for the control group.

Table 7
Post test Result of the Control Group (Typical Speech Lesson)

Oral Proficiency Components	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
Grammar and Vocabulary	4.10	Very good
Discourse Management	4.18	Very good
Of the Pronunciation	4.57	Excellent
competence and performance Interactive Communication	4.23	Excellent
TOTAL	4.27	Excellent

Legend: 4.20-5.00 – excellent
3.40-4.19 – very good
2.60-3.39 – good
1.80-2.59 – poor
1.00-1.79 – very poor

Table 7 shows that in the Typical Speech Instruction group go**thighest** oral proficiency level in the **pronunciation** component which reflects **4.57** described as **excellent**. The **lowest** oral proficiency of the Typical Speech Instruction group is in **grammar and vocabulary** which reflected **4.10** described as **very good**. The **overall** oral proficiency of the **Typical Speech Instruction** group is **4.27** described as **excellent**.

The students showed a little less competence and performance in their grammar and vocabulary just the same with

the MI group. It could really be observed that grammar and vocabulary was given no particular attention in speech instruction. Being less also in the competence and performance in discourse management is a result of poor vocabulary power. They were not able to perform high in discourse management since they are short of words to say in order to sustain conversation or the discourse.

It is remarkable to note the high proficiency of students in pronunciation component given the typical speech instruction. There is an implication that the repetitive practice of oral production of words had helped much in attaining correct pronunciation. Tongue twisters, jazz chants and drills though rote often times, can be very helpful for speech learners to imitate in the end the exact production of sound.

Most of the typical speech instruction activities are repetitive and audio-lingual in method. It therefore supports the idea that when speech students are exposed to imitative reproduction of words given a good model can be improved in their pronunciation. There is really power in repetitive and corrective process of words reproduction.

The speech instruction; be it typical or multiple intelligences in method had made a significant improvement of the oral proficiency of students. It is shown in the t – test that the t value is still very high and the 2 – tailed significance is very much lower than the t value, It means that there is a significant difference in the pre-post mean gain of those who received the multiple intelligences speech instruction and those who received the typical speech instruction of speech and oral communication.

Table 8
The MI and TSI Pre-Post Difference
Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences				
		Mean				
Pair 1 MI pretest – post test		-1.40889				
Pair 1 TSI pretest – post test		-1.32222				
		Paired Differences				
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Lower	upper	t	do	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	MI pretest –post test	-1.85403	-.96374	-6.379	44	.000
Pair 2	TSI pretest –post test	-1.44707	-1.19738	-21.345	44	.000

***significant difference**

Both groups have significantly gained in their mean as it is seen above that MI group had gained 1.40889 from pretest mean rate to post test mean rate. The Typical Speech Instruction group had also significantly gained 1.32222 from the pretest mean rating to posttest mean rating. This is strong evidence that both typical speech instruction and multiple intelligences

instruction in speech can make improvements as long as it is properly used and opted for by the creative and zealous teacher.

Table 9
The MI – TSI Post Test Difference
Paired Samples Test

Pair 1 MI post test – TSI Posttest		Paired Differences				
		Mean				
		-.01556				
		Paired Differences				
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Lower	Upper	t	do	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 MI post test-TSI post test		-.21952	.18840	-.154	44	.879

***not significant**

Table 9 shows the difference between the post test result of the MI group and the TSI group. It has a mean difference of -.01556 which was put to test of significance. It had a t value of -.154 which is far lesser than the 2-tailed .879 significances. It is analyzed that there is no significant difference in the overall oral proficiency level of the MI group and the TSI group after the experimental instruction was done.

All the data gathered in this study have pointed out that the oral proficiency of the students have increased regardless of whether it was through the Multi-Intelligences Speech Instruction or just the Typical Speech Instruction given in the speech and oral communication course.

This is even one of the reasons why there are efforts including this study to explore different bases for instruction in order to come up with a conclusion as basis for recommendation. Competency in grammar is also observed low. There is a glaring reality that many of the students have less competency in grammar and vocabulary resources.

Looking into each oral proficiency component of the rubric in the case of MI group, it is revealed that the students had the highest mark in their **interactive communication**. It means that they have

developed as much as becoming **excellent** from just being described as good in the pretest of this experiment. There is a sign of disparity in the improvement done in their interactive communication ability as described excellent compared to their grammar an vocabulary, discourse management and pronunciation which are improved but only up to the description of Very good, only one step higher than the level that they had in the pretest. It can also be noted that the lowest in means of the four components is the grammar and vocabulary.

As a whole the students got a general average weighted mean of 4.19 which is generally described as very good. The experimental group of students is just standing at the threshold of the point at being excellent in their oral proficiency. Being almost at the point of the excellent level in the average weighted mean of the post test can be attributed to their high level of proficiency particularly in the interactive communication competency.

The findings tell that the students did improve in their oral proficiency from good in the pretest to very good in the post test. It implies that the instruction has helped in the improvement of the students' oral proficiency in English. The points though, show not the maximum level of excellence in the oral proficiency but it

showed excellence in interactive communication.

The Typical Speech Instruction group had reached an overall description of excellent (4.27) although just a matter of .01556 mean difference from that of the MI group which is described very good (4.19). IT is just a negligible disparity.

Students in the control group have improved significantly in their oral proficiency level even with the typical speech instruction. When examined in every component there is really a remarkable development that can be observed that there is also an effect in the oral proficiency of the students done by simply remaining to apply the Typical Speech Instruction described as Form –Focused engagement.

Examining the activities conducted in the Typical Speech Instruction, many are actually related to the multi-intelligences activities save that it was not specifically varied and interactive. This is maybe the reason why it is pronunciation that is highly developed in the TSI group. It is then fit to say that not at all times multi intelligences had worked for the effectiveness of proficiency. It is good to relate this to the claims on the literature that despite helping to shift language learning away from the more rote, noted the indirect approach fails to; address the other areas of competent methodologies the indirect approach is not without its drawbacks. Critically, it is flawed to some extent in its assumption of Krashen's acquisitions theory as being as equally valid for second language learning.

It is however very important to note their oral proficiency difference in between components. This interpretation of the data implies that in speech and oral communication it is good to use multiple intelligences with application of all the nine in the range of activities. The instruction must not also forget the usual practice which is very linguistic in nature. This is so because those who got excellent in the pronunciation are those who were given the

typical speech instruction pattern in speech and oral communication which is more rote and do not cater much interactive communication, while those who got excellent in interactive communication are those who were given the multi-intelligences speech instruction..

Based also in the findings, the MI and Typical Speech Instruction group are low in language grammar. This finding also show that grammar and vocabulary was not given emphasis in the lessons because; many are still weak in speaking because they lack vocabulary and grammar resources which are very essential in speaking. Ur (2009) in his Teaching Grammar: Research, Theory and Practice, urged that grammar in spoken English should be taught continuously. Based on his research, though it seemed to have been widely accepted that in spoken English and instant messaging in emails there are uses of; non-sentence fragments, unconventional or inconsistent sentence structures, ellipsis, 'heads' and 'tails', chunks and other vagueness tags, it remains a responsible task for language teachers to pay attention in teaching grammar. One of his reasons for doing so is that learners expect to be taught what they see as 'standard' grammar. Another reason for the insistent teaching is that teachers see the teaching of acceptable grammar as part of their professional remit. (http://fdzenglisch.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/proj_fdz_englisch/Confere_nce/PennyUr20090228...)

On the other hand of these research findings; the difference is centered not on the general oral proficiency gained by the two groups. The difference is seen instead in particular component of the oral competency. It is clear that there was a significant increase in the mean gained by MI group particularly on **Interactive Communication** while, the Non MI group got its significant mean gain particularly in **Pronunciation**.

This case relates much to the theory mentioned in the literatures of this study that says “Language was said to develop through internalization and memorization of structures and habits through reiteration of corrective feedback. Imitation of a regulatory model was the primary technique used for teaching students a new language using this perspective” (Kern & Warschauer, 2000). It must be logical to say that when it comes to teaching pronunciation, there is effectiveness when the instruction is more on audio-lingual method and students are made to memorize and form the habit of uttering the word in correct sound structure. It must also maintain reiterated feedback.

In the light of the pre-post difference of both the MI and TSI group, the researcher found out that Multi-Intelligences Speech Instruction has an effect particularly only in the specific oral proficiency component which is Interactive Communication. With this interpretation of the researcher of the findings, it is clear that Multi – Intelligences Speech Instruction contributes best on the most important and functional component of Oral Proficiency and that is ***Interactive Communication***. Interactive Communication is well developed in the ***Language Functions*** lessons of Speech and Oral Communication. It simply means that Multi-Intelligences Speech Instruction can be very helpful to enhance interactive communication that is very functional in the spoken language. If in the typical speech instruction multiple intelligences is not specifically given emphasis, it could be modified by identifying what particular intelligences are considered in every activity conducted.

Since pronunciation or correct sounding of English contributes much to the intelligibility of the spoken language, it is well then to relate to the argument posed by the study of Kashiwagi and Snyder (2003) on the Effects of Form –Focused Instruction on Pronunciation. The findings in the study

had a strong argument to support the usefulness of the explicit instruction in phonetic symbols in school. Their findings showed that a significant number of learners could benefit from the teaching of abstract rules. The participants even commented that not only that explicit instruction coupled with phonetic transcription helped them learn to produce English sounds better, but also that being able to produce sounds better led them to hear the sounds better.

The study of Kashiwagi and Snyder (2003) suggested that teachers once again subscribe to the traditional mode of a rigid teaching sequence, where presentation of abstract rules must come first, followed by practice and error correction until the rules are mastered. It is in other words, closely supportive of the non-MI-based instruction given to the control group of this experimental study. Consistently, with such non MI-based instruction the control group gained advantage in pronunciation proficiency component over the MI group. It is very well to go back again to the suggestion Kashiwagi and Snyder that teachers must be aware that explicit instruction does not lead directly to automatic, productive use, but direct instruction, consciousness raising, and focus on form are valuable to the extent that they help learners bring order to the input they encounter, facilitate understanding, boost or support natural acquisition. It said that efforts should be made to explore how direct instruction of rules can be incorporated within a communicative framework spiced with application activities of complete set of multiple intelligences activities

4.The Instructional Design in Speech Recommended Based on the Findings of the Study

Both the lesson designs of the Multiple Intelligences Speech Instruction and the Typical Speech Instruction used as instrument in this study is recommended for

use to augment the teacher's preparation in the conduct of speech class. Since there was remarkable oral proficiency gains in the use of Multiple Intelligences Speech instruction the teacher may opt to use it as it is desired to also develop the students in their intelligences with a target of promoting and improving their oral proficiency.

This study has ended with a generated theory of two-pronged speech proficiency. The theory asserts that Multiple Intelligences Speech engagements can promote and improve the oral proficiency of students as much as the Form-Focused engagements in a speech classroom.

CONCLUSION

Since Multiple Intelligences instruction's rate of developing oral language proficiency has no significant difference from the rate of the Typical Speech Instruction which is Form - Focused, a conclusion is drawn: "Multiple Intelligences and Form – Focused type of speech engagements both develop oral language proficiency." Multiple intelligences can work well especially on the development of interactive communication while a Form-Focused activity on the pronunciation or language sounds.

RECOMMENDATION

This study has recommended a generated theory of two-pronged speech proficiency. The theory asserts that Multiple Intelligences Speech engagements can promote and improve the oral proficiency of students as much as the Form-Focused engagements in a speech classroom. Multiple intelligences can work well especially on the development of interactive communication while Form-Focused activities on the pronunciation or language sound.

LITERATURE CITED

Ho Hoe Teck, Sean (2005) The Language Function of Halliday

Kashiwagi Atsuko. & Snyder Michael (2003). The Effects of Form –Focused Instruction On Pronunciation. Showa Women's University. Japan Jalt-publications.org/archive/proceedings/2003/EO11pdf-Japan.retrieved: Oct. 26, 2010

Learning Theories Knowledgebase (2008), November). Multiple Intelligences Theory (Gardner) at Learning-Theories.com Retrieved November 18th, 2008 from <http://www.learning-theories.com/gardners-multiple-intelligences-th>

The Philippine Star) December 09, 2009

Ur, Penny (2009) Teaching Grammar: Research, Theory and Practice. University of Vienna *fdz-englisch.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user.../proj.../PennyUr20090228.pdf* Retrieved Feb 28, 2009

<http://www.worldeducationcenter.eu/index.php/wclta/wclta2011/paper/view/7344>

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811029673>

<http://ictl.intimal.edu.my/proceedings/Parallel20Sessions204/4E/4E-05-P192.docx>