

FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND VIETNAMESE

APPLYING THE THEORY OF MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TO PRIMARY STUDENTS IN HANOI

TRAN THI DUyen* - TRAN THI THANH LAN**

ABSTRACT: This paper presents a quasi-experimental research project that investigates the effects of applying the Multiple Intelligences theory into the teaching of English language on students' learning engagement and learning outcomes at a primary school in Hanoi. The instructional intervention lasted for five weeks, with activities purposefully designed to align with the different types of intelligences of the students. The data collected from pre- and post-intervention questionnaires, pre-test and post-test, and classroom observations of the control and experimental groups revealed that applying the Multiple Intelligences theory in teaching English lessons significantly improved students' learning engagement and outcomes. This study provides valuable insights for educators and researchers interested in integrating Multiple Intelligences theory into language teaching at the primary level. Future research directions and implications for instructional design are also included in the study.

KEY WORDS: Multiple Intelligences; English teaching; primary; engagement; learning outcomes.

RECEIVED: March, 20th, 2025.

EDITED: June, 20th, 2025

1. Introduction

English, as an international language, has become a crucial tool for global communication and plays a significant role in various fields, including economics, education, science, culture, and daily interactions. In Vietnam, the demand for learning English is growing rapidly, especially after the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET, 2018) mandated English as a compulsory subject at the primary school level starting in 2021. However, addressing the diversity of students' learning styles remains a significant challenge. Tomlinson (2001) emphasized that traditional teaching methods often fail to cater to all students, leading to a lack of interest and low learning outcomes. To address this, Gardner's theory of Multiple Intelligences has been introduced as an innovative approach that focuses on tailoring teaching methods to align with individual strengths and learning styles.

Previous studies have shown that applying Multiple Intelligences theory (Gardner, 1983; 1999) can significantly enhance student engagement and learning outcomes, particularly at the primary school level (Armstrong, 1994; 2009; Sibanda, 2022). However, research on applying this theory in English teaching in Vietnam remains limited. In response to the increasing demand for improving the effectiveness of English language teaching at primary level, this study explores the application of the Multiple Intelligences theory in teaching English to third-grade students at a primary school in Hanoi. In particular, it investigates how effective the application of the Multiple Intelligence approach is in improving primary students' learning engagement and learning outcomes.

2. Literature review

2.1. Overview of Multiple Intelligences Theory

The Theory of Multiple Intelligences (Gardner, 1983), proposed by psychologist Howard Gardner, suggests that intelligence is not just the ability to solve problems, but also the ability to create products and solve problems in various ways. Gardner asserts that every individual possesses multiple types of intelligence, not just a single one. Initially, he identified seven core types of

*Dr; Hanoi University of Industry, Ha Noi, Vietnam; Email: tranthiduyen@hau.edu.vn

**Mai Dich Primary School, Hanoi, Viet Nam; Email: felicitytran2023@gmail.com

intelligence: linguistic intelligence, logical-mathematical intelligence, musical intelligence, spatial intelligence, bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, and intrapersonal intelligence. Later, he added two new intelligences: naturalistic intelligence and existential intelligence, bringing the total number of intelligences to nine (Gardner, 1999).

Each type of intelligence represents a unique ability of human beings. *Linguistic intelligence* is related to the ability to use words effectively, including the ability to speak and write, as well as sensitivity to the meanings of words. *Logical-mathematical intelligence* involves the ability to reason, analyze data, and identify abstract patterns, often applied in fields such as science, mathematics, and logical reasoning. *Musical-rhythmic intelligence* reflects the ability to recognize and create patterns of sound, rhythm, and melody, allowing those with this intelligence to express themselves through music, clapping, tapping rhythms, or playing instruments. *Spatial intelligence* is the ability to imagine and create images in the mind, enabling those with this intelligence to analyze and organize objects in space visually. *Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence* is the ability to use the body to solve problems, demonstrated through physical activities such as sports, dance, or craftsmanship. *Interpersonal intelligence* represents the ability to understand and interact with others, recognizing their emotions and motivations, which helps those with this intelligence develop communication and collaboration skills in groups. *Intrapersonal intelligence* refers to the ability to understand and control one's emotions, motivations, and personal goals, typically found in individuals who are self-reflective and able to set clear objectives. *Naturalistic intelligence* helps individuals perceive and understand the natural world, distinguish natural phenomena, and sense changes in the surrounding environment. *Existential intelligence* is the ability to contemplate big life questions, such as the meaning of life, death, and human existence, enabling those with this intelligence to seek a deep understanding of their position and purpose in the universe.

The Theory of Multiple Intelligences emphasizes that each individual possesses various types of intelligence, which develop concurrently with maturity and environmental influence. These intelligences are not fixed but are constantly evolving and can be strongly developed when nurtured and supported. Moreover, the development of one type of intelligence can positively impact others.

2.2. Application of the Multiple Intelligences Theory in Education

Multiple Intelligences Theory has been widely recognized in educational research for its potential to improve/integrating Multiple Intelligences theory into educational practices to address diverse learning styles, enhance cognitive and academic development, and support inclusive education for all students.

2.3. Multiple Intelligences theory in Primary Education

The application of Multiple Intelligences theory in teaching English to primary school students has also been a focal research point in different countries. Research by Boukhari (2018) emphasizes that aligning educational activities with students' intelligence types leads to enhanced learning outcomes. Ernawati et al. (2019) highlighted the effectiveness of Multiple Intelligences theory in engaging young learners, noting that understanding students' intelligence types facilitates the design of more effective lessons. However, challenges remain in fully integrating Multiple Intelligences theory into classroom practices, such as the need for comprehensive teacher training and resource availability (Astutie, 2017). Overall, the literature supports the potential of Multiple Intelligences theory to enrich English language instruction, particularly at the primary level. This study aims to contribute to the body of knowledge by evaluating the effectiveness of Multiple Intelligences theory in enhancing learning engagement and outcomes for primary school students in Hanoi. By employing a differentiated instructional approach rooted in Multiple Intelligences theory, this research seeks to address the diverse needs for learners, ultimately promoting a more effective and engaging English language learning experience.

3. Methodology

A quasi-experimental research design is utilized in this study. Two groups of third grade students at a primary school in Hanoi were invited to participate in the study after gaining consent from the students and their parents. One group was randomly assigned as the experimental group and the other was the control group. Each group consisted of 40 students, all aged eight or nine years. Both groups followed the program mandated by the Ministry of Education. However, while the teaching of the control group followed the traditional textbook-based teaching methods, the lessons delivered to the experimental group were intentionally designed to align with the students' Intelligence tendencies.

The research process consists of three stages: pre-, while and post-intervention. Before the instructional intervention, both groups completed a pre-intervention survey to identify the dominant intelligences and explore the students' attitudes towards English lessons and learning activities. Based on the results of the experimental groups' dominant intelligence tendencies, the lessons delivered to the experimental group during the intervention were designed so that most of the learning activities matched with the dominant intelligences. The students in both groups also took a pre-intervention test to measure their English competence before the intervention. During the intervention, classroom observations were conducted in both classes, focusing on the students' learning attitudes and behaviours. After the intervention, students in both groups were invited to respond to post-intervention questionnaires and took a post-test. The questionnaire and test results were analysed and compared with the pre-intervention results to examine any changes in the students' attitudes towards English lessons, their preferred learning activities and learning achievement.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Results of pre-survey questionnaires

4.1.1. Students' intelligence tendencies

To understand students' dominant intelligence tendencies, the pre-intervention questionnaires asked students to choose the activities they usually participate in when they have free time and the activities they enjoyed most in the English lessons. Their responses are demonstrated in Tables 1 and 2.

As can be seen in Table 1, regarding free-time activities, many students in the experimental group like playing sports or dancing (42%), reading books or stories (32.5%), playing chess or checkers (30%) and drawing and coloring (25%). Some other students enjoy such activities as working or playing with friends (17.5%), looking after plants or pets (10%) and listening to or playing music (10%). Only one student in the experimental group delights in writing diaries or sitting or thinking alone. These results indicate that the students in the experimental group have a strong tendency towards such intelligences as Bodily-Kinesthetic, Verbal-Linguistic, Logical-Mathematical, and Visual-Spatial and less on Intrapersonal or Existential intelligences. And the control group exhibits a stronger inclination toward Visual-Spatial (35%) and Intrapersonal (10%) intelligences. Notably, few students in either group showed a preference for activities to Intrapersonal or Existential intelligences.

Table 1. Students' free time activities

Free-time Activities	Intelligence tendency	Experimental group		Control Group	
		N	%	N	%
Playing sports or dancing	Bodily-Kinesthetic	17	42.5%	10	25.0%
Reading books or stories	Verbal-Linguistic	13	32.5%	11	27.5%
Playing chess or checkers	Logical-Mathematical	12	30.0%	7	17.5%
Drawing or coloring	Visual/Spatial	10	25.0%	14	35.0%

Cooperating to work or play with friends	Interpersonal	7	17.5%	6	15.0%
Taking care of plants and raising pets	Naturalistic	4	10.0%	6	15.0%
Listening to music, singing or playing instruments	Musical/Rhythms	4	10.0%	1	2.5%
Writing a diary	Intrapersonal	1	2.5%	1	0.0%
Sitting and thinking alone	Existential	1	2.5%	4	10%

Regarding students' preferred learning activities in English lessons, as can be seen in Table 2, the most preferred learning activities for students in the experimental groups are playing games (42.5%), giving presentations (32.5%), drawing and colouring (30%), pairwork and groupwork (27.5%). None of the students favor writing new vocabulary in the notebook or sitting quietly alone. The results on the students' preferred learning activities are in alignment with the results on students' preferred free time activities to demonstrate the students' strong preference for Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence, Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence, Visual-Spatial Intelligence, and Interpersonal Intelligence.

Table 2. *Students' preferred learning activities in English lessons*

Free-time Activities	Intelligence tendency	Experimental group		Control Group	
		N	%	N	%
Participating in games and activities	Bodily-Kinesthetic	17	42.5%	12	30.0%
Giving presentations in English	Verbal-Linguistic	13	32.5%	9	22.5%
Drawing and coloring based on lesson themes	Visual/Spatial	12	30.0%	15	37.5%
Working in pairs or groups	Interpersonal	11	27.5%	7	17.5%
Reading chants and learning songs	Musical/Rhythms	6	15.0%	6	15.0%
Exploring and learning about the world	Naturalistic	6	15.0%	4	10.0%
Matching words or correcting mistakes in sentences	Logical-Mathematical	2	5.50%	1	2.5%
Writing new vocabulary in your notebook	Intrapersonal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sitting quietly alone	Existential	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Similar to the experimental group, students in the control group also exhibited a strong inclination toward Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence, Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence, Visual-Spatial Intelligence, and Interpersonal Intelligence. The only difference was that more students in the control group possess Visual-Spatial Intelligence and Music/Rhythms Intelligence than those in the experimental group.

The results on the experimental students' preferred free time and learning activities informed the design of the English lessons during the five-week intervention. As presented in Table 3, activities compatible with each type of intelligence were integrated in the lesson with the proportion of the activities used corresponding to the proportion of the students' dominant intellectual tendencies. Unlike the experimental group, the activities carried out in the control group followed those outlined in the course book *Wonderful World 3*, published by the University of Education Publishing House in Hanoi. Examples of the activities used in both groups during the intervention are presented in Appendix 1.

Table 3. *Aligning learning activities toward experimental students' intelligence tendencies*

Research results on students' intelligence		Learning activities for the experimental group	
Intelligences types	Percentage of students	Examples of learning activities	Total number of activities

Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence	42.5 %	Slap the board, Jumping, Who is faster, pass the ball, Simon says, Alphabet movement game	19
Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence	32.5 %	Making a project, presenting, story creation	13
Visual-Spatial Intelligence	25-30 %	Lucky number, magic wheel, Guessing game, Missing pictures, Hidden pictures, Let's colour, magic show game, Flashcards for vocabulary learning	12
Logical-Mathematical Intelligence	5.5-30 %	Hang man, Save the monkey, save the jungle, matching words with right pictures, filling with the missing words, sentence puzzle.	12
Interpersonal Intelligence	17.5-27.5 %	interview, Cooperative stories, Cooperative answering, family member hunt, group quizz show	8
Musical-Rhythmic Intelligence	10-15 %	Chanting, Musical chair, clapping rhythms, sing a song	6
Naturalistic Intelligence	10-15 %	Colour hunt, Classroom Object Hunt	5
Intrapersonal Intelligence	0-2.5 %	Journal writing	1
Existential Intelligence	0-2.5 %	Exploring different cultures	1

4.1.2. Students' attitudes towards English lessons

Table 4 demonstrates students' responses to the question "How do you feel about learning English?". As can be seen, 80% of students in the experimental group indicated positive attitudes toward English language learning. Meanwhile, the figure for the control group was a bit higher, at 92.5 %. However, the independent sample t-test results show no statistically significant difference between the two groups, $t(73.974) = .308$, $p = .759$, despite more students in the control group ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 0.636$) indicating that they like English lessons than those in the experimental group ($M = 4.38$, $SD = 0.8066$) ($M = 55$, $SD = 8$). This similarity suggests that observed effects in subsequent analyses are unlikely to be influenced by initial differences in English interest between the groups.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Interest Levels in the English Subject

		Experimental Group		Control Group	
		N	%	N	%
How do you feel about learning English?	Strongly Dislike	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Dislike	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Normal	8	20.0%	3	7.5%
	Like	9	22.5%	17	42.5%
	Strongly Like	23	57.5%	20	50.0%
Mean		4.38		4.43	
Standard Deviation		0.8066		0.636	

4.2. Results of Post-Intervention questionnaire

The post-intervention survey asked students in both groups to reflect on the English lessons and learning activities they had experienced during the intervention. The results were analyzed to identify any differences in students' perceptions of the intervention's effectiveness and to determine whether their learning attitudes had changed compared to the pre-intervention survey. Table 5 presents their responses to the question, *'To what extent do you agree with the following statements?'* using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Table 5. Students' opinions of the English lessons

Statements	N	Experimental group		Control group	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
I feel excited about the English learning activities in class.	40	4.53	.506	2.13	1.4176
I understand the lessons better.	40	4.28	.784	2.40	1.4465
I feel more confident participating in activities with the teacher and classmates.	40	4.38	.705	2.20	1.3812
I enjoy participating in activities during English lessons.	40	4.55	.597	2.28	1.4140
I enjoy learning and exploring topics in the lessons.	40	4.35	.700	2.304	1.3243
I look forward to having similar English lessons in the future.	40	4.33	.606	2.45	1.4313

The students' perceptions of English lessons, as presented in Table 5, reveal a significant difference between the experimental and control groups. Participants in the experimental group exhibited a notably more positive attitude toward English lessons, with mean scores ranging from 4.33 to 4.53 out of 5, compared to mean scores between 2.13 and 2.45 in the control group. Notably, the experimental group reported higher levels of enjoyment, comprehension, and confidence in class activities. For example, the majority of students in the experimental group strongly agreed with the statement, "I feel excited about the English learning activities in class," yielding a mean score of 4.53 out of 5. In contrast, only a small proportion of students in the control group shared this sentiment, with a mean score of 2.13. Furthermore, the lower standard deviation (SD) in the experimental group indicates greater consistency in students' positive attitudes toward English lessons, whereas the higher SD in the control group suggests greater variability and lower agreement in their learning experiences. These findings indicate that the Multiple Intelligences-based approach significantly improved students' attitudes toward English learning and fostered a more engaging and cohesive learning environment compared to traditional teaching methods.

Table 6. Students' opinions on the learning activities

Statements	N	Experimental group		Control group	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Participating in classroom games	40	4.75	0.58	4.2	0.85
Working in pairs or groups.	40	4.78	0.55	4.3	0.78
Matching words or correcting mistakes in sentences.	40	4.70	0.65	4.1	1.0
Drawing and coloring pictures based on lesson topics.	40	4.65	0.60	4.2	0.75
Learning chants and songs.	40	4.85	0.70	4.4	0.82
Writing down new words in notebooks	40	3.90	0.85	3.6	0.95
Giving presentations in English in front of the class.	40	4.75	0.72	4.15	1.05
Exploring and learning about the world around us with topics like trees, nature, animals, etc	40	4.72	0.65	4.35	0.90
Sitting alone and reflecting quietly, without engaging in conversations or activities.	40	3.40	1.15	4.04	0.88

Table 6 presents the students' responses to the question of "How do you like the activities in the English lessons?" which was on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5, respectively indicating strongly dislike, dislike, not sure, like and strongly like. As can be seen, there is a strong preference for interactive, collaborative, and creative activities in the experimental group. The highest-rated activities included learning chants and songs ($M = 4.85$, $SD = 0.70$), working in pairs/groups ($M = 4.78$, $SD = 0.55$), and classroom games ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 0.58$). Activities requiring creativity, such as drawing and exploring the natural world, were also well-rated, indicating that the Multiple Intelligences approach enhances engagement through diverse learning modalities. Students in the experimental group also indicated their favor to academic activities encouraging active participation, as seen in high scores for presentations ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 0.72$) and word-matching tasks ($M = 4.7$, $SD = 0.65$). This suggests that the Multiple Intelligences approach not only improves engagement in interactive activities but also fosters linguistic and critical thinking skills.

Compared to the experimental group, the control group had lower engagement across most activities but showed a greater preference for solitary reflection ($M = 4.04$ vs. $M = 3.40$). They also exhibited higher variability in participation, reflected in higher standard deviations for word-matching ($SD = 1.0$) and presentations ($SD = 1.05$). These findings indicate that traditional teaching methods did not seem to effectively engage all students, reinforcing the benefits of the Multiple Intelligences approach in creating a more inclusive learning environment.

4.3. Results of pre-test and post-test

Students in both groups took a test before and after the intervention. The tests were drawn from the course book package, consisting of 23 questions on listening, grammar, vocabulary, reading and writing. The pre- and post-intervention tests were comparable in terms of difficulty and content, with emphasis on the learning outcomes targeted by the intervention. The pre-test results are analysed to examine if there are any differences in the English level of the students in the two groups before the intervention. The post-test results of individual groups were compared to see if students made any progress after the intervention.

4.3.1. Students' Pre- test results

Table 7. Group Statistics for Pre-Test Scores

Score Range	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Excellent (8.5-10)	3	7.50%	10	25.00%
Good (7-8.4)	24	60.00%	8	20.00%
Average (5.5-6.9)	9	22.50%	7	17.50%
Weak (4-5.4)	3	7.50%	12	30.00%
Poor (0-4)	1	2.50%	3	7.50%
Total number of students:	40		40	
Average Score	7.03		6.73	
Standard Deviation	1.3900		2.0194	

Table 7 demonstrates the pre-intervention test scores of the two groups. The experimental group achieved a slightly higher average pre-test score ($M = 7.03$) than the control group ($M = 6.73$). Additionally, there was a minor variation in the distribution of scores between the two groups with a higher proportion of students in the experimental group achieving "good" and "average" scores than those in the control group. However, the independent sample t-test results indicate no statistically significant difference $t(69.181) = -.780$, $p = .438$ between the two groups. This finding suggests that any differences in students' learning outcomes following the intervention were unlikely to have been influenced by their initial competence levels.

4.3.2. Students Post-test results

Table 8. Experimental group students' pre- and post-test scores

Score Range	Pre-test scores		Post-test scores	
	N	%	N	%
Excellent (8.5-10)	3	7.50%	26	65.00%
Good (7-8.4)	24	60.00%	11	27.50%
Average (5.5-6.9)	9	22.50%	2	5.00%
Weak (4-5.4)	3	7.50%	1	2.00%
Poor (0-4)	1	2.50%	0	0%
Average Score		7.03		8.41
Standard Deviation		1.39		1.084

Table 8 presents the pre-test and post-test scores of students in the experimental group, demonstrating significant improvements following the intervention. The proportion of students achieving "Excellent" scores increased substantially from 7.5% to 65%. Meanwhile, the percentage of students attaining "Average" scores declined from 22.5% to 5%, and those receiving "Weak" scores decreased from 7.5% to 2%. Notably, none of the students received "Poor" scores. Since the test mainly assesses the learning content of the intervention, this result indicates that all students in the experimental group attained learning outcomes at least at the satisfactory level. The results of the paired sample Test also indicate a statistically significant difference between the pre-test ($M = 7.03$, $SD = 1.39$) and the post-test ($M = 8.41$, $SD = 1.084$) scores, $t(39) = -10.822$, $p < 0.001$.

Table 9. Control group students' pre- and post- test scores

Score Range	Pre-test scores		Post-test scores	
	N	%	N	%
Excellent (8.5-10)	10	25.00%	13	32.50%
Good (7-8.4)	8	20.00%	15	37.50%
Average (5.5-6.9)	7	17.50%	8	20.00%
Weak (4-5.4)	12	30.00%	4	10.00%
Poor (0-4)	3	7.50%	0	0.00%
Average Score	6.73		7.58	
Standard Deviation	2.019		1.603	

Table 9 presents the pre-test and post-test results of the control group, demonstrating moderate improvements in student performance after five weeks. The percentage of students achieved "Excellent" scores increased from 25% to 32.5%. The proportion of students who obtained "Average" scores slightly increased from 17.5% to 20%, and those who received "Weak" scores decreased from 30% to 10%. Similar to the experimental group, none of the students in the control group received "poor" scores, indicating that all the students in the control group achieved the learning outcomes at least at the satisfactory level. The results of the paired sample test also indicate statistically significant differences between the pre-test ($M=6.73$, $SD=2.019$) and the post-test ($M=7.58$, $SD=1.603$) scores, $t(39) = -8.4013$, $p < 0.001$.

The pre- and post-test results indicate that both groups achieved progress after five weeks of learning. However, the experimental group exhibited significantly greater progress, observably via the remarkable increase in the proportion of students achieving "Excellent" and "Good" scores. The independent sample T-test results also show a statistically significant difference between the post-test results of the experimental group ($M=8.41$, $SD=1.084$) and the control group ($M=7.58$, $SD=1.603$), $t(68.495) = -2.689$, $p < 0.05$. These findings support the hypothesis that Multiple Intelligences Theory-based teaching methods lead to greater overall improvement and more consistent student progress than traditional methods.

4.4. Classroom Observation results

To further investigate students' learning engagement, classroom observations were conducted in both the experimental and control classes over five weeks. The collected data were analyzed to determine whether the participation in English lessons of the students differed between the two groups.

4.4.1. Observation of the Control group.

Observational data from 20 lessons of the control class indicate that student participation varied slightly depending on the activity, with most students demonstrating limited or passive engagement. Only seven to nine students (out of 40) responded to teachers' questions or actively participated in teacher-led activities such as reading aloud, answering questions, and completing structured tasks. However, their participation declined when lessons required creative thinking (such as describing a family photo in another way), suggesting difficulties in adapting to new learning approaches. The other students (more than 30) exhibited passive or limited participation in the lesson such as avoiding eye contact with the teacher, keeping silent when being asked, and reluctantly standing up with unhappy facial expressions when being called upon by the teacher.

Student participation also varied according to the lesson content and classroom activities. Lessons using visual aids and focusing on familiar elements (e.g., colors, objects, numbers) generated higher

participation, while abstract lessons such as writing-intensive tasks, alphabet learning, advanced communication led to disengagement. Activities such as vocabulary instruction and board writing sustained focus among actively engaged students but led to further disengagement among passive learners. Activities involving movement or interaction (e.g., small games, group exercises) slightly increased participation but primarily among already engaged students, with minimal impact on disengaged learners.

4.4.2. Observation of Experimental group

Observations of 20 lessons in the experimental class during the intervention revealed a significant increase in student engagement. Initially, participation was limited, with only around ten students actively participating in class activities such as responding to teachers' questions or joining the group discussion. The rest of the students exhibited disengaged behaviors like those in the control group. However, as students became more familiar with the teaching approach, the number of actively engaged students increased, students interacted and collaborated more often with their peers to respond to the teacher and competed with other teams. As a result, the number of passive or disengaged students declined. Except for a few students who remained rather passive, most other students seemed to pay more attention to the lessons, responded more actively to the teacher's instructions and displayed more exciting facial expressions.

In comparison to the control class, the classroom discourse in the experimental class was much more positive and productive. More students participated in class activities, and their participation lasted longer. These findings highlight the positive impact of applying the Multiple Intelligences Theory in fostering student participation.

However, like the control class, the student participation in the experimental class also varied according to the lesson topics and the nature of the activities. In particular, such topics as colour and family attracted more students' attention and activities such as *Slap the Board* and *Jumping*, generated the highest participation rates. It was also noticed that some students did not actively take part in most of the activities, including the ones intentionally designed to engage them. These findings suggest that other factors such as language competence or personal psychology might play a role in influencing student learning engagement.

4.5. Discussion of the research findings

The research findings highlight positive impacts of the Multiple Intelligences Theory-based teaching approach on students' learning engagement and learning outcomes. With regards to the student learning engagement, it was found that applying Multiple intelligences theory in the teaching significantly improved students' participation in the English lessons. Before the intervention, both the experimental and control groups exhibited similar levels of participation. However, throughout the intervention period, as reflected in the observation results, the experimental group demonstrated a notable increase in engagement, characterized by greater proactiveness and enthusiasm in learning activities. The improvement in the student learning engagement was reaffirmed by the post-questionnaire results with almost all the students in the experimental group indicating positive attitudes towards lessons and learning activities.

The findings of this study align with previous research on the positive impact of the Multiple Intelligences approach on student learning engagement. Astutie (2017) and Arns (2021) affirmed that designing instructional activities based on Multiple Intelligences enhances students' proactiveness and enthusiasm in the classroom. These findings are also consistent with Delgoshaei and Delavari (2012) and Malo and Ahmed (2016) who emphasized that integrating Multiple Intelligences-based teaching methods fosters student participation and strengthens group interaction. The findings also align with the results reported by Haley (2001) and Ibnian and Hadban (2013), emphasizing that personalizing lessons according to Multiple Intelligences could create a more engaging learning environment, thereby increasing student participation. In the present study, the experimental group

demonstrated greater engagement in learning activities than the control group. Similarly, Delgoshaei and Delavari (2012) and Malo and Ahmed (2016) emphasized that integrating Multiple Intelligences-based teaching methods not only fosters student participation but also helps develop creative thinking skills and strengthens group interaction. The results of this study reinforce those findings, as students in the experimental group were not only more active in classroom activities but also exhibited greater initiative in collaboration and communication with their peers.

With respect to the impacts of the Multiple Intelligences Theory-based teaching approach on students' learning outcomes, the analysis of pre-test and post-test results indicates a significant improvement in academic performance of the experimental group compared to the control group. The average score of the experimental group increased from 7.03 to 8.41, whereas the control group's average score only increased from 6.73 to 7.58. Notably, the percentage of students achieving Excellent scores (8.5-10) in the experimental group rose sharply from 7.5% to 65%, while in the control group, this percentage increased only from 25% to 32.5%. These results suggest that the Multiple Intelligences-based teaching approach significantly enhances students' ability to acquire knowledge. Furthermore, the number of students with low scores also decreased considerably. Before the intervention, 10% of students in the experimental group scored in the Weak range (4.0-5.4), but this figure dropped to only 2% after the intervention. Remarkably, no students in the experimental group scored below 4.0 after the application of the Multiple Intelligences approach, whereas the control group still had 10% of students in the Weak category. This finding demonstrates that the Multiple Intelligences approach not only improves overall academic performance but also provides substantial support for lower-achieving students.

When comparing the two groups, it is evident that the traditional teaching method also led to improvements, but not as significantly as the Multiple Intelligences approach. More importantly, in the experimental group, progress was not confined to a small subset of students but was widespread across various learners, highlighting the broad impact of this method. This can be attributed to the diversity of instructional activities in the Multiple Intelligences approach, which allows students to access knowledge through multiple modalities, thereby enhancing learning effectiveness.

The findings of this study exhibit several similarities with prior discoveries regarding the positive impact of the Multiple Intelligences approach on learning outcomes. Astutie (2017) and Boukhari (2018) both emphasized that the Multiple Intelligences approach significantly improves students' academic performance by incorporating activities tailored to different intelligence types.

Overall, the present study adds further evidence that the Multiple Intelligences approach could help encourage students' active participation in learning and enhance academic performance. These findings strengthen the perspective that Multiple Intelligences is an effective teaching methodology for increasing student engagement and improving learning outcomes.

5. Conclusion

This study highlights the impact of the Multiple Intelligences-based instructional approach on student engagement and academic performance. However, several limitations should be addressed in future research to enhance its generalizability and effectiveness.

A key limitation is the small sample size, restricted to a single primary school in Hanoi with 80 students, which may limit the applicability of findings to other contexts. Future studies should expand the sample across multiple schools and regions to ensure broader validity. Additionally, the five-week intervention period may not fully capture the long-term effects of Multiple Intelligences-based instruction on language development and sustained motivation. Longitudinal studies tracking students over an academic year would provide deeper insights into retention and cognitive development. Furthermore, this study did not extensively integrate technology into Multiple Intelligences-based instruction. Future research should explore the role of digital tools, such as AI-driven learning applications and interactive platforms, to enhance personalized learning experiences.

Comparing Multiple Intelligences-based instruction with technology-enhanced traditional methods could offer a more comprehensive perspective on its effectiveness.

In conclusion, future research should expand the sample, extend the intervention period, and integrate technology to validate and refine Multiple Intelligences-based instruction. These improvements will enhance the approach's effectiveness in English language teaching and support diverse student learning needs in the digital era.

REFERENCES

1. Armstrong, T. (1994), *Multiple intelligences in the classroom*. Virginia: ASCD.
2. Armstrong, T. (2009), *Multiple intelligences in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
3. Arns, K. M. (2021), Multiple intelligence in a center-based environment. *International Journal of the Whole Child*, 6(2), 96-112. Northern Arizona University. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1833911>.
4. Astutie, D. D. (2017), Teaching English using a multiple intelligences approach. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, 8(2), 245–257. <https://jurnal.usk.ac.id/EEJ/article/view/7232>
5. Boukhari, O. (2018), Using the Multiple Intelligences Method to Teach Young Learners. *Acadimia.edu Journal online Publication*.
6. Delgoshaei, Y., & Delavari, N. (2012), Applying multiple-intelligence approach to education and analyzing its impact on cognitive development of pre-school children. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 32, 361–366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.01.054>.
7. Ernawati, E., Tsurayya, H., & Ghani, A. R. A. (2019), Multiple intelligence assessment in teaching English for young learners. *REID (Research and Evaluation in Education)*, 5(1), 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.21831/reid.v5i1.23376>.
8. Gardner, H. (1983), *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. U.S.A: Basic Books.
9. Gardner, H. (1999), *Intelligences reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. New York: Basic Books.
10. Haley, M. H. (2001), Understanding Learner-Centered Instruction from the Perspective of Multiple Intelligences. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(4), 355–367. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2001.tb02068.x>.
11. Ibranian, S. S. Kh., & Hadban, A. D. (2013), Implications of Multiple Intelligences Theory in ELT field. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(4), 292-297. https://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_4_Special_Issue_February_2013/30.pdf
12. Malo, S. S., & Ahmed, H. A. (2016), A Multiple Intelligences Based-Teaching of English at University Level. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 4(13), 948–953. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-4-13-6>.
13. Ministry of Education and Training of Vietnam. (2018, July 23), *Decision No. 2658/QĐ-BGDĐT on the issuance of the implementation plan for the project on teaching and learning foreign languages in the national education system for the period 2017-2025*. National Foreign Language Project Portal. <https://ngoainguquocgia.moet.gov.vn>.
14. Sibanda, L. (2022), The extent to which Grade 4 English First Additional Language Workbooks cater for learners' multiple intelligences. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 10(3), 185-194.
15. Stanciu, D., Orban, I., & Bocos, M. (2011), Applying the Multiple Intelligences Theory into Pedagogical Practice. Lessons from the Romanian Primary Education System.

Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 11, 92-96.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.01.040>.

16. Tomlinson, C. A. (2001), *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms*. ASCD.

Áp dụng thuyết đa trí tuệ trong giảng dạy ngôn ngữ tiếng Anh cho học sinh tiểu học tại Hà Nội

Tóm tắt: Bài viết này trình bày một nghiên cứu bán thực nghiệm nhằm đánh giá tác động của việc áp dụng thuyết đa trí tuệ trong việc giảng dạy tiếng Anh lên mức độ tham gia bài giảng và kết quả học tập của học sinh tại một trường tiểu học tại Hà Nội. Nghiên cứu tiến hành trong năm tuần, với các hoạt động được thiết kế phù hợp với các xu hướng trí thông minh khác nhau của học sinh. Dữ liệu thu thập từ bảng khảo sát và các bài kiểm tra trước và sau can thiệp, cùng với các quan sát trong lớp học, cho thấy việc áp dụng lý thuyết Đa trí tuệ trong giảng dạy đã có hiệu quả đáng kể trong việc thúc đẩy sự tham gia và cải thiện kết quả học tập của học sinh. Nghiên cứu này cung cấp các thông tin hữu ích cho giáo viên và các nhà nghiên cứu quan tâm đến việc tích hợp thuyết đa trí tuệ vào giảng dạy ngôn ngữ ở cấp tiểu học. Các hướng nghiên cứu trong tương lai và ý nghĩa đối với thiết kế hướng dẫn cũng được đưa vào để tiếp tục nghiên cứu.

Từ khóa: Đa trí tuệ; giảng dạy tiếng Anh; tiểu học; tham gia bài; kết quả học tập.