Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research, V18, N2, 2023

Opinions of Turkish Language Teachers on The Reflection of Multiple Intelligence Theory in Turkish Coursebooks[1]

Funda ÖRGE YAŞAR[2]
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University

Mert BAŞBAYRAK[3]
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University

Abstract

The aim of this study is to reveal the opinions of Turkish language teachers about the reflection of Multiple Intelligence Theory in Turkish coursebooks. The participants of the research are 30 Turkish language teachers who teach in secondary schools in Cizre district of Şırnak province in the 2020-2021 academic year. The data of the research were collected with semi-structured interview forms. Based on the data obtained in the research, separate categories were created for each question in the semi-structured interview form, and similar answers were grouped and included in the created categories. Highlights of the teacher's views were quoted directly. According to the results of the research, 83.33% of Turkish language teachers think that linguistic intelligence is the most frequently referred sort of intelligence in coursebooks, while 36.67% of teachers perceive logical-mathematical intelligence as the least frequently referred sort of intelligence in coursebooks. However, 56.67% of Turkish language teachers said that the texts and activities in the coursebook are not suitable for different intelligence domains. It has been determined that the rate of teachers who think that the level of including intelligence domains in the books differ according to the classes is 46.67%. The main problems faced by the teachers while creating activities for different intelligence domains were physical, cultural and equipment inadequacy of the schools in Cizre district of Şırnak province with 37.5%.

Keywords: Multiple Intelligence Theory, Turkish Coursebook, Turkish Language Teachers, Semi-Structured Interview

DOI: 10.29329/epasr.2023.548.9

Submitted:14 April 2022 **Accepted:** 10 October 2022 **Published:** 01 June 2023

[1] This article is a product of the master's thesis research study conducted by the second author supervised by the first author This article was compiled from the master's thesis named "Evaluation of Texts and Activities in the 6th and 7th Grade Turkish Textbooks Taught in the 2019-2020 Academic Year within the Framework of Theory of Multiple Intelligence and Teachers' Opinions".

[2] Assoc. Prof. Dr., Faculty of Education, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Türkiye, ORCID: 0000-0002-8207-9685 **Correspondence:** fundaorge@comu.edu.tr

[3] Turkish Language Teacher, Cizre/ Şırnak, Türkiye, ORCID: 0000-0003-2051-0633 Email: mertbasbayrak07@gmail.com

Introduction

As an abstract concept, the subject of intelligence, which is the field of interest of many researchers and has been studied for years, continues to maintain its importance today. Thoughts about what intelligence is or is not differed from time to time. In the 19th century, a definition was made by measuring the diameter of the skulls with a ruler, and human intelligence was evaluated according to this number range. In the 20th century, studies on the physical measurement of human intelligence were left aside and mental factors were emphasized in the determination of intelligence. In the early 1900s, when psychologist Alfred Binet and a group of his friends were granted authorization to develop a test that could be used to identify students who could be unsuccessful in primary education, studies were initiated to be implemented on this subject, and as a result, the first intelligence test emerged. According to the traditional understanding of Stanford-Binet intelligence tests, people were divided as "intelligent" and "non-intelligent", but these tests did not go beyond measuring some verbal and numerical skills. For example, a person who gives correct answers to the IQ test in daily life may have various problems in communicating with people, or a very successful artist may receive low scores from these tests. This situation led researchers to the conclusion that intelligence cannot be measured in terms of one or two dimensions (Gardner, 1999; Bümen, 2005; Saban, 2005; Saban, 2010).

Howard Gardner, a neuropsychology and development expert, brought a different perspective to the subject of intelligence and defined intelligence as "a problem-solving or product creation skill that is evaluated within one or more cultural frameworks" (Gardner, 2017, p. 28-29). According to this definition, to be able to produce appropriate and effective solutions to problems, to be creative, etc. skills are elements that should be evaluated within the scope of intelligence. Based on these ideas, Gardner suggested that intelligence cannot be one-dimensional and tried to explain this view with the theory he called Multiple Intelligence Theory. The Multiple Intelligence Theory is based on the idea that there are eight types of intelligence developed in different levels in each person. These types of intelligence are: 1. Linguistic intelligence, 2. Logical-mathematical intelligence, 3. Spatial intelligence, 4. Musical intelligence, 5. Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, 6. Interpersonal intelligence, 7. Intrapersonal intelligence and 8. Naturalist intelligence. These types of intelligence are briefly introduced below.

1. Linguistic Intelligence: It is the capacity to use language, mother tongue, and perhaps other languages to express what is on the mind and to understand other people (Checkley, 1997). People endowed with this type of intelligence can easily influence other people by using language skillfully.

2. Logical-Mathematical Intelligence: It is the capacity to "recognize concepts, work with abstract symbols such as numbers and geometric shapes, establish relationships between distinctive

pieces of information and/or see different connections between these pieces" (Tarman, 1998, p. 13). Demonstrating success in analyzing and synthesizing is one of the main characteristics of people with high intelligence capacity.

3. Spatial Intelligence: It is an individual's capacity to accurately perceive the visual world and recreate visual aspects even in the absence of physical stimuli (Armstrong, 2003). People endowed with this type of intelligence can perceive the world and objects better visually and keep them in mind.

4. Musical Intelligence: "This intelligence includes the capacity to recognize and use rhythmic and tonal concepts and to be sensitive to sounds coming from the environment, human voices and musical instruments" (Demirel, Başbay & Erdem, 2006, p. 34). According to this type of intelligence, sensitivity to sounds is at the forefront.

5. Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence: "It is the capacity of an individual to use certain organs of the body to solve a problem, build a model or create a product" (Saban, 2010, p. 15). The hand skills of people who have developed bodily kinesthetic intelligence are also sophisticated.

6. Interpersonal Intelligence: It is the capacity to notice other people and distinguish between them, to perceive their moods, their motivations and their intentions in particular (Gardner, 2017). Establishing good relations with people, empathy, etc. abilities are one of the dominant features of people with sophisticated interpersonal intelligence.

7. Intrapersonal Intelligence: It is the capacity to think about one's own feelings, thoughts and actions (Fleetham, 2006). Learning from mistakes, making self-criticism and using self-regulation capacity effectively are within the scope of this intelligence type.

8. Naturalist Intelligence: It is the capacity to be intensely interested in natural resources and the environment, to recognize flora and fauna, to distinguish them in the natural world, and to be productive about these abilities (Gardner, 1999). Naturalist intelligence, which is the last intelligence type identified by Gardner, is directly related to recognizing, perceiving and understanding the natural world (Lazear, 2000).

In our country, the constructivist approach has been taken as a basis in the preparation of the curriculum since 2004. In the preparation of these programs, different theories and approaches such as spiral approach, thematic approach, skill approach, education sensitive to individual differences, student-centered education, which are compatible with the basic philosophy of the constructivist approach, are also used. In this context, determining the gains and achievements in the program,

planning the learning-teaching process, carrying out measurement and evaluation studies, etc., the principles of Multiple Intelligence Theory are taken into consideration.

Although different tools such as computers, smart boards and projections are used today, depending on technological developments, the most used tool in education is still the coursebook. Coursebooks are prepared taking into account the curriculum of the relevant course subject. For this reason, it is expected that texts addressing different intelligence areas, preparatory studies, activities related to texts and post-theme evaluation studies are expected to be included in Turkish coursebooks in accordance with the basic philosophy of the Turkish Lesson Curriculum.

Although curricula and coursebooks have an important role in the preparation, acquisition and development of texts and activities according to Multiple Intelligence Theory, teachers also have a major contribution. Because "the most effective role falls to the teachers who are in the position of practitioner and evaluator" in the education process (Köstereliođlu & Özen, 2014, p. 154). By developing activities and designing various materials for students with different intelligence types, teachers can enrich their lessons and create learning environments that are more suitable for their students. Thus, students will be able to benefit from the education and training process more efficiently. In this context, in the study, it was tried to determine the opinions of the teachers in the field on the reflection of the Theory of Multiple Intelligences in the texts taught within the scope of the Turkish lesson and in the activities related to the texts.

Method

Research Model

Qualitative research method was used in order to determine the opinions of the teachers on the reflection of Multiple Intelligences Theory in Turkish coursebooks. According to Gürbüz & Şahin (2018), the nature of qualitative research is similar to a puzzle. Each piece of the puzzle represents the data in the qualitative research. In this context, "in the qualitative research process, the researcher tries to understand the nature of social reality (the grand scheme in the puzzle) with an exploratory point of view, acting with reference to subjective data (puzzle pieces) such as individuals' perceptions, feelings, experiences and thoughts" (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2018, p. 407). Various data collection techniques such as interview, observation and document analysis are used in qualitative research (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2018). One of these techniques, the interview, is "a data collection tool that enables to reveal what and why people think, what their emotions, attitudes and feelings are, and the factors that direct their behavior" (Ekiz, 2020, p. 69-70). Interviews can be classified as structured, semi-structured, unstructured, focus group interviews (Sönmez & Alacapınar, 2019). Of these, semi-structured interviews "combine both fixed alternative questions and being able to conduct in-depth analysis in the relevant field" (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2020, p.

159). Besides, it "allows to develop a dialogue and gives more time and opportunity to identify the points that are considered important for the interviewee" (Sözer & Aydın, 2020, p. 252). In this context, semi-structured interview technique, one of the qualitative research methods, was used to determine the opinions of Turkish language teachers on the reflection of Multiple Intelligences Theory in Turkish coursebooks.

Study Group

The study group of this research consists of 30 Turkish language teachers working in Cizre district of Şırnak province in the 2020-2021 academic year. The research group was determined by using the convenience sampling method, which is one of the non-random sampling methods. The convenience sampling is "sampling made on (volunteer) individuals who are in the immediate environment and easy to reach, available on hand and willing to participate in the research" (Erkuş, 2019, p. 145). The easy sampling method is also referred to as convenience sampling or random sampling in some sources. Although it is seen as a method that is not preferred by researchers (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel 2020), there may be cases when sample selection is difficult. "In such cases, the researcher may prefer the appropriate sampling method. For example, students from the nearest primary school can be preferred as the sample group in the research" (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012 cited by Şahin & Karakuş, 2019, p. 195). In this context, convenience sampling method was used in the creation of the study group due to the Covid-19 pandemic, which took the whole world captive. In order to conceal the identities of the teachers, female teachers were coded as F1, F2, F3; male teachers were coded as M1, M2, M3 Demographic characteristics of Turkish language teachers are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of Turkish language teachers participating in the interview

Variables		f	%
Gender			
Female		8	26.7
Male		22	73.3
	Total	30	100
Professional Seniority			
0-5 years		22	73.3
6-10 years		6	20.0
11-15 years		2	6.7
16-20 years		-	0.0
21 years and above		-	0.0
	Total	30	100
Grade(s) For Which Turkish Is Taught			
5th grade		10	33.3
6th grade		8	26.7
7th grade		7	23.3
8th grade		8	26.7

Looking at Table 1, it is seen that 73.3% of the teachers in the research group are male and 26.7% are female. When the teachers who participated in the interview are evaluated in terms of

professional seniority, it is seen that the majority (73.3%) have served between 0-5 years, 20% of the teachers have been working for 6-10 years, and 6.7% of the teachers have been working for 11-15 years. The fact that Turkish language teachers attend classes in more than one grade provided a balanced distribution in terms of 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades.

Data Collection

A semi-structured interview form prepared by the researcher was used to determine the opinions of Turkish language teachers about the level of the Theory of Multiple Intelligences being included in Turkish coursebooks. The first four questions in the semi-structured interview form, which consists of 12 questions in total, are aimed at determining the demographic characteristics of the participants. The remaining eight questions were prepared for the research topic. The semi-structured interview form to be applied to the teachers was broached to three field experts in order to ensure internal validity in the research. Field experts evaluated the questions in the interview form in terms of whether the questions were comprehensible and whether they covered the research topic. Based on the feedback from the field experts, the questions were revised, and necessary corrections were made. The data obtained by conducting a pilot interview with two Turkish language teachers who were excluded from the sample were evaluated. After the evaluation, it was concluded that the questions in the semi-structured interview form provided the desired data, and this interview form was applied to the Turkish language teachers.

Data Solution and Analysis

In order to determine the opinions of Turkish language teachers about the reflection of Multiple Intelligences Theory in Turkish coursebooks, a semi-structured interview form created by the researcher was applied to the teachers. The data obtained from the semi-structured interview forms were evaluated by subjecting them to content analysis. “The basic process in content analysis is to gather similar data within the framework of certain concepts and themes and to interpret them in a way that the reader can understand” (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2018, p. 242). In this context, the answers given by the teachers to the questions in the interview form were examined, and separate categories were created for each question. Similar responses were grouped and included in the categories created. Outstanding teachers’ opinions, whose answers were within the scope of these categories, were quoted directly.

Findings

Views of Turkish Language Teachers on the Reflection of Multiple Intelligences Theory in Turkish Coursebooks

In this part of the study, the findings obtained by analyzing the data gathered from the interviews held with Turkish language teachers for the purposes of the research are included.

Table 2. Teachers' views on what intelligence is

Code	**f**	**%**
Thinking, comprehending, perceiving, judging etc.	8	25
Adaptation	5	15.63
Problem solving skill	5	15.63
Capacity to do work	3	9.38
Ability to use multiple skills	3	9.38
Competency	2	6.25
Innate function	1	3.13
An interest-ability determining factor	1	3.13
No comment	4	12.5
Total	32	100

Table 2 shows the opinions and views of Turkish language teachers about what intelligence is. 25% of the participants defined intelligence as thinking, comprehending, perceiving, judging, and using similar concepts. M13, whose answer is in this category defined intelligence *"as the ability to reason about something, to think about something, to perceive and comprehend."* M1 similarly defines intelligence as *"thinking, reasoning, perceiving, comprehending, judging objective facts."*

15.63% of the teachers defined intelligence as adaptability, in other words, as an adaptation skill. The opinions of M10 and M16, who expressed their opinions in this direction, are as follows:

"It is adaptation to the problem you face, adaptation to the social circle you enter." (M10)

"Intelligence is the person's ability to adapt to the environment. The smarter a person is, the faster she/he adapts to the environment." (M16)

According to M11 who is one of the participants among the 15.63% of the section who see problem-solving skills as a reflection of intelligence, *"Intelligence is the state of being able to instantly find the shortest and positive solution for difficult situations or problems."*

9.38% of the participants argued that intelligence is the capacity to do work. F6 highlighted the ability of intelligence to do work and practice by saying *"It is a person's ability to do certain things in different fields."*, and M2 said *"It is a person's capacity to do a job."* thus he emphasized that he agrees with F6.

M8 and M22 are in the 9.38% segment, who apprehend the ability to use multiple skills as the equivalence of intelligence and therefore basically consider the intelligence areas in Multiple Intelligence Theory. The opinions of the participants are as follows:

"It is the ability to use different dimensions of the mind." (M8)

"It is a dimension that cannot be measured and varies according to the situation." (M22)

M18 from the group of teachers in the 6.25% segment who consider the state of being competent in any subject as intelligence, defined intelligence only as *"Proficiency"*. According to this definition, if a person is proficient in a subject, it can be concluded that this person is intelligent.

M7, which is mostly encountered in old theories and who argues that intelligence is completely innate defines intelligence as *"A brain function bestowed on human beings."* He defended the view that intelligence is innate and independent from environmental factors.

Table 3. The opinions of the teachers on the three intelligence types mostly included in the texts and activities in the Turkish coursebooks

Sequencing		Types of Intelligence									
		LI	**LMI**	**SI**	**MI**	**BKI**	**IPI**	**II**	**NI**	**NC**	**T**
1st Sequence	**f**	25	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	2	30
	%	**83.33**	-	6.67	-	-	-	-	3.33	6.67	100
2nd Sequence	**f**	3	2	16	-	-	6	1	-	2	30
	%	10	6.67	**53.33**	-	-	20	3.33	-	6.67	100
3rd Sequence	**f**	-	2	7	3	1	9	3	-	5	30
	%	-	6.67	23.33	10	3.33	**30**	10	-	16.67	100

LI: Linguistic Intelligence, LMI: Logical-Mathematical Intelligence, SI: Spatial Intelligence, MI: Musical Intelligence, BKI: Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence, IPI: Interpersonal Intelligence, II: Intrapersonal Intelligence, NI: Naturalist Intelligence, NC: No Comment, T: Total.

Table 3 presents the opinions of Turkish language teachers about which of the three intelligence types they think are the most common in Turkish coursebooks. Accordingly, 83.33% (25 people) of the teachers placed linguistic intelligence in the first place, 53.33% (16 people) of the teachers placed the spatial intelligence in the second place, and 30% (9 people) of the teachers placed interpersonal intelligence in the third place. In this context, it is possible to say that the participants think that there are texts and activities for the development of linguistic intelligence, spatial intelligence and interpersonal intelligence, respectively, in Turkish coursebooks.

Table 4. Teachers' opinions on which three intelligence types are least included in texts and activities in Turkish coursebooks

Sequencing		Types of Intelligence									
		LI	**LMI**	**SI**	**MI**	**BKI**	**IPI**	**II**	**NI**	**NC**	**T**
1st Sequence	**f**	1	11	1	5	3	2	3	3	1	30
	%	3.33	**36.67**	3.33	16.67	10	6.67	10	10	3.33	100
2nd Sequence	**f**	-	2	2	2	10	1	2	7	4	30
	%	-	6.67	6.67	6.67	**33.33**	3.33	6.67	23.33	13.33	100
3rd Sequence	**f**	-	4	-	3	6	2	6	5	4	30
	%	-	13.33	-	10	20	6.67	**20**	16.67	13.33	100

LI: Linguistic Intelligence, LMI: Logical-Mathematical Intelligence, SI: Spatial Intelligence, MI: Musical Intelligence, BKI: Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence, IPI: Interpersonal Intelligence, II: Intrapersonal Intelligence, NI: Naturalist Intelligence, NC: No Comment, T: Total.

Table 4 shows the opinions of Turkish language teachers about which of the three intelligence types they think are least included in Turkish coursebooks. Accordingly, 36.67% (11 people) of the teachers placed logical-mathematical intelligence in the first place, 33.33% (10 people) of the teachers placed bodily-kinesthetic intelligence in the second place, and intrapersonal intelligence was placed in

the third row 20% (6 people). In this context, it is possible to say that the participants think that there are texts and activities aimed at the development of at least logical-mathematical intelligence, bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, and intrapersonal intelligence in Turkish coursebooks, and that these listed intelligence types are neglected.

Table 5. Opinions of teachers on the appropriateness of texts and activities in Turkish coursebooks for different intelligence types

Code	**f**	**%**
Not appropriate	17	56.67
Appropriate	6	20
Partly appropriate	4	13.33
No comment	3	10
Total	30	100

In Table 5, teachers' views are shown on whether the texts and activities in Turkish coursebooks are suitable and appropriate for different intelligence types. Most of the teachers (56.67%) said that the texts and activities in Turkish coursebooks are not suitable for different intelligence types. On this subject, F3 expressed her views by saying, *"I don't think there are proper activities for all intelligence types."* M5, on the other hand, gave examples from the intelligence types in the Theory of Multiple Intelligence and expressed himself by saying, *"Necessity of being based on verbal-linguistic intelligence is a deficiency. The type of intrapersonal intelligence and naturalist intelligence should be included more frequently. The activities should be prepared to cover various intelligence types."* M6, on the other hand, expressed his opinion on this subject by saying *"I think it does not reflect logical, musical and bodily-kinesthetic intelligence."* M20 stated that *"In general, I cannot say that it covers other intelligence types, but it is rather limited with 1-2 intelligence types."* He said that the target area of the book is limited to a few intelligence types.

20% of the teachers think that the texts and activities in Turkish coursebooks are suitable for different intelligence types. M7, one of the participants, expressed himself saying, *"I think the books are suitable for multiple intelligence types."* F2 also supports M7 with her comment: *"There are activities suitable for different intelligence types."*

F6 and M4, who expressed their opinions that the texts and activities in the Turkish coursebooks are partially suitable for different intelligence types, expressed their views on this subject with respect to the following sentences:

"There are activities suitable for different intelligence types, but they can be more diversified." (F6)

"We cannot confirm that the texts and activities in Turkish coursebooks are entirely suitable for different intelligence types. Because They have been prepared limited to a few of the types and not for all of them." (M4)

Table 6. Teachers' opinions on whether the level of inclusion of different intelligence types in Turkish coursebooks differs according to classes

Code	**f**	**%**
It differs	14	46.67
It does not differ	9	30
It partly differs	1	3.33
No comment	6	20
Total	30	100

Table 6 shows the opinions of teachers about whether the level of including different intelligence types in Turkish coursebooks differs according to grades. In this context, 46.67% of the teachers said that the level of including intelligence types in the coursebooks differs according to the classes. F3 expressed her opinions by saying that *"Yes, it differs. The activities of the lower grades are more active and diverse, while the activities of the higher grades are slightly more verbal-oriented."* M8, M14 and M20 emphasized that the level of including different intelligence types in the coursebooks should be directly proportional to the cognitive levels of the students. The opinions of these participants are given below:

"It differs. Because the cognitive level of students at all grades is not the same. As the level increases, the cognitive level of the student will increase, so the student will need more diverse intelligence types." (M8)

"As the level progresses, the level of inclusion of intelligence types differs between grades. I interpret this as normal for it to differ depending on personal development. I interpret this as normal for abstract thinking to happen. In addition to the realization and increase of abstract thinking, the increase in interests naturally necessitated the inclusion of different intelligence types." (M14)

"Since cognitive development is related to age, as a matter of fact, intelligence types also differ between levels." (M20)

The rate of teachers who argue that the coursebooks do not differ in terms of the level of addressing different intelligence types according to the grade levels is 30%. In this context, F2 said, *"I don't think it makes any difference; different intelligence types are considered and applied at each grade level."* She therefore stated that she did not notice any difference. F4, on the other hand, similarly said, *"I don't think there is a noticeable difference in terms of including intelligence types."* She stated that there was no significant difference. M12 said *"It doesn't make any difference. It's pretty much the same level."* He therefore stated that he thinks in a similar manner with respect to F2 and F4.

One of the Turkish language teachers (M16) said, *"I don't think it differs much."* He emphasized that there was no significant difference between the grades.

Table 7. Opinions of teachers on whether the level of inclusion of different intelligence types in Turkish coursebooks differs according to publishers

Code	**f**	**%**
It differs (in favor of Ministry of National Education Publications)	12	40
It differs (details are not specified)	6	20
It differs (in favor of private publisher)	3	10
It partially differs (in favor of Ministry of National Education Publications)	1	3.33
It does not differ	4	13.33
No comment	4	13.33
Total	30	100

Table 7 shows the opinions of teachers about whether the level of including different intelligence types in Turkish coursebooks differs according to publishers. 70% of the teachers said that the level of inclusion of intelligence types differs according to the publishing houses. The rate of those who say that the level of inclusion of intelligence types differs in favor of Ministry of National Education Publications is 40%. F1 stated that this difference is in favor of Ministry of National Education Publications by saying that *"It differs. Coursebooks published by the Ministry of National Education address more intelligence types."* While M17 supports this view, he also included the aspect of intelligence development and said, *"I can say that the Ministry of National Education publications are better than private publications in terms of intelligence development."*

20% of the participants stated that the level of inclusion of intelligence types is different between the coursebooks prepared by the Ministry of National Education and private publishing houses, but they did not specify which publishing house this difference is in favor of. M5 expressed his opinion by saying that *"Both publishing houses have pros and cons. There should be cooperation in the preparation process."* Based on this view, it is possible to say that there are various differences between the Ministry of National Education publications and the Turkish coursebooks published by private publishing houses, and such differences sometimes create positive and negative consequences.

M14, one of the advocates of the 10% segment who argues that there is differentiation in favor of private publications, expressed his views on this subject with the following words: *"I think that the level of inclusion of intelligence domains in the coursebooks published by private publishing houses is better distributed."*

13.3% of the participants think that there is no difference between the two publishers. F4, who expressed an opinion within the scope of this category, said, *"I don't think there is a difference. I think that both the books prepared by the Ministry of National Education and the books of private publishing houses are monotonous."* M18 said, *"I don't think there is much difference between them. After all, both are taught as coursebooks in schools. So in my opinion, there is indeed a similarity between them."*

Table 8. Opinions of teachers on the problems they encounter while creating activities for different types of intelligence in Turkish lessons

Code	**f**	**%**
Problems related to physical, cultural characteristics and lack of equipment of schools	12	37.5
Lack of materials	7	21.88
Implementation difficulty	6	18.75
Compatibility problem	3	9.38
No comment	4	12.5
Total	32	100

Table 8 shows the opinions of teachers about the problems they encounter while creating activities that address different intelligence types in Turkish lessons. According to this, 37.5% of the teachers said that while they were creating activities that appeal to different intelligence types, they had problems related to physical, cultural and equipment inadequacy of schools. For example, M2 expressed his views on this subject: *"Physical conditions are the most important problem. Accordingly, cultural and geographical conditions are also effective. In terms of timewise, I think there is a disadvantage in this regard."* M5 stated, *"The predominance of verbal activities for memorization neglects other types of intelligence. Special activities for specific regions can be designed. Activities for comprehension skills can be increased for students in the eastern part."* He mentioned that special activities should be designed for comprehension skills, especially for students in the eastern part of the country. M9 emphasized the physical dimension of the situation a bit more by saying that *"The physical environment of the classroom is important. Having spacious classrooms in which one can move around increases student and teacher interaction. The number of students in a classroom exceeding the limit is the main problem for the activity. You can't interact with every student. The socio-economic conditions of the region are also important. The student should be open to difference."*

21.88% of the participants stated that they had problems due to lack of material. The views of F3 and M21 who expressed their opinions in this direction are given below.

"I usually have problems because the school's facilities are inadequate. I cannot do certain monitoring activities because there is no smart board. I try to perform listening activities with my own means (such as telephone, loudspeaker). Sometimes, some texts in the book can be challenging at high level. That's why I am having difficulties." (F3)

"The lack of materials at my school limits access to different types of intelligence." (M21)

In general, the participants who declared that they had problems with the implementation difficulty had a rate of 18.75%. M4 expressed the hardship of making applications in certain intelligence types by saying that *"It is not possible to create activities suitable for every intelligence type. For example, with the idea of "Naturalist and bodily-kinesthetic intelligence."* M8 said,

"Students always think of intelligence in one dimension in activities that include many different types of intelligence. The inability to blend and apply many intelligences in the activity." Thus, with his sentences, he highlighted an application problem caused by the lack of students.

9.38% of the participants stated that they experienced adaptation problems while creating activities that appeal to different intelligence types in Turkish lessons. One of the participants, M10, said, *"As activities that address the verbal-linguistic intelligence type in general are used in Turkish lessons, the student's adaptation problem is one of the most common problems I encounter with activities outside this type."* While M15 said, *"Verbal-oriented students are not open to different types of intelligence. Not suitable for classroom environments."* He defended the view that students with a dominant linguistic intelligence are closed to other intelligences and cannot adapt.

Table 9. Opinions of teachers on educational-dimensional suggestions for the development of different types of intelligence

Code	**f**	**%**
Implementing appropriate activity	12	27.91
Using appropriate material	8	18.6
Organizing / Changing physical, cultural, social etc. conditions	7	16.28
Moving away from the exam logic	4	9.3
Considering the Theory of Multiple Intelligences	3	6.98
Collaborating between disciplines	3	6.98
Using technology	2	4.65
Receiving in-service training	1	2.33
No comment	3	6.98
Total	43	100

Table 9 presents the opinions of the teachers regarding the educational dimensional suggestions they brought for the development of different types of intelligence. 27.91% of the participants suggested that appropriate activities should be used. The opinions of some participants are listed below:

"To do various activities that will reveal the child's latent powers." (M1)

"Activities can be increased in the fields of spatial intelligence and musical intelligence." (F6)

18.6% of the participants stated that appropriate materials should be used. M19, one of the advocates of this view, expressed the necessity of creating appropriate materials by saying that *"Creating environments that appeal to the most senses as possible by creating or developing materials and spaces suitable for education."* M18, on the other hand, emphasized the coursebooks and advised *"Coursebooks should be reviewed."*

16.28% of the participants made suggestions on the need to regulate and change physical, cultural, social, etc. conditions. M2 expressed his views on this subject as *"Classes should be*

organized accordingly. Environments should be created for students to organize their own activities. The physical and cultural conditions of the schools are very important in this regard. It also needs to be addressed in terms of management."

9.3% of the teachers suggested the necessity of leaving the exam logic as a suggestion. E.g; M6 stated that students should care about their personal development instead of exams by saying that *"Development of intelligence types is only possible by letting students free from the logic of the exam. A horse in a horse race cannot turn left and right and turn towards other roads."* He stated that students should care about their personal development instead of exams. F5, on the other hand, expanded the subject of exam pressure a little more and included teachers as well. *"Lessons should not be taught only in the classroom environment. Sometimes a nature park, a forest, a theater should be a classroom. Students should focus on artistic activities. Exam pressure on students and teachers should be lifted."*

M9 expressed himself by saying that *"The Turkish lesson aims to develop the student in terms of language in terms of its mission. It keeps its relationship with other courses alive. In Turkish lesson, students can discover their interests and abilities. Coursebooks are composed of pure reading and listening. Coursebooks are insufficient in this regard. The emphasis should be on drama and each sort of intelligence within the student should be revealed."*

F3, on the other hand, was the only participant who offered to receive in-service training and expressed his opinion on this subject: *"Coursebooks can be a little more colorful on the development of different intelligence types. Each theme can have at least three listening tracking texts. Visual reading and interpretation activities can be more. Games to develop bodily-kinesthetic intelligence can be added. There may be in-service trainings for teachers on this subject as well."*

Conclusion and Discussion

When the results of the research are evaluated, how 25% of the teachers think about intelligence, comprehend, perceive, judge, etc. are described in the figures. On the other hand, intelligence includes adaptation (15.63%), problem-solving skills (15.63%), ability to do work (9.38%), ability to use multiple skills (9.38%), competence (6.25%), it was also determined that innate function (3.13%) was defined as the determining factor of interest-ability (3.13%). Considering these results, Turkish language teachers do not define the concept of intelligence differently from the definitions in the current literature. It was seen that they started to perceive intelligence as being able to perform higher level skills rather than perceiving it as one-dimensional.

83.33% of Turkish language teachers think that linguistic intelligence is the most used intelligence type in coursebooks. This view of Turkish language teachers addressed by Dağlı (2006),

Kırcı (2011), Bayram & Baki (2014), Demir (2016), Epçaçan & Kırbaş (2018), Keskin & Yeşilyurt (2019), Sarikaya (2021), Başbayrak & Örge Yaşar (2021) is consistent with the results obtained in the studies. According to teachers' opinions, logical-mathematical intelligence stands out as the least included intelligence in Turkish coursebooks (36.67%). This view of Turkish language teachers is different from the results obtained in the studies of Kırbaşoğlu Kılıç, Baki & Bayram (2014), Çökmez (2017), Demir (2017), Kana & Demir (2017) and Başbayrak & Örge Yaşar (2021). Because in the aforementioned studies, it has been determined that logical-mathematical intelligence is the second most common intelligence type in coursebooks. While it is expected due to the branch that teachers emphasize linguistic intelligence, considering logical-mathematical intelligence as the least included intelligence is thought to be due to the neglect of the "logic" dimension in this intelligence type.

When the suitability of the texts and activities in the coursebooks to multiple intelligences fields was examined, 56.67% of the teachers stated that they were "not appropriate". It can be said that the fact that the texts and activities were prepared more for linguistic intelligence had an effect on the teachers' thinking manner. In the study of Kana & Demir (2017) titled *"Multiple Intelligences Theory in Secondary School Turkish Education"*, teachers stated that there are no activities in the books according to each intelligence type. Another study in which the opinion that the activities in the Turkish coursebooks is not suitable for the theory of multiple intelligences is titled *"Evaluation of Textbooks which are Used for Teaching Turkish to Syrian Students based on Teacher Opinions"* by Biçer & Kılıç (2017). In this context, it is seen that teachers have similar views that Turkish coursebooks are not prepared in accordance with the theory of multiple intelligences.

46.67% of Turkish language teachers stated that the level of including intelligence types in the coursebooks differs according to the classes, while 3.33% stated that it differs partially. The rate of teachers who stated that the level of inclusion of intelligence types in Turkish coursebooks does not differ according to classes is 30%. Başbayrak & Örge Yaşar (2021) examined the texts and activities in Turkish coursebooks in terms of Multiple Intelligences Theory in their study called *"Evaluation of 6th and 7th Grade Turkish Course Books within the Framework of Multiple Intelligence Theory"* and that the level of musical intelligence and interpersonal intelligence did not differ according to classes. They found that logical-mathematical intelligence, spatial intelligence, bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence, and naturalist intelligence decreased in the 7th grade, while linguistic intelligence increased. It is seen that the results obtained in the two studies overlap. 20% of the teachers did not express an opinion on this issue. It can be said that the fact that most Turkish language teachers only teach certain classes and cannot have enough command of the coursebooks at other grade levels lead to such a consequence. In addition, the fact that teachers working in the provinces of the Southeastern Region have generally just started their profession further supports this situation.

According to the results of the opinions on whether the level of inclusion of intelligence types differs according to the publishers, the opinion differs in favor of the Ministry of National Education Publications stands out with a rate of 40%. Then the views are specified as follows: it differs [(details not specified, 20%), (in favor of private publications, 10%)], does not differ (13.33%), and partially differs (in favor of Ministry of National Education Publications, 3.33%). 13.33% of the teachers have no idea about the question asked. Başbayrak & Örge Yaşar (2021) stated that Turkish coursebooks published by the Ministry of National Education are significantly ahead of those published by the private sector in terms of containing texts and activities in the types of interpersonal intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence and naturalist intelligence. Başbayrak & Örge Yaşar (2021) also stated that texts and activities for spatial intelligence are more common in Turkish coursebooks published by the private sector; they stated that there is no significant difference between publishers in terms of other types of intelligence.

At the beginning of the problems that teachers encounter while creating different intelligence activities, the physical, cultural conditions related to the inadequate equipment of the schools come with a rate of 37.5%. This is followed by lack of materials (21.88%), difficulty in application (18.75%) and adaptation problems (9.38%). 13.5% of the teachers have no idea about this issue. If this result is evaluated, it can be thought that the teachers working in the schools in Cizre district of Şırnak province emphasize these results slightly more due to the lack of equipment in the schools. Koşar (2006) similarly stated that teachers have difficulties in finding sample activities, materials, tools, guidebooks and appropriate equipment.

Teachers suggested using appropriate activities with a rate of 27.91% to develop different intelligence types. This was followed by using appropriate materials (18.6%), arranging/ changing the physical, cultural and equipment facilities of the schools (16.28%), leaving the logic of the exam (9.3%), considering the Theory of Multiple Intelligences (6.98%), disciplines cooperation (6.98%), using technology (4.65%) and in-service training (2.33%) respectively. 6.98% of the teachers do not have any suggestions. It has been stated by the teachers that the intelligence areas of the students can be developed effectively if the activities and materials that appeal to the students are provided and the knowledge of the teachers on the application of Multiple Intelligences Theory is increased through in-service training. With the consideration of Multiple Intelligence Theory and highlighting the necessity of developing appropriate materials and activities on this subject, the study was also carried out by Demir (2017) and Kalenderoğlu & Zorluoğlu (2018), with suggestions for in-service training and enrichment of educational environments, which is in line with the studies carried out by Canbay (2006) and Şener & Doğan. (2021).

Suggestions

Suggestions made based on the results obtained in the research are presented below:

▪ The Ministry of National Education should provide practical examples as well as explaining the Multiple Intelligence Theory theoretically in its curricula.

▪ While creating an activity for the Theory of Multiple Intelligences, information should be exchanged with teachers and their views and wishes should be analyzed at regular intervals in order to eliminate the knowledge deficiencies that teachers experience, if any, and to share issues related to physical, cultural and social conditions.

▪ As the grade levels increase, the level of inclusion of different intelligence types in the coursebooks should not be reduced.

▪ Researchers should not only go through theory in their studies on Multiple Intelligences Theory, but also should not neglect the opinions of teachers in the practical aspect of the work. The fact that the researchers do not neglect the opinions of the teachers will enable the relevant theory to be evaluated within the framework of the social, cultural, sociological and physical conditions of the country and that region.

Policy Implications

Educators find it very useful to use all disciplines to reveal students' intelligence areas and benefit from them in education. In other words, an interdisciplinary program approach should be taken in the program applications of the theory of multiple intelligences in the curriculum development process. For this purpose, the core curriculum approach (core curriculum) stands out and is recommended. In this approach, after learning common core subjects, students take courses in topics they are interested in their intelligence areas (Campbell, Campbell & Dickinson, 1996; Duran & Akdeniz, 2016, p. 754). Educators can individualize the curriculum in line with each individual's interests, needs, and potential through the theory of multiple intelligences because the idea of various intelligences teaches educators that all students have potential but that each learner is intelligent in different areas. In this respect, this theory is an effective model for understanding the individuality of each student and accordingly individualizing teaching (Saban, 2002, p. 70). It also increases diversity and inclusiveness in education and removes the "same model, same program for everyone" view from education (Fierros, 2004, p. 14).

Conflict of Interest

No potential conflict of interest was declared by the authors.

Funding Details

No funding or grant was received from any institution or organization for this research.

Credit Author Statement

The authors contributed equally to this research.

Ethical Statement

Ethics committee approval within the scope of the research has been obtained from Şırnak District of National Education with the permission numbered 61543340-604.02-E.12136778 on 04.09.2020.

References

Armstrong, T. (2003). *The multiple intelligences of reading and writing.* Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Başbayrak, M. (2021). *2019-2020 öğretim yılında okutulan 6 ve 7. sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metin ve etkinliklerin çoklu zekâ kuramı ve öğretmen görüşleri çerçevesinde değerlendirilmesi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Eğitim Enstitüsü Türkçe ve Sosyal Bilimler Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Çanakkale.

Başbayrak, M., & Örge Yaşar, F. (2021). 6 ve 7. sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarının çoklu zekâ kuramı çerçevesinde değerlendirilmesi. *Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research, 8*(69), 1066-1077. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.26450/jshsr.2417

Bayram, B., & Baki, Y. (2014). Ortaokul 6. sınıf Türkçe dersi öğretmen kılavuz kitabının çoklu zekâ kuramı açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Dil ve Edebiyat Eğitimi Dergisi, 9,* 133-147.

Biçer, N., & Kılıç, B. S. (2017). Suriyeli öğrencilere Türkçe öğretmek için kullanılan ders kitaplarının öğretmen görüşleri doğrultusunda değerlendirilmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi, 5*(4), 649-663. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.329809

Bümen, N. (2005). *Okulda çoklu zekâ kuramı* (3. Baskı). Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2020). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (29. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Campbell, L., Campbell, B., & Dickinson, D. (1996). *Teaching and learning through multiple intelligences.* Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Canbay, S. (2006). *İlköğretim birinci kademede çoklu zekâ kuramı uygulamalarına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri (Yalova örneği)* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Sakarya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Sakarya.

Checkley, K. (1997). The first seven and the eighth: A Conversation with Howard Gardner. *Educational Leadership, 55*(1), 8-13.

Çökmez, N. (2017). *Çoklu zeka kuramının yabancı dil olarak Türkçe ders kitaplarında incelenmesi ve değerlendirilmesi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi Bilim Dalı, İstanbul.

Dağlı, A. (2006). *1990-2000 yılları arası ilköğretim II. kademe Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki halk şiiri metinlerinin "çoklu zekâ teorisi" açısından incelenmesi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı, Samsun.

Demir, B. (2016). *Türkçe dersi çalışma kitaplarındaki etkinliklerin çoklu zekâ kuramı bakımından incelenmesi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler ve Türkçe Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Kırşehir.

Demir, R. (2017). *Ortaokul Türkçe eğitiminde çoklu zekâ kuramı* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler ve Türkçe Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Çanakkale.

Demirel, Ö., Başbay, A., & Erdem, E. (2006). *Eğitimde çoklu zekâ kuram ve uygulama.* Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.

Duran, M., & Akdeniz, H. (2016). Çoklu zekâ kuramı. In G. Ekici (Editor)*, Öğrenme-öğretme kuramları ve uygulamadaki yansımaları* (pp. 701-769). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Ekiz, D. (2020). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (6. Baskı). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Epçaçan, C., & Kırbaş, A. (2018). Türkçe ders kitabı etkinliklerinin çoklu zekâ yaklaşımı temelli öğretim açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Ekev Akademi Dergisi, 22*(76), 57-78.

Erkuş, A. (2019). *Davranış bilimleri için bilimsel araştırma süreci* (6. Baskı). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Fierros, E. G. (2004). How multiple intelligences theory can guide teachers' practices: Ensuring success for students with disabilities. *On Point Series,* Washington, DC: National Institute for Urban School Improvement, Office for Special Education Programs. 1-16

Fleetham, M. (2006). *Multiple intelligences in practice: Enhancing self-esteem and learning in the classroom.* Great Britain, Cornwall: Network Continuum Education.

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century.* New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (2017). *Zihin çerçeveleri.* In E. Kılıç & G. Tunçgenç (Trans.). İstanbul: Alfa Bilim.

Gürbüz, S., & Şahin, F. (2018). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri* (5. Baskı). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Kalenderoğlu, İ., & Zorluoğlu, Y. (2018). Çoklu zekâ kuramına göre yurtdışında yaşayan Türk çocuklarına Türkçe öğretimi ile ilgili öğretmen görüşleri. *21. Yüzyılda Eğitim ve Toplum, 7*(20), 577-601.

Kana, F., & Demir, R. (2017). Ortaokul Türkçe eğitiminde çoklu zekâ kuramı. *SOBİDER Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 4*(11), 399-416. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.16990/SOBIDER.3441

Keskin, H., & Yeşilyurt, E. (2019). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde kullanılan "Yedi İklim Türkçe Öğretim Seti"nin çoklu zekâ kuramı açısından incelenmesi. *Karaelmas Journal of Educational Sciences, 7*(1), 1-18.

Kırbaşoğlu Kılıç, L., Baki, Y., & Bayram, B. (2014). Ortaokul 8. sınıf Türkçe dersi öğretmen kılavuz kitabındaki etkinliklerin çoklu zekâ kuramı ile örtüşme düzeyi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi, 2*(2), 72-89. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.82843.

Kırcı, I. (2011). *İlköğretim ikinci kademe Türkçe dersi ders kitapları, öğrenci çalışma kitapları ve öğretmen kılavuz kitaplarının çoklu zekâ kuramına uygunluk durumları* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Türkçe Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Trabzon.

Koşar, E. (2006). Türkçe derslerinde çoklu zekâ kuramının uygulanmasına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 19*(2), 345-358.

Köstereliоğlu, İ., & Özen, R. (2014). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sosyal bilgiler dersi öğretim programını uygulamaya yönelik hizmet içi eğitim ihtiyaçları. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 14*(1), 153-176. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2014.14.1-5000091507

Lazear, D. (2000). *The intelligent curriculum: Using MI to develop your student's full potential.* New York: Zephyr Press.

Saban, A. (2002). *Öğrenme öğretme süreci: Yeni teori ve yaklaşımlar* (2. Baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Saban, A. (2005). *Çoklu zekâ teorisi ve eğitim.* Ankara: Atlas Yayın Dağıtım.

Saban, A. (2010). *Çoklu zekâ kuramı ve Türk eğitim sistemine yansıması.* Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Sarikaya, B. (2021). 8. sınıf Türkçe ders kitabı etkinliklerinin çoklu zekâ kuramı bağlamında değerlendirilmesi. *Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi, 1*(1), 39-63.

Sönmez, V., & Alacapınar, F. G. (2019). *Örneklendirilmiş bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (7. Baskı). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Sözer, Y., & Aydın, M. (2020). Nitel veri toplama teknikleri ve nitel veri analizi süreci. In B. Oral & A. Çoban (Eds.), *Kuramdan uygulamaya eğitimde bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* (pp. 249-283). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Şahin, Ç., & Karakuş, G. (2019). Katılımcıları seçme: Evren ve örneklem. In G. Ocak (Editor), *Eğitimde bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* (pp. 179-216). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Şener, N., & Doğan, M. C. (2021). Investigation of multiple intelligence practices in social studies courses in context of textbooks and teachers' opinions. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 29*(3), 643-653. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.754945

Tarman, S. (1998). Çoklu zekâ teorisi ve zekânın yedi türü. *Yaşadıkça Eğitim, 58,* 12-16.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2018). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (11. Baskı). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.