Education Quarterly Reviews

The online version of this article can be found at:
https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research, and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.

ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

The Representation of Multiple Intelligences in the Secondary School Turkish Curriculum

Süleyman Aydeniz[1]

[1] Muş Alparslan University, Turkey, Orcid: 0000-0001-9277-529X

Correspondence: Süleyman Aydeniz, Faculty of Education, Muş Alparslan University, Muş, 49040, Turkey. E-mail: s.aydeniz@alparslan.edu.tr

Abstract

This study aims to investigate to what extent learning objectives in the secondary school Turkish curriculum (2019) reflect and engage Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence. Furthermore, the study considers the frequency with which each intelligence type is presented in the curriculum. In the study, a total of 112 objectives are focused on. These objectives have been checked and rated by each of the experts. The study employs document analysis method as a research design. Research data has been collected and analysed through using document analysis descriptive and analysis techniques, respectively. Careful analysis of these objectives reveals that the intelligence profile of the curriculum is primarily verbal/linguistically (103). This is followed by mathematical/logical (17), visual/spatial intelligence (12), social/interpersonal (3), and bodily/kinesthetic intelligences (2), respectively. It further reveals that there are no objectives that cater to internal, musical/rhythmic and naturalistic intelligences. These findings suggest several courses of action for future researches.

Keywords: Secondary School Turkish Curriculum, Multiple Intelligence Theory, Qualitative Research.

1. Introduction

Humans exhibit many of the same characteristics as other creatures in nature. However, there are also some other abilities of humanity. For example, only human has capable of speech and complex language. Therefore, ancient philosophers believed man was a ''rational animal''. According to Yılmaz (2018), these traits make him superior to all other creatures in the universe because they emphasize human intelligence. Only by intelligence his actions have an influence on thoughts and feelings. For this reason it has been a feature of philosophy from the beginning, and many definitions have emerged over the years. At first, intellect, inclination, etc. were used to denote intellectual thought or actions. But now the word ''intelligence'' is used to describe this concept. In the Great Turkish dictionary (2009: 2228), the intelligence is defined as "all the abilities of a person to think, reason, perceive objective facts, judge and draw conclusions, understand, resist, and foresight." It is evident from this definition that there are two common basics of intelligence, i.e., the capacity to adjust to new situations, and general mental adaptability.

In some respects, every human being behaves like all other humans. For example, all human being has a physical body, a non-physical soul and free will. In other respects, they behave like no others. This reinforces the fact that not all people respond to any event in the same way, and share the same interests or perspectives. In fact, according to the scientists, the reason why people differ from each other is the intellectual competencies and abilities. For this reason, the theory of multiple intelligences suggested by Gardner has attracted much attention from philosophers, educators and scientists in general. His theory, which he calls "Multiple Intelligence Theory," suggests that human intelligence manifests itself in different forms, and includes eight different types of intelligence. These are as follows:

Verbal/Linguistic Intelligence: "refers to a person's ability to use words in speech and writing effectively." (Armstrong, 1994: 2).

Mathematical/Logical Intelligence: "refers to a person's ability to think in logical; understanding part-whole, whole-part relationships, making inferences, understanding cause-and-effect relationships, etc. " (Güney et al., 2010).

Visual/Spatial Intelligence: "refers to a person's ability to perceive, understand and analyze colors, lengths, shapes, forms, surfaces, and the relationships that exist between them" (Armstrong, 1994: 2).

Bodily/Kinesthetic Intelligence: "refers to a person's ability to convey emotions and thoughts through body language." (Güney et al. 2010).

Musical/Rhythmic Intelligence: "refers to a person's ability to express feelings and thoughts. People who possess this type of intelligence enjoy music and rhythm in their lives." (Güney et al. 2010)

Social/Interpersonal Intelligence: "refers to a person's ability to empathize, understand the mood and feelings of others." (Güney et al. 2010).

Intrapersonal Intelligence: "refers to a person's ability to direct oneself, and to be aware of his/her abilities." (Güney et al. 2010).

Naturalistic Intelligence: "refers to a person's ability recognize nature. This is the eighth type of intelligence introduced by Gardner in 1995." (Demirel, 1998: 144: cited in Sarıkaya, 2021).

The Secondary School Turkish Curriculum lists the objectives as follows: "support national and spiritual values; promote rights and responsibilities; provide necessary skills, attitude and competences required by Turkish Qualifications Framework; and improve students' academic competence." (MEB, 2019). Until now, a great many Turkish language curriculum has been designed for secondary school students. However, 2019 curriculum is the latest and current curriculum.

It is recognized that every curriculum define expected learning objectives or learning outcomes. Turkish language curriculum for 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grade also has learning objectives. The curriculum comprises the following areas: Listening/monitoring objectives, speaking objectives, reading objectives, and writing objectives. The number of objectives for each language skill is 17, 7, 62, and 26, respectively. In total, there are of 112 learning objectives. 20 of these objectives also encompass grammar topics. However, there are no listening/monitoring and speaking learning objectives dealing with grammar. Only 16 reading and 4 writing objectives deal with grammar.

The literature review shows that a great many studies have been devoted to understanding multiple intelligences such as multiple intelligence theory in Turkish lesson curricula (Güney et al. 2010), multiple intelligence theory in Turkish lessons (Kana and Demir (2017), multiple intelligence theory in Turkish textbooks (Kırbaşoğlu, Baki & Bayram, 2014; Bayram & Baki, 2014; İnan, 2015; Epçaçan & Kırbaş, 2018: Sarikaya, 2021) and studies investigating the relationship between grammar and multiple intelligences (Arıcı, 2012, Dolunay and Demir 2018). However, to date, there are no data in the literature that investigates to what extent learning objectives in the current Turkish curriculum (2019) reflect and engage Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence. The contribution of this study to the literature therefore is manifold.

With this in mind, this study seeks to answer the question: "To what extent the secondary school Turkish curriculum (2019) reflect and engage Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence?"
Sub-problems include:

1. To what extent listening/monitoring objectives reflect and engage Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence?
2. To what extent reading objectives reflect and engage Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence?
3. To what extent speaking objectives reflect and engage Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence?
4. To what extent writing objectives reflect and engage Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence?

2. Method

2.1. Research Design

The study employs document analysis method as a research design. Document analysis is the analysis of written materials that contain information about the facts and events intended to be investigated. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the research problem (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2008). In addition, material readiness frees the data collection process from the subjectivity of the researcher (Mayring, 2000: 36-37). As such, this study takes document analysis method, in response to the nature of research data, i.e., the availability of written material.

2.2. Data Collection

Research data has been collected through using document analysis method. Document analysis is "a systematic examination of existing records or documents, which include the analysis of written materials containing information about the topics to be investigated. The essential condition for a succesful document analysis is to find and examine the documents on the subject and to make the necessary arrangements to reach a synthesis that will reveal a certain situation or opinion." (Karasar, 2007). In the study, document analysis has been used to investigate the occurences in which different intelligences are represented across the curriculum.

2.3. Analysis

In the analysis of research data, the descriptive data analysis technique has been used. Descriptive data analysis employs pre-determined codes or headings to guide the interpration and data analysis. The focus here is reporting and discussing the research findings in an edited and interpreted manner (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2008). In this study, after collecting the data, a framework has been developed, and then themes has been haveected. Themes has beenhavee-selected based on the existing literature, studies on similar subjects and expert opinions.

The study provides evidence of content validity using inter-coder reliability. Expert review ensures accuracy in data analysis and collection process. Four experts have been involved in the study. 2 of them are lecturersTurkishsh education), 1 curriculum development specialist, and 1 Turkish teacher.

Following this process, expert opinions have been compared to quantify consistency. Experts have been asked to rate each objectives independently how well they represent the multiple intelligences. The results have been calculated using Miles and Huberman's (1994) formula (Reliability= Consensus/Disagreement + Consensus x 100), and 89% agreement has been reached. This value suggests that data analysis process is truly reliable.

3. Findings

This part has the statement of the sub-problems.

3.1. Findings for the First Sub-Problem:

Findings for the representation of the multiple intelligences in the listening/monitoring objectives are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: The Representation of the Multiple Intelligences in the Listening/Monitoring Objectives

No.	Learning Objectives	Grade	Type of Intelligence
1	The students are able to: make predictions about the development and outcome of events that take place as they listen/watch.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
2	guess the meaning of words they don't know as they listen/watch.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
3	find the main idea/basic emotion of what they listen/watch.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
4	summarize what they listen/watch.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
5	answer the questions about what they listen/watch.	7	Verbal/Linguistic
6	answer the questions about what they are listening/watching.	5,6,8	Verbal/Linguistic
7	suggest different titles for what they listen/watch.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
8	animate narrative texts that they listen/watch	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic Bodily/Kinesthetic
9	comprehend non-verbal signals of the speaker.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic Mathematical/Logical
10	evaluate the content of what they listen/watch.	5,6,7	Mathematical/Logical
11	express their opinions about what they listen/watch.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
12	use listening strategies.	5, 6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
13	identify critical thinking skills examples used in the listening text.	7, 8	Verbal/Linguistic
14	determine the topic of the listening text.	5, 6,7	Verbal/Linguistic
15	identify the topic of the listening text.	8	Verbal/Linguistic
16	gauge the consistency of the listening text.	7, 8	Verbal/Linguistic Mathematical/Logical
17	evaluates the media texts they listen/watch.	8	Mathematical/Logical Visual/Spatial

Table 1 shows that there are 17 listening/monitoring objectives in the curriculum. 15 objectives cater to the verbal/linguistic intelligence. This is followed by mathematical/logical (4), bodily/kinesthetic (1), and visual/spatial intelligence (1), respectively.

3.2. Findings for the Second Sub-Problem:

Findings for the representation of the multiple intelligences in the speaking objectives are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: The Representation of the Multiple Intelligences in the Speaking Objectives

No.	Learning Objectives	Grade	Type of Intelligence
1	The students are able to: prepare and give a speech.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic Social/Interpersonal
2	give an impromptu speech	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic Social/Interpersonal
3	use speaking strategies.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
4	use body language effectively in their speeches.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic Bodily/Kinesthetic
5	use words exactly according to their accepted meanings.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
6	use appropriate transitional expressions n their speeches.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
7	use Turkish equivalents for the words that came from other languages.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic

Table 2 shows that there are 7 speaking objectives in the curriculum. All these objectives cater to the verbal/linguistic intelligence. This is followed by social/interpersonal (2), and bodily/kinesthetic intelligences (1), respectively.

3.3. Findings for the Third Sub-Problem:

Findings for the representation of the multiple intelligences in the reading objectives are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: The Representation of the Multiple Intelligences in the Reading Objectives

No.	Learning Objectives	Grade	Type of Intelligence
1	The students are able to: reads aloud and quietly, paying attention to punctuation marks.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
2	read the text in order to assign it to a genre.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
3	Reads the texts written in different fonts.	5,6,7,8	Visual/Spatial
4	use reading strategies.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
5	use context to determine the meaning of unknown word or word groups.	5,6,7,8	Mathematical/Logical Verbal/Linguistic
6	determine the purpose of idioms and proverbs in a text.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
7	find synonyms of words.	5	Verbal/Linguistic
8	find antonyms of words.	5	Verbal/Linguistic
9	distinguish the meanings of heteronyms.	5	Verbal/Linguistic
10	distinguish the roots and affixes.	5	Verbal/Linguistic
11	describe the function of derivational affixes.	5	Verbal/Linguistic
12	distinguish the text types.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
13	summarize what they read.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
14	find the main idea/basic emotion of the text.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
15	find a solution to the problems encountered in the text.	5,6,7,8	Mathematical/Logical
16	determine the fiction story elements in the text.	5,6,7	Verbal/Linguistic
17	interpret the text critically.	5	Verbal/Linguistic Mathematical/Logical
18	ask any questions about the text.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
19	answer the questions about the text.	5	Verbal/Linguistic
20	determine the topic of the text.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
21	identify the topic of the text using such clues as title and visuals.	5,6,7,8	Visual/Spatial
22	answer the questions about the visuals.	5,6,7,8	Visual/Spatial Verbal/Linguistic
23	understand in what ways the main points are emphasized in the text.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
24	suggest an appropriate title to the text.	5,7	Verbal/Linguistic
25	evaluate the media texts.	5,6,7	Verbal/Linguistic Visual/Spatial
26	evaluate the contribution of the transitional expressions that add up to the text meaning.	5,6,7	Verbal/Linguistic
27	make comparisons between the texts.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
28	use the information sources effectively.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
29	gauge the reliability of the information sources.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
30	distinguish the real and fictional elements in the text.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
31	make inferences about what they read.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic Mathematical/Logical
32	identify the figure of speech in the text.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
33	distinguish between the real, metaphorical and locutional words in the text.	5	Verbal/Linguistic Mathematical/Logical
34	answer the questions about the information presented with the graphs, charts, and tables.	5	Visual/Spatial Verbal/Linguistic

Continuation of Table 3: The Representation of the Multiple Intelligences in the Reading Objectives

No.	Learning Objectives	Grade	Type of Intelligence
35	distinguish the functions of inflectional suffixes.	6,7	Verbal/Linguistic
36	describe the contribution of nouns and adjectives to the meaning of the text.	6	Verbal/Linguistic
37	describe the contribution of noun and adjective clauses to the meaning of the text.	6	Verbal/Linguistic
38	describes the contribution of prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections to the meaning of the text.	6	Verbal/Linguistic
39	distinguish between the simple, derivative and compound words.	6	Verbal/Linguistic
40	describe the contribution of pronouns to the meaning of the text.	6	Verbal/Linguistic
41	suggest an appropriate title to the text.	6	Verbal/Linguistic
42	answer the questions about the text.	6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
43	interpret the text content.	6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic Mathematical/Logical
44	describe the formal elements of a poem.	6	Verbal/Linguistic
45	interpret the information presented with the graphs, charts, and tables.	6,7,8	Mathematical/Logical Visual/Spatial
46	distinguish between the simple, derivative, and compound verbs.	7	Verbal/Linguistic
47	describe the contribution of adverbs to the meaning of the text.	7	Verbal/Linguistic
48	notice the meaning properties of verbs.	7	Verbal/Linguistic
49	identify an ambiguity in a text.	7	Verbal/Linguistic
50	find the supporting ideas in the text.	7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
51	compare the media presentations with the written version of the texts.	7	Visual/Spatial Mathematical/Logical
52	identify the forms of expression in the text.	7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
53	identify the critical thinking skills examples used in the text.	7	Verbal/Linguistic
54	comprehend the process steps in the text.	7,8	Mathematical/Logical
55	identify the textual ambiguity in a text.	8	Verbal/Linguistic
56	comprehend the functions of gerunds in the sentences.	8	Verbal/Linguistic
57	evaluate the contribution of the transitional expressions that add up to the text meaning.	8	Verbal/Linguistic
58	suggest an appropriate title to the text.	8	Verbal/Linguistic
59	determine the fiction story elements in the text they read.	8	Verbal/Linguistic
60	analyze the media texts.	8	Mathematical/Logical Visual/Spatial
61	compare the media presentation with the written text of the literary work.	8	Mathematical/Logical Visual/Spatial
62	identify the critical thinking skills examples used in the text they read.	8	Verbal/Linguistic

Table 3 shows that there are 62 reading objectives in the curriculum. 55 objectives cater to the verbal/linguistic intelligence. This is followed by mathematical/logical (10), and visual/spatial intelligences (9), respectively. In addition to these, 16 of these objectives deal with grammar.

3.4. Findings for the Fourth Sub-Problem:

Findings for the representation of the multiple intelligences in the writing objectives are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: The Representation of the Multiple Intelligences in the Writing Objectives

No.	Learning Objectives	Grade	Type of Intelligence
1	The students are able to: write a poem.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
2	write an informative text.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
3	write a narrative text.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
4	use writing strategies.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
5	use the capital letters and punctuation marks where appropriate.	5	Verbal/Linguistic
6	write the process steps of any undertaking.	5,6	Verbal/Linguistic Mathematical/Logical
7	uses proverbs, idioms and sayings to add a new flavour to their writings.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
8	write the numbers correctly.	5	Verbal/Linguistic
9	edit what they write.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
10	publish what they write.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic Social/Interpersonal
11	use correctly the words that undergone phonological change in their writings.	5	Verbal/Linguistic
12	use Turkish equivalents for the words that came from other languages in their writings.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
13	fill out the forms completely and accurately.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic Mathematical/Logical
14	write a short text.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
15	suggest an appropriate title for what they write.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
16	use the appropriate transitional expressions in their writings.	5,6,7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
17	uses the charts and tables as needed to help in writing.	6	Visual/Spatial Verbal/Linguistic
18	uses the charts and tables to visualize data.	7,8	Visual/Spatial Verbal/Linguistic
19	write the process of an undertaking step by step.	7,8	Verbal/Linguistic Mathematical/Logical
20	use the forms of expression in their writings.	7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
21	write up their research results.	7,8	Verbal/Linguistic
22	use auxiliary verbs correctly.	7	Verbal/Linguistic
23	use humor in their writings.	8	Verbal/Linguistic
24	determine the parts of speech in a sentence.	8	Verbal/Linguistic
25	identify different types of sentences.	8	Verbal/Linguistic
26	comprehend the contribution of verb voice features to the meaning.	8	Verbal/Linguistic

Table 4 shows that there are 26 writing objectives in the curriculum. All of these objectives cater to the verbal/linguistic intelligence. This is followed by mathematical/logical (3), visual/spatial (2), and social/interpersonal intelligences (1), respectively. In addition, four of these objectives deal with grammar.

4. Result

This study aims to investigate to what extent learning objectives in the secondary school Turkish language curriculum (2019) reflect and engage Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence. In the curriculum, there are 112 learning objectives that learners will have acquired completing their studies. The study results show that each objective in the curriculum caters to at least one type of intelligence. However, 25 objectives cater to more than one intelligences. The study further reveals that out of 8 intelligence types only 5 of them have been represeented in the curriculum. The objectives in the curriculum mainly represent verbal/linguistic intelligence (103). This is followed by mathematical/logical (17), visual/spatial (12), social/interpersonal (3), and bodily/kinesthetic intelligences (2), respectively. The ratio of the objectives representing verbal/linguistic

intelligence is 75%. The reason for this is that Turkish is a verbal and linguistic course. Another important finding is that there are no objectives in the curriculum representing intrapersonal, musical/rhythmic and naturalistic intelligences. The literature also provides enough evidence to support this finding. For example, Güney et al. (2010) in their study, investigated the profile and the extent of use of the multiple intelligences in the 2005 Turkish course curriculum. The study found that learning objectives represent the most verbal/linguistic intelligence, and mathematical/logical intelligences, respectively. However, no example of musical/rhythmic and naturalistic intelligences was found. Another study was conducted by Ergin (2007: 107). He investigated to what extent learning objectives in the 4th and 5th grade curriculum represent Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence. The study also shared the same results with the current and above mentioned researches. Learning objectives mostly catered to verbal/linguistic and mathematical/logical intelligences, leaving almost no place for musical, bodily-kinesthetic, social and naturalistic intelligences. Apart from these studies, there are also a few studies evaluating the activities in Turkish textbooks whether they can be described as appropriate based on multiple intelligence theory. For example, Sarikaya (2021) found that intelligence profile of the activities in the Turkish textbook is predominantlyverbal-linguisticc. Naturalistic and musical/rhythmic intelligences, on the other hand, were identified as the least intelligence type catered in the activities. Kırbaşoğlu, Baki and Bayram (2014: 83) also reached findings similar to those of Sarikaya (2021). The intelligence profile of the activities in the 8th grade Turkish teacher's guide book is predominantly verbal-linguistic. Epçaçan and Kırbaş's (2018) study again disclosed that the prominent intelligence type in the activities given in the 8th grade Turkish textbook is verbal/linguistic. However, no example of naturalistic and musical/rhythmic intelligences was found. Lastly, the studies in which the views of Turkish teachers were discussed shared also similar findings (Kana & Demir, 2017).

In the curriculum, there are a total of 15 listening/monitoring objectives. These represent the most verbal/linguistic intelligence (15). This is followed by mathematical/logical (4), bodily/kinesthetic (1), and visual/spatial intelligences (1), respectively. However, no example of social/interpersonal, internal, musical rhythmic, and naturalistic intelligences has been found. The study, conducted by Güney et al. (2010), also provides evidence to prove this finding. The study found that learning objectives represent the most mathematical/logical (19), and verbal/linguistic (15) intelligences, respectively. However, there were no learning objectives representing musical/rhythmic and naturalistic intelligences.

The number of speaking objectives in the curriculum, on the other hand, is 7. All these cater to the verbal/linguistic intelligence. This is followed by social/interpersonal (2), and bodily/kinesthetic intelligences (1), respectively. It seems to shows that this skill is missing both in terms of the number of objectives and frequency distribution of intelligences. However, it seems plausible that learning objectives mostly cater to verbal/linguistic since speaking is an expressive skill (Başaran and Erdem, 2009: 744). In their study, Güney et al. (2010) also yielded the same results. Speaking objectives mostly catered to the verbal/linguistic intelligence.
There are also a total of 62 reading objectives in the curriculum. These objectives again represent mostly verbal/linguistic intelligence (55). This is followed by mathematical/logical (10), and visual/spatial intelligences (9), respectively. These rates emphasize enough the importance of reading skill but despite this, no example of intrapersonal, musical rhythmic, and naturalistic intelligences has been found. This is one of the remarkable findings of the study. Many of the research results also provide evidence to prove this finding. For example, in his study, Epçaçan (2013) found that activities based on the theory of multiple intelligence improve students' reading habits and their perception of reading comprehension. In their study, Güney et al. (2010) also reached findings similar to the current study. Reading objectives mostly catered to the verbal/linguistic and and mathematical/logical intelligences. However, no example of musical rhythmic and naturalistic intelligences was found.

Lastly, there are 25 writing objectives in the curriculum. These objectives again represent mostly verbal/linguistic intelligence (26). This finding is important because writing has a positive impact on a person's world of thought and language (Sarikaya, 2020: 44). Following verbal/linguistic intelligence, mathematical/ logical (3), visual/spatial intelligence (2), and social/interpersonal intelligences (1) are identified as the most intelligence type catered in the writing objectives. Güney et al. (2010), also yielded also the same results. Writing objectives represented mostly verbal/linguistic, and mathematical/logical intelligences.

The following recommendations for future researches are based on the study finding:

1. It is noteworthy that there are no objectives which cater to internal, musical/rhythmic and naturalistic intelligences. This can be considered a deficiency in existing the curriculum. Therefore, activities that can help overcome this can be designed.
2. Conducting some courses in a natural environment, using musical tracks in some courses, or performing activities in which students are able to recognize and express themselves can make the curriculum more efficient.
3. Teachers and administrators can be informed about multiple intelligence theory.
4. Learning objectives in the curriculum of other courses can also be studied and discussed based on the theory of multiple intelligence.

References

Arıcı, B. (2012). *Assisted Turkish eighth grade students' multiple intelligences course of his presentation gerunds primary effect of clutch situations.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, Trabzon: Karadeniz Technical University Institute of Education Sciences.

Armstrong, T. (1994). Multiple intelligences. *Educational Leadership, 52*(3), 26-28.

Başaran, M., & Erdem, İ. (2009). A research about views of teacher candidates on rhetorical speaking skill. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 17*(3), s. 743- 754.

Demirel, Ö. (1998). *Eğitimde çoklu zekâ kuram ve uygulama [Multiple intelligence theory and practice in education].* Ankara: Pegem Publishing.

Dolunay, S. K.,& Savaş, Ö. (2018). Grammar teaching based on the multiple intelligences theory. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Education Faculty Journal,18*(3), 1433–1455.

Epçaçan, C. & Kırbaş, A. (2018). The evaluation of Turkish textbooks in terms of multiple intelligence theory based education. *Ekev Academic Review, (76)*, 57–78.

Epçaçan C. (2013). The effect of activities based on multiple intelligence theory attitudes of reading habits and reading comprehension self-efficiencies of students. *The Journal Turkish Social Research, (16)*4, 209-236.

Ergin, G. (2007). *Evaluation of the primary education 4th and 5th grades Turkish lesson curriculum with respect to multiple intelligence theory.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, Konya: Selçuk University Institute of Social Sciences.

Gardner, H. (1999). *Multiple intelligences: Interviews and articles* (Ed.) C. J. Vickers, (Translator) M. Tüzel, İstanbul: Enka Schools BZD Publications.

Güney, N., Aytan, T., & Gün, M. (2010). Accordance level of Turkish curriculum at presecondary education with multiple intelligence theory. *The Journal of International Social Research, (3),* 213–229.

Kana, F. & Demir R. (2017). Multiple intelligence theory in secondary Turkish education. *The Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(11), 399–416.

Karasar, N. (2007). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi [Scientific research method].* Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Kırbaşoğlu Kılıç, L., Baki, Y., & Bayram, B. (2014). A qualitative research on the correspondence level of the activities in the secondary school 8th grade Turkish course book with the theory of multiple intelligences. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education, 2*(2), 72–89.

Mayring, P. (2000). *Nitel sosyal araştırmaya giriş [Introduction to qualitative social research].* (Translator. A. Gümüş ve M. S. Durgun). Adana: Baki.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman A. M. (1994). *An expanded source book: Qualitative data analysis.* CA: Sage Publications.

Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2019). *Turkish Curriculum for 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades.* Ankara: Ministry of Education.

Sarikaya, B. (2020). Suitability of writing achievements for creative writing (Examples of 2015 and 2018 Turkish course teaching programs). *Turkey Education Journal, 5*(1), 42–55.

Sarikaya, B. (2021). The evaluation of 8th class Turkish course book activities in the context of multiple intelligence theory. *Journal of Bitlis Eren University Humanities and Social Sciences, 1*(1), 31–54.

Türkçe Sözlük, (2009). Ankara: Turkish Language Association Publications.

Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri [Qualitative research methodology in social sciences].* Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.

Yılmaz, Ö. (2018). Mehmed Fevzi Efendi's human definition and classification on some human considerations. *Journal Of AnalyticDivinity, 2*(3), 6–22.