Transformative Pedagogies
eISSN: 3093-7752
https://tp.cultechpub.com/index.php/tp

Application of Multiple Intelligences Theory in Primary School English Teaching: A Comparative Study in Renqiu City

Yu Lu

Master's Student, Educational Administration, School of Education Science, Jiangsu Normal University, Xuzhou, Jiangsu, China

Abstract

Multiple Intelligences Theory is a typical educational theory of psychology, which has been widely used in classroom teaching in recent years due to its innovative thinking and characteristics. In China's English education of elementary school, under the pressure of examination, students can't fully understand the meaning and purpose of English learning, and teachers' teaching objectives are not clear, some schools have uneven teaching standards. According to English education of elementary schools and using of Multiple Intelligences Theory, this paper proposes how to apply Multiple Intelligences Theory in primary school English classes and what are the differences between that teaching method and the traditional teaching method? This paper takes questionnaire survey and comparative analysis method as research methods. By discussing the application of the theory in the classroom, students can give full play to their own intelligences, which is beneficial to promote English learning.

Based on the questionnaire results, targeted teaching strategies were designed for eight types of intelligences (excluding existential intelligence, which is less relevant to primary school students), and an experimental teaching practice was conducted. The results showed that MIT-based teaching significantly stimulated students' interest in English learning, improved their classroom participation, and differed from traditional teaching in terms of teacher roles, teaching concepts, and focus areas. Specifically, MIT-based teaching transformed teachers from knowledge imparters to facilitators, shifted the focus from exam performance to holistic development, and balanced the cultivation of multiple intelligences. This study concludes that the application of Multiple Intelligences Theory in primary school English teaching is conducive to promoting personalized learning and improving teaching effectiveness, providing valuable insights for primary school English educators.

Keywords

Multiple Intelligences Theory, Primary School English Teaching, Teaching Strategy, Questionnaire Survey, Experimental Study

1. Introduction

1.1 Research Background

Multiple Intelligences Theory proposed by Howard Gardner, a psychology doctor from Harvard University in the United States, it has exerted a great impact on the history of education of all countries in the world, and has also won the general popularity of the educational circles in China. In China, many students feel confused about the real purpose of learning English under the pressure of exam-oriented education. Students are forced to accept new knowledge constantly, while in the process of accepting the knowledge, they have to start learning in every sector without understanding correct learning content.

Teachers focus on improving students' test scores and thus ignore the development of students' other intelligences. China's current school teaching focuses on linguistic intelligence and logic-mathematical intelligence, while ignoring other intelligences. Teaching method not only is dull, but also greatly suppresses the students' talent and leads to increase the burden of those who are weak in linguistic intelligence and logic-mathematical intelligence.

1.2 Literature Review Embedded

InternationallyIn , Gardner believes that human beings are born with more than seven kinds of intelligence in 1983. Gardner added natural intelligence in 1995 and existential intelligence in 1998 [1].

Campbell believes that teachers should first understand the Multiple Intelligences Theory and explain it to students [2].

Lazear proposes various types of thematic unit models, emphasizing that curriculum design should be combined with intelligent development [3].

Armstrong believes that schools should combine Multiple Intelligences Theory in teaching activities. He provides a number of application patterns and puts forward the idea of student-centered teaching mode in class [4].

Christison proposes the form of brainstorming, first identifying the theme and then using some straight lines to correspond to different intelligences [5].

In China, Qian Wenxiu believes that in English teaching, students' intelligences should be comprehensively developed by utilizing the characteristics of intelligences [6].

Xu Guohua believes the theoretical design of multiple intelligences in English teaching provides good materials for improving students' intelligence and implementing quality-oriented education [7].

Hou Yanjie believes that the Multiple Intelligences Theory is not a simple negation of traditional education, but a kind of sublation. Multiple Intelligences Theory exhibits a new perspective for us to understand the relationship between intelligence and teaching [8].

Li Hong believes using Multiple Intelligence Theory in primary school English teaching can help teachers to establish the teaching concept that everyone can become a talent and teach students in accordance with their aptitude [9].

Li Xiaonan believes that by applying the Multiple Intelligences Theory, students will learn more efficiently and the teaching content will be richer [10].

1.3 Research Purpose and Questions

Based on the current situation of primary school English education and the application of Multiple Intelligences Theory, the paper proposes two main questions:

- How to apply Multiple Intelligences Theory in primary school English classes?
- What are the differences between the multiple intelligence teaching and the traditional teaching method?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Foundations of Multiple Intelligences Theory

Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory originated from his critique of traditional intelligence theories, which he argued oversimplified human intelligence as a single, measurable trait. In 1987, Gardner initially proposed seven types of intelligence: linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, and intrapersonal intelligence. He defined intelligence as "the ability to solve problems or create products that are valued in one or more cultural settings [11]"

In 1995, Gardner added naturalist intelligence, which refers to the ability to recognize, classify, and utilize the characteristics of natural objects and environments. In 1998, he further proposed existential intelligence, the ability to contemplate fundamental questions about life, death, and existence, though he acknowledged that this intelligence is less developed in children and more relevant to adolescents and adults. Gardner emphasized that each individual possesses all nine intelligences, but the combination and degree of development of these intelligences vary from person to person, forming unique intelligence profiles.

2.2 Limitations of Existing Research

Despite the progress made, existing research has several limitations. First, international studies are often based on Western educational contexts, and their findings may not be directly applicable to Chinese primary schools, which face unique challenges such as large class sizes and exam-oriented pressure. Second, domestic empirical studies are limited in scale, usually involving only one or two classes, making it difficult to generalize the results. Third, few studies systematically compare MIT-based teaching with traditional teaching, especially in terms of long-term effects on student learning. Fourth, research on naturalist intelligence and intrapersonal intelligence in primary school English teaching is scarce, with most studies focusing on linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligence. Finally, there is a lack of in-depth discussion on how to evaluate the effectiveness of MIT-based teaching, with most studies relying on subjective feedback rather than objective indicators.

2.3 Theoretical Framework of This Study

This study is based on Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory, focusing on eight of the nine intelligences (excluding existential intelligence, as it is considered less relevant to primary school students aged 8-9). The eight intelligences are defined as follows:

- Linguistic intelligence: The ability to use language effectively in speaking and writing, including skills in storytelling, reading, and vocabulary use.
- Logical-mathematical intelligence: The ability to reason logically, solve mathematical problems, and recognize patterns, applicable to tasks such as classifying words and analyzing sentence structures.
- Spatial intelligence: The ability to perceive and manipulate spatial relationships, useful in activities like drawing

English scenes and understanding directions.

• Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence: The ability to use the body or hands to express ideas, relevant to role-plays, gestures, and drama performances.

• Musical intelligence: The ability to perceive rhythm, pitch, and melody, applicable to learning through songs, rhymes, and chants.

• Interpersonal intelligence: The ability to understand and interact with others, useful in group work, pair discussions, and collaborative projects.

• Intrapersonal intelligence: The ability to understand one's own emotions and thoughts, relevant to self-reflection and individual presentations.

• Naturalist intelligence: The ability to recognize and classify natural objects, applicable to learning English through nature-related topics (e.g., plants, animals, seasons).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a mixed-methods research design, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to explore the application of MIT in primary school English teaching. The quantitative component involves a questionnaire survey to assess students' intelligence profiles, while the qualitative component includes an experimental teaching intervention and classroom observations to explore the practical application of MIT and compare it with traditional teaching methods. This mixed design allows for a comprehensive understanding of both "what" students' intelligence characteristics are and "how" MIT can be applied to improve teaching outcomes.

3.2 Participants

The study was conducted in Class 1, Grade 3 of the Research Institute Primary School of Renqiu City, Hebei Province. This class was selected for three reasons: first, the students (aged 8-9) had two years of primary school education, with basic Chinese language comprehension skills to understand the questionnaire; second, they were in the initial stage of English learning (starting English in Grade 3), making it easier to cultivate their interest through new teaching methods; third, the class size (49 students) was representative of average primary school classes in China, ensuring the generalizability of the results.

The students were homogeneous in terms of age, educational background, and English learning duration, reducing the impact of confounding variables. The class teacher, with 10 years of primary English teaching experience, participated in the study as the instructor for both the experimental and traditional teaching phases, ensuring consistency in teaching quality.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

3.3.1 Questionnaire on Students' Intelligence Profiles

The questionnaire was adapted from Armstrong's Multiple Intelligences Test, which is widely used in educational research to assess intelligence types. To suit primary school students, the original test (designed for adults) was revised: complex vocabulary and abstract questions were removed, and simple, child-friendly language was used. The revised questionnaire included 40 items, with 5 items corresponding to each of the eight intelligences (linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, naturalist).

Each item used a 5-point Likert scale, with options ranging from 1 ("completely inconsistent") to 5 ("completely consistent"). For example, items for linguistic intelligence included "I enjoy telling English stories to my classmates" and "I can remember new English words quickly"; items for bodily-kinesthetic intelligence included "I like to act out English dialogues with gestures" and "I learn better when I can move around in class."

3.3.2 Teaching Intervention Materials

Based on the questionnaire results, eight sets of teaching strategies were designed for the eight intelligence types, each including 3-5 specific activities. For example:

Linguistic intelligence: English story retelling, English poem creation, vocabulary guessing games.

Logical-mathematical intelligence: English number puzzles, grammar rule induction, sentence structure classification.

Spatial intelligence: English scene drawing, map description in English, 3D model making with English labels.

Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence: English drama performances, "charades" (guess words through actions), gesture-based vocabulary learning.

Musical intelligence: English song singing, rhythm-based pronunciation practice, rhyme creation.

Interpersonal intelligence: Group English discussions, collaborative story writing, peer teaching.

Intrapersonal intelligence: English self-introduction, reflection journals in English, personal goal setting.

Naturalist intelligence: English descriptions of plants/animals, seasonal changes in English, nature observation diaries.

3.3.3 Classroom Observation Checklist

A checklist was used to record student and teacher behaviors during both traditional and MIT-based classes. The checklist included indicators such as "student participation rate," "types of student activities," "teacher-student interaction frequency," and "use of teaching aids," allowing for systematic comparison between the two teaching methods.

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

3.4.1 Pre-questionnaire Administration

One week before the teaching intervention, the questionnaire was distributed to the 49 students in Class 1, Grade 3 during a regular English class. The class teacher explained the instructions, and students completed the questionnaire independently. The questionnaire was collected on-site, with a recovery rate of 100% (49 valid responses).

3.4.2 Intelligence Classification

Based on the questionnaire results, students' intelligence scores were calculated by summing the scores of the 5 items for each intelligence type. A score of 18 or above was defined as "dominant intelligence," and a score of 12 or below as "weak intelligence." This classification was used to group students for targeted teaching activities.

3.4.3 Teaching Intervention

The teaching intervention lasted for 8 weeks (16 classes, 40 minutes per class), focusing on the unit "My School Life" in the third-grade English textbook. The first 4 weeks used traditional teaching methods (teacher-centered lectures, textbook exercises, vocabulary dictation), and the next 4 weeks used MIT-based teaching, with activities designed according to students' dominant intelligences.

For example, in the lesson on "Classroom Objects," traditional teaching involved the teacher showing pictures and explaining words like "desk," "chair," and "blackboard," followed by repetition and dictation. MIT-based teaching, by contrast, included:

- Linguistic intelligence: Students described classroom objects in English stories.
- Spatial intelligence: Students drew classroom layouts and labeled objects in English.
- Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence: Students acted out "finding the object" (e.g., miming sitting at a desk).
- Interpersonal intelligence: Students worked in groups to list classroom objects in English.

3.4.4 Classroom Observation

During the 8-week intervention, two researchers observed 4 traditional classes and 4 MIT-based classes, recording data using the observation checklist. Observations focused on student engagement, teacher roles, and activity diversity.

3.4.5 Post-intervention Feedback

After the intervention, informal interviews were conducted with 10 students (selected to represent different dominant intelligences) and the class teacher to collect qualitative feedback on their experiences with MIT-based teaching.

3.5 Data Analysis Methods

3.5.1 Quantitative Analysis

Questionnaire data were analyzed using SPSS 26.0. Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency) were calculated to describe students' dominant and weak intelligences. Differences in student participation rates between traditional and MIT-based classes were analyzed using paired-samples t-tests to assess statistical significance.

3.5.2 Qualitative Analysis

Classroom observation records and interview transcripts were coded using thematic analysis. Key themes were identified, such as "changes in teacher roles," "student interest in learning," and "differences in teaching focus," which were then used to compare the two teaching methods.

4. Results

4.1 Students' Intelligence Profiles

The questionnaire results revealed diverse intelligence profiles among the 49 third-grade students (see Table 1).

Table 1. Distribution of Dominant and Weak Intelligences Among Students(n=49)

Intelligence Type	Number of Students with Dominant Intelligence (Score ≥18)	Percentage (%)	Number of Students with Weak Intelligence (Score ≤12)	Percentage (%)
Linguistic	16	32.65	5	10.2
Logical-mathematical	11	22.45	12	24.49
Spatial	9	18.37	8	16.33
Bodily-kinesthetic	13	26.53	4	8.16
Musical	10	20.41	7	14.29
Interpersonal	12	24.49	6	12.24
Intrapersonal	8	16.33	9	18.37
Naturalist	7	14.29	11	22.45

As shown in Table 1, linguistic intelligence was the most common dominant intelligence (32.65% of students), followed by bodily-kinesthetic (26.53%) and interpersonal intelligence (24.49%). Logical-mathematical intelligence was the most common weak intelligence (24.49%), followed by naturalist intelligence (22.45%). Most students had 2-3 dominant intelligences, reflecting the uniqueness of each student's intelligence profile.

4.2 Comparison Between Traditional Teaching and MIT-based Teaching

Analysis of classroom observations and teaching records revealed significant differences between the two teaching methods in four key areas:

4.2.1 Teacher Roles

In traditional teaching, the teacher acted as the primary knowledge imparter: 85% of class time was spent on lectures, explaining vocabulary and grammar, and students were passive recipients (observation data). The teacher rarely adjusted methods based on student responses, and interaction was mostly one-way (teacher asking, students answering).

In MIT-based teaching, the teacher's role shifted to facilitator and collaborator: 60% of class time involved guiding student activities, providing feedback, and resolving problems. For example, during group work for interpersonal intelligence, the teacher circulated to offer English expression tips rather than dictating answers. Teacher-student interaction increased by 75% compared to traditional teaching (from an average of 8 interactions per class to 14 interactions).

4.2.2 Teaching Concepts

Traditional teaching was rooted in exam-oriented concepts, with the primary goal of improving test scores. This was reflected in the focus on vocabulary memorization and grammar accuracy, with 90% of homework consisting of textbook exercises and dictation (teacher interview). The teacher admitted that "activities unrelated to exams, like English songs, are often skipped to save time."

MIT-based teaching was guided by the concept of holistic development, emphasizing the cultivation of multiple intelligences alongside language skills. The teacher reported that "the goal is not just to learn words, but to let students use English in diverse ways that match their strengths." For example, a student with dominant musical intelligence improved vocabulary retention through English songs, even if this activity was not directly tested.

4.2.3 Teaching Focus

Traditional teaching focused almost exclusively on linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligences: 70% of activities involved reading textbooks, writing sentences, and solving grammar problems (observation data). Other intelligences were rarely addressed; for example, physical education or music-related English activities were never used.

MIT-based teaching balanced all eight intelligences, with each class including 3-4 activities targeting different

intelligences. For instance, a lesson on "Animals" included:

- Naturalist intelligence: Observing and describing classroom pets in English.
- Linguistic intelligence: Writing short stories about animals.
- Musical intelligence: Singing "Old MacDonald Had a Farm" in English.
- Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence: Acting out animal movements.

This diversity led to a 60% increase in the types of student activities compared to traditional teaching (from 3 types per class to 5 types).

4.2.4 Student Engagement

Student participation in traditional classes was low, with only 45% of students actively responding to teacher questions (observation data). Many students with weak linguistic intelligence were inattentive, with 30% reported "looking away or talking privately" (observation records).

In MIT-based classes, overall participation increased to 85%, with students of all intelligence types engaged. For example, a student with weak linguistic but strong bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, who rarely spoke in traditional classes, actively participated in role-plays, using gestures to communicate when unable to find words. The teacher noted that "even shy students became involved when activities matched their strengths."

4.3 Impact of MIT-based Teaching on English Learning

Post-intervention feedback and observation data indicated several positive impacts of MIT-based teaching:

4.3.1 Increased Learning Interest

All 10 interviewed students reported higher interest in English after MIT-based teaching. A student with dominant musical intelligence stated, "I used to hate English because it was just memorizing, but now I love singing English songs and can remember words better this way." The teacher observed that "students now look forward to English class, whereas before, many sighed when the bell rang [12]."

4.3.2 Improved Language Application Ability

Students showed more flexible use of English in diverse contexts. For example, students with dominant interpersonal intelligence used English to negotiate roles in group projects; those with naturalist intelligence described seasonal changes in English during outdoor observations. The teacher noted that "students are no longer limited to textbook sentences but can create their own English expressions [13]."

4.3.3 Enhanced Self-confidence

Students with weak linguistic intelligence, who often felt frustrated in traditional classes, gained confidence through MIT-based activities. A student with dominant spatial intelligence said, "I'm bad at spelling, but I can draw English stories well, and the teacher praised my pictures—that makes me want to learn more English."

4.3.4 Diversified Learning Styles

MIT-based teaching encouraged students to develop personalized learning strategies. For example, some used songs (musical intelligence) to remember grammar, while others used drawings (spatial intelligence) to organize vocabulary. This reduced reliance on rote memorization, with 80% of students reporting "using my own way to learn English" in post-intervention feedback.

5. Discussion

5.1 Interpretation of Results

The findings of this study provide empirical support for the application of Multiple Intelligences Theory in primary school English teaching. The diverse intelligence profiles identified in the questionnaire (Section 4.1) align with Gardner's (1983) assertion that individuals possess multiple intelligences in varying degrees, confirming the need for tailored teaching. The high percentage of students with dominant bodily-kinesthetic and interpersonal intelligence also highlights the importance of active and social learning for young children, which traditional teaching often neglects.

The differences between MIT-based and traditional teaching (Section 4.2) reflect a paradigm shift from "teacher-centered" to "student-centered" education, consistent with Campbell's (1997) argument that MIT requires teachers to "adapt to students rather than forcing students to adapt to teaching." The increased student engagement in MIT-based classes supports Armstrong's (1999) finding that multi-intelligence activities can "unlock students' potential by connecting learning to their strengths."

The positive impact of MIT-based teaching on learning interest and language application (Section 4.3) echoes Li Hong's (2015) domestic study, which found that MIT can enhance primary students' English learning motivation. The improvement in self-confidence among students with weak linguistic intelligence is particularly significant, as it

addresses a key limitation of traditional teaching—its failure to recognize and nurture diverse talents.

5.2 Theoretical Implications

This study contributes to the theoretical development of MIT in primary education by:

- Providing empirical evidence for the applicability of MIT in Chinese primary school English classrooms, supplementing the predominantly theoretical domestic research.
- Clarifying the specific mechanisms through which MIT influences learning (e.g., role shifts, activity diversity), enriching the understanding of how intelligence theory interacts with language teaching.
- Highlighting the importance of excluding existential intelligence in primary education, offering guidance for adapting MIT to young learners' developmental stages.

5.3 Practical Implications

For primary school English teachers, the study suggests several practical strategies:

- Assess Intelligence Profiles: Use questionnaires or observations to identify students' dominant intelligences, avoiding "one-size-fits-all" teaching [14].
- Design Diverse Activities: Integrate multi-intelligence activities into lessons, such as combining songs (musical), role-plays (bodily-kinesthetic), and group work (interpersonal) to cater to different strengths.
- Shift Roles: Act as facilitators rather than dictators, providing targeted support based on student needs (e.g., helping linguistic weak students express ideas through gestures).
- Adopt Diversified Evaluation: Expand evaluation beyond test scores to include participation in multi-intelligence activities, such as creativity in English drawings (spatial intelligence) or collaboration in group projects (interpersonal intelligence).

5.4 Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations. First, the sample size is small (one class), limiting generalizability. Future research should include multiple schools and regions to verify the findings. Second, the intervention duration (8 weeks) is short; long-term studies are needed to assess the sustained impact of MIT-based teaching on English proficiency. Third, the study did not include a control group; comparing an experimental class with a control class using traditional teaching would strengthen causal inference.

Future research could also explore:

- The application of existential intelligence in higher primary grades (Grades 5-6) to determine its relevance for older students.
- The impact of MIT-based teaching on students with learning difficulties in English.
- The role of parents in supporting MIT-based learning at home (e.g., encouraging English activities aligned with children's dominant intelligences).

6. Conclusion

6.1 Summary of Findings

This study explored the application of Multiple Intelligences Theory in primary school English teaching through a mixed-methods design involving 49 third-grade students in Renqiu City. The results showed that:

- Students have diverse intelligence profiles, with linguistic, bodily-kinesthetic, and interpersonal intelligences being the most common dominant types, and logical-mathematical and naturalist intelligences being the most common weak types.
- MIT-based teaching differs significantly from traditional teaching in teacher roles (facilitator vs. imparter), teaching concepts (holistic development vs. exam performance), teaching focus (multiple intelligences vs. linguistic/logical-mathematical), and student engagement (high vs. low).
- MIT-based teaching enhances students' interest in English, improves their language application ability, boosts self-confidence, and encourages diversified learning styles.

6.2 Research Contributions

This study makes both theoretical and practical contributions. Theoretically, it enriches empirical research on MIT in Chinese primary school English teaching, clarifying the specific differences between MIT-based and traditional teaching. [15] Practically, it provides detailed teaching strategies for each intelligence type, offering actionable guidance for frontline teachers. The study also highlights the importance of adapting educational theories to local contexts,

demonstrating how MIT can be modified to address the challenges of exam-oriented education in China.

6.3 Final Recommendations

Based on the findings, we strongly recommend that primary school English teachers adopt Multiple Intelligences Theory in their practice. By recognizing and catering to students' diverse intelligences, teachers can transform English classrooms from dull, exam-focused environments into engaging, inclusive spaces where all students can succeed. Schools and policymakers should support this shift by prioritizing holistic development over narrow test scores, ensuring that English learning becomes a joyful and meaningful experience for young learners.

References

[1] Gardner H,Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice,Basic Books,1993.
[2] Campbell L,How Teachers Interpret Mi Theory.,EDUC LEADERSHIP,1997,55(1):14-19.
[3] Lazear D,Eight Ways of Teaching: The Artistry of Teaching with Multiple Intelligences. Third Edition. K-College.,Skylight Training and Publishing Inc., 2626 S. Clearbrook Dr., Arlington Heights, IL 60005-5310. Tel: 800-348-4474,1999.
[4] Armstrong T,7 Kinds of Smart,1999.
[5] Christison M A,Applying Multiple Intelligences Theory: In Preservice and Inservice Tefl Education Programs,Forum,1998.
[6] Qian, Wenxiu. A Study on Effective Teaching of English Reading in Primary School Classrooms Under the Guidance of Multiple Intelligences Theory. Shanghai Normal University, 2016. MA thesis.
[7] Xu, Guohua. "Multiple Intelligences Theory and English Language Teaching." Journal of Chengdu College of Education, no. 8, 2006, pp. 53-54+125.
[8] Hou, Yanjie. "On Multiple Intelligences Theory and Primary School English Teaching." Talent, no. 29, 2017, p. 177.
[9] Li, Hong. An Empirical Study on Stratified Teaching in High School English. Shandong Normal University, 2015. MA thesis.
[10] Li, Xiaonan. A Study on the Application of Multiple Intelligences Teaching Method in High School English Teaching. Shenyang Normal University, 2017. MA thesis.
[11] Gardner H,The Theory of Multiple Intelligences,ANN DYSLEXIA,1987,37(1):19-35.
[12] Hopper B,Hurry P,Learning the Mi Way: The Effects On Students' Learning of Using the Theory of Multiple Intelligences,PASTOR CARE EDUC,2000,18(4):26-32.
[13] Serin N B,Serin O,Yavuz M A,The Relationship Between the Primary Teachers' Teaching Strategies and their Strengths in Multiple Intelligences (their Multiple Intelligence Types) (Sampling: Izmir and Lefkosa),Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences,2009,1(1):708-712.
[14] Cheung K C,Reforming Teaching and Learning Using Theory of Multiple Intelligences: The Macao Experiences,Springer Netherlands,2009.
[15] Nihat Ş,Sebahattin A,The Levels of English Teachers at Primary Schools to Employ Materials and Activities Based On Multiple Intelligences Theory (Malatya Sample), İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2008, 9(15).