Adapting Teaching Methods Based on Male Students' Multiple Intelligences: A Case Study in a Public Secondary School in Shiraz

Mohammad Khosravanian[1], Pooria Goorakani[2], Zahra Kazemi[3]
[1] B.A. in English Translation, Department of English Language and Literature, Zand Institute of Higher Education, Shiraz, Fars, Iran
[2] M.A. Student in English Translation, Department of Foreign Languages, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz Branch, Shiraz, Fars, Iran
[3]M.A. Student in English Translation, Department of English Language and Literature, Zand Institute of Higher Education, Shiraz, Fars, Iran

ABSTRACT

The present qualitative case study looks at teacher practice of Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences (MI) in one male public secondary school in Shiraz, Iran. Based on the Gardner's wish to understand intelligence as a galaxy of distinguishable cognitive processes, the research examines how the knowledge of MI profiles of the students can influence the adjustments in instructional practice by the teacher and define the pattern of interactions in the classroom. Eight teachers were purposively sampled and were observed systematically in classes, interviewed semi-structurally, and documents analyzed. The results reveal that learning methods that matched with the predominant intelligences of students-especially interpersonal, bodily-kinesthetic, and logical-mathematical intelligences were related with prolonged motivation, antecedent, and understanding. However, its success was limited by the systemic barriers such as the fixed national curricula, lack of teacher training and inadequate classroom time. The findings provide evidence of the pedagogical merits of MI-informed practice in facilitating the promotion of learner-centered education in the exam-intensive contexts, and have implications that contribute to the improvement of the potential for teacher professional development and curriculum redesign to foster differentiated instruction within the context of Iran.

Keywords: **multiple intelligences, learner-centered instruction, differentiated teaching, Iranian education, qualitative research, Gardner's theory**

1. *INTRODUCTION*

However, since Howard Gardner produced the Theory of Multiple Intelligences (MI) in 1983, the long-held view in this matter that intelligence is a unitary, unchangeable cognitive event has been highly challenged. Gardner had redefined intelligence as a collection of diverse, not unified, modalities, linguistic, logical-mathematical, bodily-kinesthetic, spatial, and interpersonal intelligences, all of which refers to specific forms of processing of information and solving issues (Gardner, 1999). This many dimensional framework has implications on pedagogy, and one of its greatest impacts is that it has facilitated differentiated instruction and progressive instruction towards a better and more accommodating approach to teaching by focusing more on the individual learner.

Also numerous empirical studies prove that when the strategies employed in teaching meet the dominant intelligences of students, a greater level of engagement, a more profound understanding, and an academic achievements may be expected (Tirri & Nokelainen, 2008; Özdemir, Güneysu, & Tekkaya, 2006). MI-based pedagogy insists that all teachers have to diversify their teaching themselves and in this way create active learning environments, which support the different cognitive strengths and learning preferences (Shearer, 2004). By having a keen perception of the intelligence types of students under their teaching, teachers have a better means of providing instruction to match with every individual difference and suit pedagogical inclusivity well.

Despite the overwhelming body of literature on Multiple Intelligences (MI) which testifies to its coloration popularity around the world, absorption of this model within the Iranian educational system is insignificant. Sameness in instructional approaches, knowledge-based curriculum and high-stakes testing are still favored in the Iranian school system at the expense of learner-based practices (Khajehpour & Ghazvini, 2011). In addition to that, working with separatist school systems where male and female study in institutionally distinct environments that are juridically divided provide an under-researched avenue to explore issues of curricular design of instruction to fit cognitive and social demographics of one or the other group.

Subsequently, it is on this background that original empirical research that has the potential of placing MI theory in the Iranian classroom is necessary. Although previous research has reported on associations between MI-based instructional methodology and positive student performance, few researchers have focused on the diagnostic efforts and changes of the teachers, especially within boys' secondary schools.

Notably, the given study aims at filling this gap by analyzing how teachers in one of the secondary schools among secondary schools that educate boys in Shiraz are inclined to see and support diverse intelligences of students. It raises the question of whether such modifications result in tangible gains of engagement and learning. This study highlights the experiences of teachers working under the highly structured educational system of online learning, so it not only enriches the local discussion surrounding teaching reform but also advancing the global research on MI-centered application in a resource-limited high-stakes setting.

2. LITRURE REVIEW

The theory of multiple intelligences (MI) proposed by Howard Gardner in his 1983 book Frames of Mind, was an alternative to the then-current standard psychometric view of intelligence: that it was a unitary measurable dimension of human potential. Intelligence is conceived as a constellation of relatively independent modalities, and therefore it is constituted by a linguistic, logical mathematical, bodily-kinesthetic, spatial, interpersonal, intrapersonal, musical, and naturalistic modalities because each of them makes a unique contribution to the cognitive repertoire of a person (Gardner, 1999). This re-conceptualization has a significant impact on educational discourse regarding the prioritization of cognitive diversity and the teaching strategies that support diverse learning strengths.

The effectiveness of the MI theory in pedagogy has been confirmed by an extensive number of empirical studies. Özdemir, Güneysu and Tekkaya (2006) showed an improvement in the student motivation and performance when using MI-based instruction in the science classroom. In a meta-analytic study, Bas (2016) indicated that differentiated instruction founded on the MI theory showed a positive influence on the performance of students in various subjects. Shearer (2004) also indicated that the MI-based pedagogy advocates differentiated instruction, as a result of which students are able to perceive the contents with the help of particularly favorable mental channels, become more engaged, and motivated. Similar results were arrived at by Strahan, Summey, and Bowles (1996) studied normalized instances of middle-school students who like occurred when they were taught using multimodal instructional procedures.

Despite the fact that quality educational practice is still informed by the MI theory, the most recent studies question its empirical basis. Waterhouse (2006) argued that there has been a lack of sound neuroscientifically defensible evidence of the framework and failure to show that the intelligences proposed are independent. This criticism was repeated by Advisory Board on Visser, Ashton, and Vernon (2006) who objected to overlap in skills and the great intercorrelations of measures claimed to measure different modalities. Most recently, Ferrero, Garaizar, and Vadillo (2021) have echoed these issues by maintaining that contextualizing the theoretical boundaries of MI is by far the most important way to separate the theoretical limitations of MI and the proven efficacy of pedagogical strategies it gives rise to.

Followers of the MI theory hit back by emphasizing the practical usefulness of the framework rather than its psychometric accuracy. Armstrong (2009) and Hoerr (2000) insist that MI works as a pedagogical schema but not as a psychometrically-testable construct. In this perspective, MI acts as a heuristic in the design of inclusive, interesting, and learner-responsive instructions specifically where cultural or under-resourced learning prevails.

The application of multiphrenic-informed practice in the Iranian educational context is very limited, even though it has been noted that the proposed method can effectively neutralise an exam-oriented and lecture-based paradigm of instruction (Khajehpour & Ghazvini, 2011). Dolati and Tahriri (2017) have managed to show that those Iranian teachers of English language who had conceptual knowledge of MI varied their instructional methods and way more dynamic learning environments were created. Some complementary

studies have been done on the relationship between discrete intelligences and the performance of the students. Such studies as that conducted by Ahmadian and Hosseini (2012) which found strong correlation between linguistic intelligence and proficiency in writing as well as Raissi Ahvan and Zainali Pour (2016) that found visual-spatial, interpersonal, and verbal intelligences as predictors of academic achievement are just some of the studies that produced these findings.

Nevertheless, a large amount of the still-existing research in Iran is still correlative by limiting its findings to the outcomes of learners and avoiding questioning the instructional practice in a systematic way. Besides, there has been scant interest in how the MI theory is applied to the process of teaching and learning in Iran, where gender-separated schooling is a critical but poorly studied characteristic of the country. According to Yidana (2022), teachers in boys classes use mainly linguistic and interpersonal instructions but seldom touch a wider range of MI-based strategies because of their low training and access to resources.

Collectively, the literature is indicative of the assertions that MI-infused pedagogy could significantly increase engagement and performance as long as it is purposefully coordinated with the cognitive strength of the learners. Even so, the gap between the theoretical approval and in-class practices exist especially in the education system which includes curricular standardization, strict methodology, and limited teacher freedom. This paper is a response to this disjunction by looking at how the male secondary-school teachers in Shiraz assess the intelligences of students and then respond to it in their teaching. In one way, it contributes to the emerging research body that supports and proposes the use of culturally contextualized, empirically-based application of the MI theory in diverse educational settings.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design

The current research carried out a qualitative case study design exploring the manner in which secondary school teachers within a male public school in Shiraz, Iran differentiate their instructional techniques based on multiple intelligences (MI) of students. The use of a case study design was considered suitable since it devised usage of rich, contextual data in regard to teacher behavior, instructional adaptation, and interactions of the students in a limited educational context (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In accordance to the MI framework developed by Gardner (1999), the purpose of the study was to clarify how MI-based pedagogy could be applied to transform the learning process, which, according to the authors, is heavily standardized and environmentally boring educational system that focuses more on passing the exam than on the learning itself.

3.2 Participants

The case study participants in the current investigation were identified using purposive sampling as a method of ensuring that appropriate instructional experience, as well as proven adherence to learner diversity, are components of the sample. The quota sample was made up of 8 (secondary-school) male teachers who had at least 2 years teaching experience in state schools; and were actively working in the same mither-school all-boys secondary school in Shiraz. One selection criterion was preliminary screening which implied some level of knowledge about differentiated instructions or other pedagogical strategies. The targeting male teachers alone aligns to the gender-separated model of schooling in Iran and is aligned with the goal of the study which is to test MI-based modification in male only classrooms.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

Data were obtained with the help of three main qualitative tools, i.e., a semi-structured interview, classroom observation, and document analysis to guarantee the triangulation and reliability of the findings.

3.3.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

This study based its interview procedure on the MI theory (Gardner, 1999), as well as pedagogical literature, such as Shearer (2004) or Ozdemir et al. (2006). It consisted of open-ended questions that aimed at getting understandings of MI by the participants, how they determined the dominant intelligence of the students, and the particular mode of instructional adaptations they performed. Some of the examples were questions like the following:

• How do you evaluate and identify the various intelligences that your students have?
• What are some of the classroom strategies to accommodate the differences in intelligences of students?
• How do you approach these challenges when undertaking these strategies?

The duration of each interview was about 45-60 min, the interviews were recorded, and the participants gave their informed consent to this procedure.

3.3.2 Classroom Observations

To support self-reported data and to gain genuine access to classroom practice, non-participant observations of classroom practices were realized through using a structured checklist based on accepted MI teaching concepts (e.g. Bas, 2016; Strahan et al., 1996). The checklist was used to obtain information on the type and variety of instructions (verbal, visual, kinesthetic, etc.), the rate of engagement of the students, whether differentiated tasks, and the responsiveness of the teacher to individual learner preferences. Every teacher has been observed during four to six lessons, and the field notes were taken to capture instructional behaviour and interactions between students and the teacher.

3.3.3 Document Analysis

On the subject of the research, studying material skillfully consistent with the subject in question, that is, lesson plans, worksheets, and curricular materials, was collected by the cooperating teachers. The content analysis protocol was implemented in order to assess the richness of Motivational Interviewing (MI) theoretical framework as a reference or implicit to these materials. This method of analysis acted as a triangulation approach that enriched the qualitative data resource in terms of interviews and observation in the classroom and provided a feasible piece of evidence of pedagogical planning in line with the MI principles.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

The time that the data collection part of this study required was six weeks within in the academic year. All of the interview processes took place within closed premises to ensure the privacy of the interview and to be able to obtain open answers. Observations were conducted in such a manner that they did not interfere with the flow of instructions and the observation bias was reduced as the protocols of observation were standardized. The informed consent has been obtained by all participants equal to the ethical research regulation, and the pseudonyms have been preserved to keep anonymity.

3.5 Data Analysis

In order to shed some light on how multiple intelligences (MI) theory is performed in practice, transcripts of interviews, observations of classrooms, and documents were categorized to thematic analysis using a step-by-step procedure presented by Braun and Clarke (2006). In the sequence of analysis were:

1. Data Familiarization. They were all transcribed verbatim and combined with observational memos and supporting papers. The corpus was re-read numerous times so as to create some familiarity with it.
2. Sorting out First Codes. Pervasive trends of discussion in relation to the identification of MI, adaptation of instruction and student engagement were coded systematically at all sources of data.
3. Themes seeking. There was a production of an initial code list after which there was an assembling of candidate themes which reflected prominent patterns in teacher knowledge, pedagogical practice, and related issues.
4. Reviewing Themes. Themes were also improved to strengthen internal consistency and make them unique throughout the data set.
5. Themes Defological and Names. Themes were ultimately labeled to reflect their conceptual pertainment and aptitude with the research questions.
6. Interconnecting Data Source. Triangulation of themes in the interviews, observation and document sources was done to strengthen validity and to increase interpretive rigor.

In an effort to ensure the credibility of the analysis, I kept peer debriefing and researcher reflexivity during coding procedures. The use of various data sources made it easy to offer a systematic and reliable documentation of the manner in which the theory on MI had been interpreted and performed in the target educational environment.

4. RESULTS

Based on the review of the interview transcripts, classroom observations, and teaching records, it was possible to single out four key themes. To begin with, the teachers demonstrated the understanding of multiple intelligences and deployed informal practices to establish the perceived strengths and weaknesses. Second, the instructional modification was incorporated in order to reflect the assumed intelligences of the students. Third, such adaptations tended to make students participate more. And fourth, there were a number of system-wide limitations to full integration of MI.

4.1 Awareness and Informal Identification of Multiple Intelligences

A survey that involved a cross section of the teachers found out that, all the teachers had been or at least heard about the theory of Gardner, but there was a difference that varied between having some sort of a

cursory knowledge and a very sophisticated understanding of that theory. Two-thirds of the participants did not study the MI theory formally; however, they all specified being able to identify strengths in learners by observing them in the classroom environment and via casual talk. Specific intelligences that were to be classified were done mainly by behavioural evidence in terms of teachers taking in account the ease of speaking, inclination of solving problems, tendencies of interacting socially, and the extent of physical activity.

Linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligences were mentioned most often by the participants, but the former was most often cited. Seeing that there were no teacher comments related to the concepts of naturalistic intelligence in describing the student strengths. The general trend can be generalised in Table 1.

Table 1. *Teacher's perceptions of common intiligences among students(N=8)*

Intelligence type	%of teachers noting it
Linguistic	100%
Logical-Mathematical	83%
Interpersonal	66%
Bodily-Kinesthetic	50%
Visual-Spatial	50%
Musical	33%
Intrapersonal	33%
Naturalistic	0%

4.2 Instructional Adaptation Based on MI Profiles

However, in spite of low formal training in instruction, all the respondents noted that they used a variety of teaching approaches aimed at accommodating various learner types. Though many of these as adaptations were not directly tied to Motivational Interviewing theory they often aligned with the MI-informed principles. These methods were seen to be working collaboratively in groups, storytelling, visual representation, solving problems using logic, role-playing, any movement types of activities.

These self-reports were supported by the observational data that did not find any difference in the implementations of interpersonal and linguistic approaches in different classrooms except a significant sign in usage in group discussions and oral presentation exercises. Kinesthetic and visual strategies were the least of all, but were witnessed at the science and physical education departments.

Table 2.*Observed Instructional Strategies Across 30 Lessons*

Strategy Type	Frequency of Use
Group discussions (interpersonal)	24
Problem-solving tasks (logical)	20
Visual aids (charts, diagrams)	18
Storytelling / reading aloud (linguistic)	16
Hands-on / movement-based tasks (kinesthetic)	10
Music, rhythm, or audio elements (musical	4

The common feeling expressed by teachers concerns the pedagogical usefulness of diversified instructional patterns: When I utilize role-play or peer teaching even the silent children are led to play. They appear less tense and engage in it." (Teacher C)

4.3 Student Engagement and Perceived Instructional Impact

A critical review of classroom action suggests that teaching methods that match with the strength of the learners is associated with improvement in engagement. To be more precise, in regard to the activities based on the Multiple Intelligences (MI) frameworks, the level of the involvement of students, their interest, and their active interaction improved. These findings can also be supported by the field notes made during the observations in which the learners were recorded as becoming more animated, responsive and attentive when the instructional tasks were in tune with their dominant intelligences.

Teacher E presented graphic witnesses: Visual students are on the prompt when I attach a diagram or infographics. It is as though, they finally relate to the lesson."
The effect had been most significant in the teamwork, problem-solving, and kinesthetic usages. Lectures or reading textbooks on the other hand, which are teacher centered were linked to less participation and reduced attention span.

4.4 Challenges in Implementation

Although such a general willingness to change instructional methods was observed, a number of systemic barriers made a coherent application of MI in the classroom complex. The most commonly mentioned limitation was curricular rigidity: the set of a centralized and examination-based curriculum induced a minor degree of flexibility in pedagogical design. Even the time was another obstacle; big classes and tight time schedules hindered differentiated planning progress. Moreover, insufficient training was also revealed as a major barrier, since the teachers did not have any institutional resources or professional development to help in systematic assessment and practical implementation of MI concepts. A gap that participants identified was a lack of continuation in the support that was provided, one teacher noted: We have intentions of implementing these ideas, but we lack the support and training on doing it in a proper manner. Even though there existed MI assessment tools at the institutional level they were not used in a directed manner and the use of informal and experience-based judgement continued.

Table 3.*Summary of Key Thematic Findings*

Theme	Description
Awareness of MI	Teachers recognize cognitive diversity but lack theoretical depth.
Informal assessment	Reliance on classroom observation rather than standardized tools.
Instructional adaptation	Use of varied methods aligned with perceived intelligences.
Student engagement	Increased motivation and participation linked to MI-aligned strategies.
Institutional constraints	Rigid curricula, insufficient training, and lack of resources as barriers.

5. DISCUSSION

The investigation that was carried out within the framework of this study outlines the didactic relevance as well as the applied constraints of applying Gardner Theory of Multiple Intelligences (MI) in Iranian secondary school classrooms. According to analytical results, teachers manifest the essential understanding of the heterogeneous cognitive strengths of students and regularly change the mode of instruction, though it is not always clearly based on MI theory. Nonetheless, these kinds of adaptations are always in line with the principles of the framework and are found to improve engagement in the classroom. The data also indicate structural obstacles outstanding barriers intrinsically experienced in wholesome adoption of MI-based pedagogy; paramount among them being rigidity of the curricula and inadequate preparation of teachers in the Iranian field.

5.1 Reconciling Theory with Practice

The results of the present study confirm those acquired by the earlier researchers who have shown that educators often resort to the Motivational Interviewing (MI) theory in their practice yet stay afar of its theoretical background (Shearer, 2004; Bas, 2016). Participants who were not formally certified in the use of MI assessment tools however used various strategies including group work, acting out stories, kinesthetic activities and problem-solving activities in order to reach their varied learning styles. By so doing, they reiterated the conclusion advanced by Moran, Kornhaber, and Gardner (2006) that a major strength of the MI theory does not lie on its scientific accuracy but rather its ability to foster pedagogical creativity.
Moreover, the fact that the teachers turn to the informal observation to determine the strengths of students on a regular basis highlights the bigger trends in the context of under-resourced education. In the view of Armstrong (2009), MI does not have to be joined with psychometric testing to be of pedagogical use rather, they provide an adaptable model along which the instruction can be based on the teacher sensitivity and

understanding. Such versatility was critical to the process of helping the research participants apply MI principles in the study, despite there being no formal institutional support of MI-based education or any available diagnostic instruments.

5.2 Evidence of Student Responsiveness

Conduct of the present study shows that there is a positive symbolic relationship between multistructural instructions, synchronized with the preferred intelligences of students, and engagement of the learners. The results confirm the findings of other scholarly literature according to which MI informed pedagogy is found to lead to both academic gains and intrinsic motivations (Tirri and Nokelainen, 2008;, Ozdemir et al., 2006). In addition, the findings can be correlated with the existing research on gender learning preferences. According to Sax (2007) and Gurian and Stevens (2005), young men will mostly take their tasks into respect when they are in the form of movement, collaborative and spatial-based. The current research verifies this assumption in educational setting of Iran proving that male learners were more active on classes in which instructional design involved physically challenging or socialized learning, which is underrepresented in traditional classrooms.

5.3 Structural Barriers to Implementation

Structural and institutional barriers, preventing the pedagogical potential of the MI theory to be fully utilized, are revealed in the study, though their existence is not a new discovery. The most common of these inhibitors include the inflexibility of the national curriculum, time allotments due to large classes and inadequate professional training on various ideas relating to differentiated instructions. These indicators are in line with the report by Khajehpour and Ghazvini (2011) who cite that the Iran education system has an exam-based orientation and puts more emphasis on content coverage and standardized testing, which do not consider the learning paths of the individual student.

The frustrations of the teachers, also, are not ideological: rather, logistical they tend to be most interested in the diversification of instruction but do not have systemic support that would allow them to do a good job of it. This means that the assimilation of MI-based strategies is not an issue of theoretical acceptance, but it is the institutionally feasible choice. Even the most pedagogically reliable frameworks cannot survive in a place where teachers have little freedom and innovation is structurally discouraged (Ferrero et al., 2021).

5.4 Bridging the Research-to-Practice Gap

As the current study explains, there is an enduring gap between academic criticism of this theory and practical effectiveness of the instructional activities guided by the theory. Despite debate as to the neuroscientific accuracy of MI, its effectiveness in the real classroom environment, especially through cultivating diversified instructions, is still being justified. This discussion is further developed in the study, that it shows that MI can serve as a culturally flexible heuristic of responsive teaching in even resource-limited and exam-focused setting.

Further, the male-female arrangement of Iranian schools gives the unique stage to evaluate how the instruction informed by MI can be aligned with specific groups of learners. These results (based on male students) indicate that it is necessary to undertake more research on how and whether instructional modifications can be different in female classrooms, especially in the intelligences that are activated most significantly.

6. IMPILICATIONS

The research stage of the presented study provides a number of implications to the teachers, teacher educators, and policymakers interested in the enhancement of a learner-centered, differentiated instruction in a standardized education system. To start with, the integration of even such minor techniques of multimodality as visual aids, group work, and kinaesthetic activities can have a beneficial impact on the interactions and engagement of students in the classroom. Adaptations of this kind will be especially useful in resource-limited settings where structural change on a large scale might be slow or hard to attain.

The implications of the findings to educators emphasize the ability of observation and reaction to the cognitive abilities of a student regardless of the available official diagnostic tools. The intuitiveness of the way teachers spotted the intelligences in students bears evidence to the fact that it is possible to implement meaningful differentiation based on reflective practice and professional curiosity. In such a way, both theoretical knowledge acquisition of multimodal instruction and practical approaches to designing an instructional adaptation to the subject areas and student characteristics should be the focus of the professional development efforts.

On the policy level, a strong urge to amend curriculum recommendations and teacher-education systems to favour more exaggerated and inclusive teaching models is needed. Incorporating the multimodal competencies into the pre-service program teacher education and the in-service training would contribute to making differentiated instruction a common practice instead of an isolated instance. Simply equipping teachers with easily accessible instruments of evaluation, including Gardner (1999) MI Inventory assessment, or Armstrong (2009) classroom checklist would help to establish more thoughtful relationship between the upcoming instructional design and the learning styles of the students.
Lastly, the findings indicate the need to ensure that systemic obstruction hindering innovation at the classroom level is removed. Unless there is comfort in curricular flexibility, institutional support, and enough planning time, even the teachers with good intentions will not be able to consistently perform on the multimodal practice field.

7. LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The current experiment presents an opportune source of empirical evidence regarding how the Motivational Interviewing (MI) principles are enacted by Iranian teacher in the course of working in secondary schools; however, there are multiple methodological limitations that should not be ignored. One, the research was limited to one of the public boys schools in Shiraz therefore forgone external validity to the other students who are male students in the public schools. Second, a male-male sample formats the research and does not allow comparative analysis of gender. Third, even though there was triangulation of the interview data with observational and documentary money matters, the employment of the standardized instruments would have beefed up the conclusions as regards student learning outcomes. Investigations could be used in the future to solve these problems and include the school-type-region-and educational levels comparisons, and the effectiveness of MI-based instruction in the classroom by males and females.

8. CONCLUSION

The current paper has discussed how secondary-school teachers in a male governmental school in Shiraz, Iran, understand and implement the Theory of Multiple Intelligences defined by Gardner in their daily practices. The results revealed that although the Iranian national school system was primarily test driven, the instructional behavior of teachers has been found to be capable of adapting to adjust to the heterogeneous nature of the students based on their cognitive abilities. Although these adjustments were largely non-formal and did not require a great deal of thought, their application was associated with a corresponding increase in student participation, motivation, and understanding.
Even though the MI of Gardner has been criticized in theory, this paper supports his assertion that the design of differentiated inclusive instruction can be tailored by using the framework. However, in order to achieve the full potential of MI, it is not enough that individual teachers focus on doing the work alone; instead, it requires an entire system, curriculum flexibility, and focused professional development.
Through the offering of a contextually located report of MI-oriented pedagogy within a context that goes under-represented within the learning environment, the paper contributes to ongoing dialogue of instructional transformation and ideological variety in learning. It shows that even among teachers in limited settings, it is possible to act as agents of innovative practice and invites further reflections upon how the theory of MI could be accommodated and calibrated to cater to the needs of a broad range of learners working within diverse cultural and institutional settings.

REFERENCES

[1] Ahmadian, M., & Hosseini, S. M. (2012). A study of the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' multiple intelligences and their performance on writing. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3(4), 677–686. http://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2012.03.01.111
[2] Armstrong, T. (2009). Multiple intelligences in the classroom (3rd ed.). ASCD.
[3] Bas, G. (2016). The effect of multiple intelligences instruction strategy on academic achievement. International Journal of Educational Research Review, 1(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.24331/ijere.309960
[4] Campbell, L., Campbell, B., & Dickinson, D. (2004). Teaching and learning through multiple intelligences (3rd ed.). Pearson.
[5] Çelikten, M. (2019). Effects of MI-based learning on secondary students' academic motivation. Journal of Education and Learning, 8(4), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v8n4p45

[6] Christodoulou, J. A., & Kirschner, D. (2012). Multiple intelligences: What does the research say? Educational Leadership, 70(2), 10–16.
[7] Davis, K., Christodoulou, J. A., Seider, S., & Gardner, H. (2011). The theory of multiple intelligences. In R. J. Sternberg & S. B. Kaufman (Eds.), The Cambridge handbook of intelligence (pp. 485–503). Cambridge University Press.
[8] Dolati, Z., & Tahriri, A. (2017). EFL teachers' multiple intelligences and their classroom practice. SAGE Open, 7(3), 1–10.
[9] Ferrero, M., Garaizar, P., & Vadillo, M. A. (2021). Neuromyths in education: Prevalence and predictors of misconceptions among teachers. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 646722.
[10] Furnham, A. (2004). Intelligence and intelligence testing: What makes a person intelligent? Psychology Review, 11(3), 18–21.
[11] Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. Basic Books.
[12] Gardner, H. (1999). Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century. Basic Books.
[13] Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ. Bantam Books.
[14] Gurian, M., & Stevens, K. (2005). The minds of boys: Saving our sons from falling behind in school and life. Jossey-Bass.
[15] Haley, M. H. (2004). Learner-centered instruction and the theory of multiple intelligences with second language learners. Teachers College Record, 106(1), 163–180.
[16] Hoerr, T. R. (2000). Becoming a multiple intelligences school. ASCD.
[17] Javaherian, M., & Hemati, M. (2020). Investigating the effectiveness of MI-based teaching strategies on Iranian EFL learners' motivation and achievement. Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 8(2), 1–20.
[18] Khajehpour, M., & Ghazvini, S. D. (2011). Attitudes toward education and academic achievement in Iranian students. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15, 2404–2409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.118
[19] Khajehpour, M., & Ghazvini, S. D. (2011). The role of gender in learning styles and multiple intelligences. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15, 1806–1810.
[20] Lazear, D. (2005). Higher-order thinking: The multiple intelligences way (2nd ed.). Corwin Press.
[21] McClellan, E. (2006). Teacher leadership in the context of intelligence theory. Educational Leadership, 63(8), 68–72.
[22] Mokhtari, H., & Aryadoust, V. (2013). The impact of MI-based teaching on vocabulary acquisition in Iranian EFL learners. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3(11), 2066–2074.
[23] Moran, S., Kornhaber, M. L., & Gardner, H. (2006). Orchestrating multiple intelligences. Educational Leadership, 64(1), 22–27.
[24] Neisser, U., Boodoo, G., Bouchard, T. J., Jr., Boykin, A. W., Brody, N., Ceci, S. J., Halpern, D. F., Loehlin, J. C., Perloff, R., Sternberg, R. J., & Urbina, S. (1996). Intelligence: Knowns and unknowns. American Psychologist, 51(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.51.2.77
[25] Özdemir, P., Güneysu, S., & Tekkaya, C. (2006). Enhancing learning through multiple intelligences. Journal of Biological Education, 40(2), 74–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2006.9656029
[26] Raissi Ahvan, Y., & Zainali Pour, H. (2016). The correlation of multiple intelligences for the achievements of secondary students. Educational Research and Reviews, 11(4), 141–145.
[27] Reiss, M. (2005). Teaching ethics in science. Studies in Science Education, 41(1), 1–34.
[28] Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
[29] Shearer, C. B. (2004). Multiple intelligences theory after 20 years. Teachers College Record, 106(1), 2–16.
[30] Shearer, C. B. (2012). Assessment of multiple intelligences for the 21st century. International Journal of Psychological Studies, 4(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v4n1p1
[31] Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence. Cambridge University Press.
[32] Strahan, D., Summey, H., & Bowles, N. (1996). Teaching to diversity through multiple intelligences. Research in Middle Level Education Quarterly, 19(2), 1–19.
[33] Sulaiman, T. (2013). The effectiveness of multiple intelligences approaches in enhancing students' academic achievement. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 3(2), 219–230.

[34] Tirri, K., & Nokelainen, P. (2008). Identification of multiple intelligences with the Multiple Intelligences Profiling Questionnaire III. Educational Psychology, 28(4), 425–439. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410701632212
[35] Veenema, S., & Gardner, H. (1996). Multimedia and multiple intelligences. The American Prospect, 7(29), 69–75.
[36] Visser, B. A., Ashton, M. C., & Vernon, P. A. (2006). Beyond g: Putting multiple intelligences theory to the test. Intelligence, 34(5), 487–502.
[37] Wang, M. T., & Holcombe, R. (2010). Adolescents' perceptions of school environment and academic engagement. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 39, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9251-7
[38] Waterhouse, L. (2006). Inadequate evidence for multiple intelligences, Mozart effect, and emotional intelligence theories. Educational Psychologist, 41(4), 247–255.
[39] Yidana, I. (2022). Exploring the application of multiple intelligences theory in economics instruction. Journal of Social Sciences Education Research, 13(1), 165–180.
[40] Yousefi, M., & Asgari, A. (2015). The effects of MI-based instruction on Iranian high school students' academic achievement. Iranian Journal of Educational Psychology, 12(3), 45–58.
[41] Zarei, A. A., & Mohseni, F. (2012). On the relationship between multiple intelligences and vocabulary learning strategies. International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 1(3), 56–65.