The prevailing assumptions about schooling and acquisition of knowledge in society today stress that the purpose of schooling is for the transmission of information and the preservation of cultural standards where schools impose social conformity and train productive workers (Koegal, 2003; Miller, 1997). In this type of teaching environment, the “experts” teach from the front of the room lecturing using a top-down, outside-in approach. They impart knowledge to students who are waiting to receive information. Learning in this type of classroom offers neither discussion, nor debate, nor dialogue surrounding the curriculum that is being imparted. Embedded within the core assumptions about knowledge is the notion that a holistic teaching practice with its bottom-up, inside-out approach to knowledge and its tenet of “drawing out” and “leading forth” the students’ hidden gifts does not prepare students for standardized testing. Unfortunately, the prevailing tendency is that holistic educators are not concerned about furthering a student’s intellectual capacity (Koegal, 2003).

People have some characteristics that distinguish them from others. One of these characteristics is intelligence. Studies conducted to define the features of intelligence date back to ancient times. Studies in a scientific sense started to be conducted after 1900’s; however, these efforts have not been sufficient enough to turn intelligence into a concept explained by one single definition. Intelligence is sometimes defined as the ability to manage cognitive complexity. In current usage, the distinction between intelligence and reason has been largely lost. For example, as defined in Webster’s Dictionary (Mish, 1993), intelligence includes the ability to understand, to apply knowledge, to use reason skillfully, and to manipulate one’s environment.

A few explanations defining intelligence are as follows:

Intelligence is a concept explaining all intellectual powers people have (Stoddard, 1956). “Intelligence is the power of adaptation to environment in new and surprising conditions, the power of abstraction and problem solving (Selçuk, 1999). Binet defines intelligence as the capacity of reasoning, decision making and self-criticism (Toker et al., 1968). Thorndike defines intelligence as the ability to react positively in terms of the reality or phenomena (Toker et al., 1968).
The most important development on the issue of “What is intelligence?” is the agreement reached by nearly all researchers that at least some aspects of our intellectual skills are related with our past experiences (Yekovich, 1994). The view that intelligence comprises many different abilities is supported by current trends in neurology and cognitive psychology.

When we look at it from an educational perspective, we see that the quality rather than the definition of intelligence comes into prominence. Since there is no consensus on “What is intelligence? and “How can it be measured?”, many theories have been developed. Spearman’s Two Factors Theory, Thorndike’s Multiple Factors Theory, Thurstone’s Group Factor Theory, Piaget’s Theory of Equilibrium and Gardner’s Multiple Intelligence Theory can be listed as examples in this scope.

Multiple Intelligence Theory represents the pluralist appearance of intelligence domains and the diversity of the ways of expressing the skillfulness and skills of the individual in the scope of their own culture (Allen, 1997). Gardner’s research indicates that different kinds of intelligence develop relatively independently of each other, and proficiency in one area does not imply proficiency in another. Further, each one of us has unique blend of all types of intelligences. Some of us are high in one type and some on the other.

In this study, Gardner’s Multiple Intelligence Theory will be discussed and the effects of teaching activities based on this theory on mathematics achievements of information learned by students via. 8 types of modules will be tested.

The thesis has been presented in five chapters. Chapter I consists of the introductory part followed by review of related studies in Chapter II. Chapter III concerns the Research Methodology and procedures of the study and describes the experiment in details with development of module and its effectiveness. Chapter IV consists of the analysis and interpretation of data and provides details of both descriptive and inferential statistical treatment. The summary, findings, conclusion and educational implications are given in Chapter V. This chapter also presents some suggestions for further research work in this field.