CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter will elaborate the result of survey data analysis. It involves the result of: personal MI profile, class-based MI profile, gender-based MI profile, post-administration analysis of validity and reliability and MI profile of the whole survey response, which can be found on part 4.1. The data, then, are presented visually in table and graphic.

There will be three main domains discussed on part 4.2 namely the construction of the MI Inventory, MI tendency of first grade students of SMA N 1 Paguyaman and gender differences on the MI tendency.

4.1 Research Findings

4.1.1 Personal MI Profile

Following the main purpose of the study, it is important to present the data of each respondent involving in the survey in order of giving information about MI Profile of first grade students of SMA N 1 Paguyaman in terms of The Eight Intelligence of Gardner and McKenzie’s MI Domain.

The brief description of MI Profile of the 155 respondents of the survey is presented on the Table of Students’ Response on the Eight Intelligence, (see Addendum 2).

4.1.2 Class-Based MI Profile

MI Profile per class can be found on the table on Addendum 3, that are summarized the result of total-scale on the eight intelligence and MI domain.

4.1.2.1 MI Profile of Class X-A
Class X-A consists of 25 respondents; 11 males and 14 females. The highest score gathered was 47 of 50 maximum score, which was resided in Interpersonal Intelligence by respondents X-1-001 and Visual-Spatial Intelligence by respondents X-1-024. The lowest was 16; it was gathered from respondent X-1-006 on Musical Intelligence.

Table 4.1
MI Profile of Class X-A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>136.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>461.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>229.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 33.1
Percent = 66%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>532.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 32.3
Percent = 65%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>280.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 31.9
Percent = 64%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>409.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>937.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-K</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>390.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>280.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>777.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V-L</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>390.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>280.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>777.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>229.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>777.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the description above, it can be observed that in Class X-A, the average value on the eight intelligences can be classified on Strong Tendency. The so-called very weak level of tendency does not exist in all the eight intelligence. Meanwhile, other levels of tendency show the variation of frequency. The brief description about the variation can be presented in the following graphic:

The tendencies of class X-A were distributed in good variation that can be observed on the intersecting lines on graphic per tendency level. The highest
frequency reached in Musical Intelligence at the strong level, while the counter
flow movement happened on Logical-Mathematical, Interpersonal and Bodily-
Kinesthetic Intelligence at the Very strong and sufficient level.

On the MI Domain, the tendency level is measured by observing its
percentage on the table which is gained from the combination of scores on the
eight intelligences per domain classification. The percentage range on calculation
is more or less 45% which is stretched from 44% to 89% of lowest-to-highest
arrangement. From the calculation of the average value on the eight intelligence, I
got the average value of the MI Domain, namely (1) Analytical Domain with
32.43; (2) Interactive Domain with 33.23; and (3) Introspective 31.3 of the
average value; or 1.036 : 1.061 : 1 on ratio.

On average value, Class X-A have better performance on Interactive
Domain which was affected by the high average value on interpersonal
intelligence. The interpretation that can be taken on this part is that intelligence
tendency of Class X-A worked well on interpersonal interaction among them that
definitely supported by ability in language as a tool of communication and bodily-
kinesthetic movement as mannerism in making relationship with others.

On the other hand, Class X-A also showed high average value on analytical
domain which supported by the high average value on naturalist and musical
intelligence. This domain is important for learning activity to enhance student’s
logical and critical thinking toward condition, interaction, information and
environmental changes on their daily activity.
### 4.1.2.2 MI Profile of Class X-B

Class X-B consists of 26 respondents, 12 males and 14 females. The highest score was 50 and the lowest was 20. The tendency level is only stretched from sufficient to very strong level on seven intelligences. Only respondent X-2-034 scores on interval 10-20 (*weak tendency*); which is resided on Intrapersonal intelligence.

#### Table 4.2
MI Profile of Class X-B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.73</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.65</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L-M</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.96</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>409.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-K</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>390.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>331.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V-L</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>461.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>280.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>532.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tendency Level Score Group fi % xi fixi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>603.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 32.80  Percent = 66%

All average values on Class X-B can be categorized as *Strong tendency* which are resided on the interval between 31 and 40. As happened in Class X-A, Interpersonal Intelligence shows the highest average value which has 4 points of difference with the second highest in order. Meanwhile, other intelligences only show more or less one point of difference among them.

Following graphic summarizes the variation of tendency level of Class X-B on the eight intelligences:

**Graphic 4.2**

*The Summary of Tendency Level on the Eight Intelligences in Class X-B*
I got the average value of the MI Domain, namely (1) Analytical Domain with 33.44; (2) Interactive Domain with 33.70; and (3) Introspective of the average value; or 1.050 : 1.508 : 1 on ratio.

4.1.2.3 MI Profile of Class X-C

Class X-C consists of 10 male and 17 female respondents. The highest score (50) was resided in Interpersonal Intelligence by respondent X-3-076. The lowest was 21 gathered by respondent X-3-072 on Intrapersonal Intelligence. As what occurs on two previous classes, it can be seen that the respondents’ scores are more often higher in the Strong interval (31-40) except in Interpersonal Intelligence. It can be predicted that the respondents mostly answered 3 or 4 to the questionnaire articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NT</th>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>409.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>603.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1038.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>127.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>968.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>35.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency Level</td>
<td>Score Group</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>fixi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1008.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1108.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>390.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>918.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>318.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>988.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INTRA Tendency Level Score Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>136.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>948.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 35.12  Percent = 70%

### V-S Tendency Level Score Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>318.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>968.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 35.87  Percent = 72%

**Graphic 4.3**

The Summary of Tendency Level on the Eight Intelligences in Class X-C
The existence of 59% of respondents who scores in high middle point interval (very strong level) made the average value and percentage on Interpersonal Intelligence got to the highest on the calculation. The value on Interpersonal Intelligence can be categorized as Very Strong Tendency, while the other seven intelligences are in Strong Tendency.

On MI Domain calculation, I got the ratio of average value of analytical, interactive and introspective domain, which is 1.04: 1.04: 1

4.1.2.4 MI Profile of Class X-D

In Class X-D, the scores that is represented by 23 respondents (7 males; 16 females), reach its highest score, that is, 46 by respondent X-4-082 in Musical and Interpersonal Intelligence; and the lowest (21) by respondent X-4-091 in Bodily Kinesthetic Intelligence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>227.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 35.06
Percent = 70%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>532.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 35.5
Percent = 71%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Strong</strong></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>136.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strong</strong></td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>674.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sufficient</strong></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weak</strong></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Weak</strong></td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          |          | 23 | 100% | 836.5 |

Average = 36.36
Percent = 73%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Strong</strong></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>500.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strong</strong></td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>390.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sufficient</strong></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weak</strong></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Weak</strong></td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          |          | 23 | 100% | 916.5 |

Average = 39.84
Percent = 80%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Strong</strong></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strong</strong></td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>603.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sufficient</strong></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weak</strong></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Weak</strong></td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          |          | 23 | 100% | 776.5 |

Average = 33.76
Percent = 68%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Strong</strong></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strong</strong></td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>603.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sufficient</strong></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>127.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weak</strong></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Weak</strong></td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          |          | 23 | 100% | 776.5 |

Average = 33.76
Percent = 68%
### INTRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>136.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>806.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 35.06
Percent = 70%

### V-S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>603.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>836.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 36.36
Percent = 73%

**Graphic 4.4**

*The Summary of Tendency Level on the Eight Intelligence in Class X-D*
There is a big gap among the tendency level in terms of frequency that is showed on the graphic above, except in Interpersonal Intelligence. All highest frequency was resided in strong level, which is more or less 5 points higher than other levels. It indicated that the respondents on Class X-D largely responded positively (answer “4” or “5”) on the eight intelligences.

These phenomena influenced the calculation on MI Domain, which showed the slightly balanced-ratio of average value, which is 1: 1.004: 1.002 with 35.64 of the average on analytical, 35.78 on interactive domain and 35.71 on introspective domain.

4.1.2.5 MI Profile of Class X-E

Total respondents on Class X-E are 27: 8 males and 19 females. The highest scores in Class X-E reached 100%, which are represented by respondent X-5-127 on Interpersonal Intelligence. Meanwhile, the lowest is 21 or 42%, represented by X-5-112 on Logical-Mathematical Intelligence. Because the lowest score still in the interval score of sufficient level, the tendency of this class only distributed on three levels, between sufficient to very strong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>409.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>461.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>127.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>998.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>36.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency Level</td>
<td>Score Group</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>fixi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>136.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>948.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L-M</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>461.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>978.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>591.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1088.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-K</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>603.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>229.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>878.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class X-E represented *very strong tendency* on Interpersonal Intelligence, and *Strong tendency* on the other seven intelligences. Seven of the eight intelligences have the interval between *sufficient* to *very strong* levels of tendency. Interpersonal Intelligence only shows distribution between strong to very strong level. The following graphic summarizes the variation of tendency level in the eight intelligences:
What can be seen in the graphic is that, the tendency level that positively responded by Class X-E is strong level, representing the domination of answers “3” or “4” on the articles. It got highest frequency on musical intelligence, which is represented by 20 respondents.

The absence of weak and very weak level; and the low frequency of sufficient level (21-30) made the graphic presents an extreme differences among the tendency level. It can be observed on Naturalist, Musical, Bodily-Kinesthetic and Visual-Spatial intelligence, when strong level got high frequency, the graphic line of very strong level went down. The correlation will be proved on the discussion about inter-aspect correlation on the next part of this writing.

Even though Interpersonal Intelligence shows high value on average, the data still present balanced-tendency on MI Domain. On my calculation, I got the ratio of average value of Class X-E tendency toward the MI domain, which is
1.02: 1.04: 1 with 36.11 of the average on analytical; 36.73 on interactive domain, and 35.12 on introspective domain.

4.1.2.6 MI Profile of Class X-F

Class X-F consists of 27 respondents: 10 male and 17 female respondents. The highest scores in Class X-F reached 47 that are represented by respondent X-6-129 on Interpersonal Intelligence and respondent X-6-131 on Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence. Meanwhile, the lowest is 18, represented by X-6-149 on Naturalist Intelligence.

Table 4.6 MI Profile of Class X-F on the Eight Intelligences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>461.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>229.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 32.90 Percent = 66%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>603.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 32.16 Percent = 64%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>Fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>L-M</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>178.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>928.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>227.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1008.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>37.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-K</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>136.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>888.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V-L</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>229.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>888.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INTRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>674.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>878.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 32.53  
Percent = 65%

### V-S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>127.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>928.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 34.38  
Percent = 69%

---

**Graphic 4.6**  
*The Summary of Tendency Level on the Eight Intelligences in Class X-F*
The graphic shows the unique description in *sufficient* and *strong* level. It can be seen that in Naturalist, Musical, Interpersonal, Bodily-Kinesthetic, Verbal-Linguistic, Intrapersonal and Visual-Spatial Intelligence, there is a counter flow movement of *sufficient* and *strong* level on the graphic. Meanwhile, the so-called gap on the tendency level existed on Interpersonal Intelligence; when the highest frequency reached 22 on strong level, the very strong level went to 5 point.

In addition to the tendency on the eight intelligences, I got the calculation on the average values on MI Domain, that are: 33.15 on Analytical; 34.38 on Interactive; and 33.46 on Introspective; or 1: 1.027: 1.009 on ratio. This balanced-tendency can be categorized on strong level as happened on the other five classes previously. The description can be put together on the summary in order to know the tendency of respondents per class based on its average value.

### Table 4.7
Summary of the Average Value on the Eight Intelligences and MI Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>AVERAGE/ RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE EIGHT INTELLIGENCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-A</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>1.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-B</td>
<td>34.73</td>
<td>31.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-C</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>35.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-D</td>
<td>35.06</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>1.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-E</td>
<td>36.98</td>
<td>35.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>1.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-F</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>32.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.3 Gender-based MI Profile

Apparently, right or wrong, in school practice, male and female students performed different profile in terms of intelligence characteristic. It is still becoming a debatable case, whether or not sex differences in intelligence and interest are purely affected by the sex itself.

This part is not about to prove that term. The following result is only the description of MI Profile which has been classified and analyzed based on respondents’ gender. The objective of this is to describe to educators, parents and students about the intelligence tendency of males and females toward the eight intelligences and MI Domain.

4.1.3.1 MI Profile of Male Respondents

There are 58 male respondents (37% of total respondents) who are covered in this survey. Following frequency table will give information about how male respondents respond to the survey articles on each kind of intelligences. More than 50% of male respondents have total response score in Strong interval on all eight intelligences. Except in Musical and Intrapersonal Intelligence, the scores distributed from sufficient to very strong tendency level.

Table 4.8
MI Profile of Male Respondents on the Eight Intelligences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>773.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>280.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 36.53
Percent = 73%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>318.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>433.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.08</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>591.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1242.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.01</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>773.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>127.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.56</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>500.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1171.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.98</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency Level</td>
<td>Score Group</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>fixi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>409.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1242.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average =** 34.63  
**Percent =** 69%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>535.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average =** 31.53  
**Percent =** 63%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average =** 35.5  
**Percent =** 71%

After calculating the percentage of all 58 male respondents, I got the result of the tendency on the MI Domain, that all domains reach the percentage which are resided in strong level as follows:

1. Analytic Domain 70% (strong)
2. Interactive Domain 71% (strong)
3. Introspective Domain 67% (strong)
Table 4.9
Summary of the MI Profile of Male Respondents on the Eight Intelligences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Eight Intelligence</th>
<th>Average Values</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>37.56</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalist Intelligence</td>
<td>36.53</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical-Mathematical Intelligence</td>
<td>36.01</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual-Spatial Intelligence</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence</td>
<td>34.98</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Intelligence</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tendency level can be observed on the following graphic:

Graphic 4.7
The Summary of Tendency Level of Male Respondents
4.1.3.2 MI Profile of Female Respondents

There are 97 female respondents involving on my survey samples (63%) which are spread on the six sampled-classes. The following frequency table will give information of MI Tendency in the eight intelligences and MI Domain.

Table 4.10
MI Profile of Female Respondents on the Eight Intelligences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>682.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>2059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>586.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 34.46  Percent = 69%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>500.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>2236.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 34.15  Percent = 68%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1952.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 34.46  Percent = 69%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>2093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1668.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3863.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 39.82
Percent = 80%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>227.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1147.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3023.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 31.17
Percent = 62%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3263.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 33.64
Percent = 67%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>2272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>484.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3333.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 34.36
Percent = 69%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>409.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>2201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>637.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3263.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 33.64  Percent = 67%

On the following table female respondents show similar result in top-three intelligences in highest-to-lowest arrangement.

**Table 4.11**
Summary of the MI Profile of Female Respondents on the Eight Intelligences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Eight Intelligence</th>
<th>Average Values</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>39.82</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalist Intelligence</td>
<td>34.46</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical-Mathematical Intelligence</td>
<td>34.46</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>34.36</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Intelligence</td>
<td>34.15</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual-Spatial Intelligence</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence</td>
<td>31.17</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though all intelligences are categorized in Strong level, there is more or less 11% difference between Interpersonal and the other Intelligences. It is caused by the high frequency presented on the table is resided in very strong interval (41-50) which has high middle-point value in calculation.
The count of average value for the MI Domain are; 69% on Analytical and Interactive, and 68% on Introspective, that can be categorized in strong level of tendency. The high value of average score is caused by the huge number of respondent who score between 31 and 40, which is resided in strong level of tendency.

Male and female respondents show strong tendency both in the eight intelligences and MI Domain. However, female respondents show more varieties scores distribution on the eight intelligences as presented on Graphic 4.8 above. Male respondents are better than female, on average, in Naturalist, Logical-Mathematical, Bodily-Kinesthetic, Verbal-Linguistic and Visual-Spatial.
Intelligence. Meanwhile, female respondents are good in Musical, Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Intelligence. The differences can be observed as follows:

Table 4.12
The Summary of MI Tendency of Male and Female Respondents on the Eight Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Eight Intelligence</th>
<th>The Average Value</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalist Intelligence</td>
<td>36.53</td>
<td>34.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Intelligence</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>34.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical-Mathematical Intelligence</td>
<td>36.01</td>
<td>34.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>37.56</td>
<td>39.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence</td>
<td>34.98</td>
<td>31.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>33.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>34.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual-Spatial Intelligence</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>33.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.4 Result of Data Analysis of the Whole Survey Responses

This part will give information about the result of the data analysis that put the overall data gained from the respondents as a group. The data from 155 respondents are analyzed per kind of intelligence and MI Domain. The average value, tendency level and percentage will be provided.

Following table will give information about the range of scores existed on each intelligence to be adjusted with the tendency level. The table presents that, my survey respondents show a variation of scores range on the eight intelligences. As a whole, the scores are stretching from 16 to 50. They are resided in Musical and Interpersonal Intelligence. By observing the highest and lowest score on the eight intelligences, it can be observed that on Logical-Mathematical and
Interpersonal Intelligence, the tendency level is stretching from sufficient to very strong level; the other six intelligences are from weak to very strong level.

Table 4.13
The Summary of Score Range on the Eight Intelligences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE EIGHT INTELLIGENCE</th>
<th>HIGHEST SCORE</th>
<th>LOGEST SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESPONDENT</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalist Intelligence</td>
<td>X-3-071</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-5-108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-5-104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-5-127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-3-067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Intelligence</td>
<td>X-3-062</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-3-065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical-Mathematical Intelligence</td>
<td>X-5-104</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-1-007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>X-3-076</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-5-127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-2-047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence</td>
<td>X-2-047</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence</td>
<td>X-3-068</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-6-131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>X-3-076</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual-Spatial Intelligence</td>
<td>X-3-055</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Musical Intelligence showed the widest with the 31 points of its lowest-to-highest score range. The rest will be: Naturalist Intelligence with 30 points, Interpersonal and Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence (29 points), Intrapersonal, Logical-Mathematical and Visual-Spatial Intelligence (27 points); and Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence with 25 points. Below, the distributions and/or the tendency level are described in frequency table.
### Table 4.14
The Summary of Tendency Level on the Eight Intelligences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
<th>Score Group</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>xi</th>
<th>fixi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>1456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>3124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5462.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>35.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>3372.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>994.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5232.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L-M</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>1319.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>3195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5432.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>2866.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>2946.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>229.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6042.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average =</td>
<td>38.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent =</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency Level</td>
<td>Score Group</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>fixi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-K</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>2804.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1504.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5052.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V-L</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>955.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>3230.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5272.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>3550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5162.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V-S</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>955.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>3408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>943.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5322.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All eight intelligences show percentage in the interval of strong tendency, which is caused by the high frequency on strong tendency on all intelligences. There are several points to be observed on the table above, namely: (1) More than 50% of respondents on the eight intelligences showing strong tendency; (2) The more frequency get higher on high-middle-point interval, the more average and percentage get high value on the calculation; and (3) In highest-to-lowest arrangement of average values, Interpersonal intelligence is in first position in order with 38.98; that is 3.74 higher than Naturalist intelligence in the second. Meanwhile, the other intelligences only reach ≤ 0.71 of differences of one another. This is caused by great quantity in strong and very strong level in interpersonal intelligence.

The following table gives the information about the averages, differences, percentages and interpretations on tendency level, that are sorted from highest to lowest.

Table 4.15
The Summary of Average Value on the Eight Intelligences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Eight Intelligence</th>
<th>Average Value</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Tendency Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>38.98</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalist Intelligence</td>
<td>35.24</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical-Mathematical Intelligence</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual-Spatial Intelligence</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence</td>
<td>34.01</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Intelligence</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal Intelligence</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence</td>
<td>32.59</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As happened in previous analysis, there is a big gap between frequencies given on strong tendency with the other levels. The interval from the highest frequency reached on strong level with the nearest point on very strong level, is 37 points.

What interesting on the graphic above is the counter flow movement of graphic on Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Intelligence; when one kind of intelligence shows high frequency on very strong or strong level, another will be low on the graphic line. Such phenomenon also happened between sufficient and very strong level, except in Intrapersonal Intelligence.

In terms of MI Domain, Strong tendency also showed, where, on average it represents 68% on Introspective Domain, 69% on Analytical Domain and 70% on Interactive Domain. These indicate that, respondents are a little bit stronger, on
tendency toward the intelligence related to interactive communication, relationship and learning activity.

4.1.5 Post-Administration Analysis of Validity and Reliability of MI Inventory

In this part, the findings are gathered from the post-administration analysis of the instrument. This is aimed to ensure whether or not the MI Inventory can be used in subsequent research. Validity analysis involves: inter-item correlation and inter-aspect correlation; reliability analysis involves: internal consistency analysis. All of findings are analyzed by using SPSS v.19. The SPSS outputs are presented on Addendum 5.

4.1.5.1 Inter-Item Correlation

Inter-item correlation values represent how the items/articles in the aspect of intelligence are correlated each other. The analysis of inter-item correlation in this study is based on the prerequisite of critical value on \( r \) Product-Moment table by observing N of survey respondents. For my survey, with N=155, the nearest point showed on \( r \) table is N=150, which represented:

- \( r \geq 0.159 \) is significant at the 0.05 or (95%) level of confidence
- \( r \geq 0.210 \) is significant at the 0.01 or (99%) level of confidence

Item-to-total correlation shows \( r = 0.278 – 0.679 \) which are significant at the 0.01 level, means that the MI Inventory has measured what it should measure on the articles. However, the matrixes of inter-item correlation showed following results:

- 22 invalid-correlations on Naturalist Intelligence,
- 29 invalid-correlations on Musical Intelligence,
- 20 invalid-correlations on Logical-Mathematical Intelligence,
- 14 invalid-correlations on Interpersonal Intelligence,
- 25 invalid-correlations on Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence,
- 14 invalid-correlations on Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence,
- 30 invalid-correlations on Intrapersonal Intelligence, and
- 24 invalid-correlations on Visual-Spatial Intelligence.

Those invalid correlations reveal that not all items within an aspect of intelligence that I formulated on the articles, are correlated each other. These should be considered at subsequent survey administration.

4.1.5.2 Inter-Aspect Correlation

Mostly similar with inter-item correlation, the inter-aspect correlation analysis is also based on the prerequisite of \( r \) value. The SPSS output describes: (1) Inter-aspect correlation value are significant at the 0.01 level with \( r = 0.284 – 0.657 \); (2) Aspect-total correlation showed \( r = 0.654 – 0.822 \) which means that the survey was to measure properly what is required to measure at my sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>LM</th>
<th>INTER</th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>VL</th>
<th>INTRA</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td>.555**</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.654**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>.437**</td>
<td>.491**</td>
<td>.542**</td>
<td>.341**</td>
<td>.448**</td>
<td>.680**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>.555**</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500**</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>.549**</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.754**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>.437**</td>
<td>.500**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>.543**</td>
<td>.524**</td>
<td>.564**</td>
<td>.725**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BK</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.491**</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.541**</td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>.583**</td>
<td>.674**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>.542**</td>
<td>.549**</td>
<td>.543**</td>
<td>.541**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.545**</td>
<td>.657**</td>
<td>.822**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRA</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td>.341**</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>.524**</td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>.545**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.514**</td>
<td>.700**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.448**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.564**</td>
<td>.583**</td>
<td>.657**</td>
<td>.514**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.808**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>.654**</td>
<td>.680**</td>
<td>.754**</td>
<td>.725**</td>
<td>.674**</td>
<td>.822**</td>
<td>.700**</td>
<td>.808**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(**) Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, (*) Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level
Statistically, verbal-linguistic and visual-spatial intelligence have a very strong correlation values more or less 0.6 points higher than critical value required at the 0.01 level. Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence is strongly consistent on correlation with Musical, Logical-Mathematical, Interpersonal, Bodily-Kinesthetic, and Intrapersonal Intelligence; showing approximately 0.54 of \( r \) value; and higher correlation with Visual-Spatial Intelligence and lowest for Naturalist Intelligence with 0.657 and 0.417 for each. Meanwhile, Visual-Spatial Intelligence is well-correlated to Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence with \( r = 0.657 \) and lowest with \( r = 0.448 \) to Musical Intelligence.

### 4.1.5.3 Internal Consistency

Prerequisite on this part are (1) The function of checking internal consistency value is to determine the consistency of the instrument (MI Inventory) to get similar result if it is used or held on different setting, time, subject and place (2) The consistency will be based on Cronbach’s alpha if item deleted from SPSS output; the more this value higher than the Cronbach’s alpha value from item-total calculation, the more the item will be considered for the deletion.

Cronbach’s alpha value is ranging from zero to +1, which means that the more it reached nearby +1, the more the survey scales reliable for later-time administration. I will discuss the alpha following Dornyei (2003, p. 112) suggestion toward criteria for alpha value, that, it should be \( \geq 0.6 \) to obtain good construction of the survey.
In addition, other criteria comes from Koenker (as cited in Morissan et al., 2012, p. 380) formulated the general measurement of reliability interpretation as follows:

Table 4.16 Reliability Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Alpha</th>
<th>Reliability Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.80 – 1.00</td>
<td>Very reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60 – 0.79</td>
<td>Moderate (Reliable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40 – 0.59</td>
<td>Enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20 – 0.39</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00 – 0.19</td>
<td>Unreliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complete result of internal consistency is in the addendum 5. In order to know the summary of Cronbach’s alpha values, the following table will help.

Table 4.17 The Result of Internal Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Eight Intelligences</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Criticized Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>No. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>No. 2 &amp; 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>No. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>No. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BK</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>No. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRA</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>No. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>No. 70 &amp; 77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the result above, can be concluded that: (a) Musical and Intrapersonal Intelligence are reliable enough to be generalized for subsequent administration of the survey, by only representing the $\alpha = 0.553$ and $0.532$; (b) other six intelligences can be categorized as moderately reliable with $\alpha = 0.607$-
0.705; (b) Nine items were criticized for omission, namely, item No.6, 2, 16, 21, 42, 61, 50, 70 and 77; (c) Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence showed the highest Cronbach’s alpha value with $\alpha = 0.705$; and (d) In spite of being the lowest on average value, Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence is the most reliable aspect with no items criticized for deletion.

As Gardner’s conception about multiplicity of intelligence, we cannot consider the number presented on the table and graphic above as an absolute value of respondents intelligence. The intelligence can work together as a unit in human brain. Terms that should be emphasized is that the tendency described on this survey is related to what respondents have experienced in their life, their habitual action and interest. If the survey result showed above, put the respondents on strong tendency on interpersonal intelligence, it means that they have strong interest and experience toward interpersonal interaction, prefer working in team when learning or affected by socio-cultural factor that shaped them to be an interpersonal person.

4.2 Discussions

This part will discuss about three domains, namely the instrument construction, the MI Tendency of survey sample and Gender differences on the intelligences.

4.2.1 The Construction of MI Inventory

The result on the validity and reliability analysis show the weaknesses in terms of inter-item correlation and internal consistency. However, the eight intelligences involved at the articles are well correlated one another. The
correlation showed good correlation which occur in complex ways among the aspect on the eight intelligence, which also means that Gardner’s third prerequisite of MI Theory that, the eight intelligences work together in complex way, was proven. The complexity of aspect correlation can be observed, for instance, on Interpersonal and Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence; when the other Intelligences are strongly correlated among the one which has a narrow interval of difference on average; these intelligences have it on high-differences value.

The result indicates more complex terms to be considered, that is, the eight intelligences which represented different kinds of proclivity in human brain, work in the midst of process of solving daily life problem. Naturalist intelligence as responses toward environmental condition, need to be supported by other intelligences in order of the construction of problem solving comprehension. These are also happened on students, where ones can be having dominant tendency toward certain kind of intelligence, but giving a label based on the tendency cannot be a good way of this condition. The key point is, that when brain decide to choose many and complex ways to solve the problem, it means that there are many ways to be intelligent.

This part discusses the criticized items on the eight intelligences in terms of how the way it constructs the whole component of MI Inventory and how it connects to other items.

4.2.1.1 Naturalist Intelligence

Generally, the naturalist intelligence is about interest toward things related to animal, plants, and other environmental condition. What can be interpreted
from the construction of this aspect is that having preferred spot in nature did not influence the tendency of speaking out in class for the right of animals, and getting excited when studying about ecology, nature, plants or animal. My sample, perhaps have preferred spot in nature only in reason of having fun without paying attention toward nature itself and living things on it.

Speaking out in class for the right of animals was criticized because it cannot predict the other aspects of tendency. There is possibility that, my samples have no chance to speak about the right for animal in their learning practice. This also happened on item about sensitivity towards climate or natural changes that only connected to terms about having favorite place in nature and sensitivity towards animals and plants preservation.

The article related to terms of getting excited to learn about ecology, nature, plant or animal as the representation of the concept of school subject show a good correlation with preference of watching plant or animal TV program, intention of working outdoor, and the likes of having field trip in nature. These indicate that the items are strongly explore the characteristic in the aspect of naturalist intelligence.

Unfortunately, based on the internal consistency analysis, there is an item namely speaks out in class for the right of animals that has no correlation with other nine items. It indicates that this item cannot be involved in aspect of naturalist intelligence. This might be happened because of the word “speak” stated on the article that might be responded by my sample as the kind of verbal ability.
In addition, the formulation of sentence in the article may cause this problem. Here is the original article formulated in bahasa Indonesia:

“Saya menangis/iba saat melihat kucing yang terlantar di jalanan
atau binatang yang dipukuli manusia”

The item can make the respondents confuse because of the existence of “cry” (action) and ‘compassion” (effect) in the sentence. In another hand, the specific objects: “cat”, “street” and “animal”; and subject: “human” can be confusing for high school students. The compassion may exist in some people in caring for one kind of animal but not for others. Otherwise, it can be conditional depends on the situation found on real life. Therefore, in order to construct a good self-developed MI Inventory for subsequent administration, this item should be omitted.

4.2.1.2 Musical Intelligence

This kind of intelligence is connected to the capacity of perceiving musical and rhythmic pattern in mind. Technically, the article consists of domain of performance in music, ability in using music to learn, interest to music, sensitivity to noise and interest to rhythmic pattern.

The analysis concludes that the tendency of learning with musical background can predict one’s tendency of playing musical instrument. It also builds the habit which place “learning” and “music” in one’s mind at once, stimulating other tendencies like using music to remember information, and tapping rhythmically when working or learning.

The interest and ability of playing musical instrument makes one to be close to music which enable one’s mind to manipulate or use music to remember
information and any other things related to the habit of enjoying music. It is reflected by the correlation of the item to other items namely, learning with music background, using music to remember information, having good singing voice and melodies/song lyrics memory.

The findings indicate that the one, who has ability of memorizing song lyrics, which is involved at the interest to music, has no guarantee of learning best with music background, listening to and identifying rhyming pattern in poetry, or having sensitivity to environmental noises.

Sensitivity to environmental noises, in my sample, influence the tendency toward the enjoyment of listening to and identifying rhyming pattern in poetry. Both items related to abstract form of musical and rhytmical intelligence. In the article, environmental noise is originally represented by “bird song” illuminates how music provide by nature can be supporting factor in building the learning characteristic.

Items about ‘learning with musical background’ and ‘having hard time concentrating if there is background noise’ are needed to be omitted based on the statistical analysis. However, my interpretation is that, first, these kinds of ‘activity’ and ‘behavior’ is connected to the so-called “socially constructed” terms stated by Rhoads (2004) on the previous part. Dislikes of students of ‘learning with musical background’ should be re-check by doing in-depth observation, whether or not students can do such kind of activity in school practice. It is important not to consider musical background as a noise that can disturb learning process. Perhaps it does in some students, but ones who have this tendency should
be detected and appreciated. Secondly, the environment shapes students not to make a ‘noise’ when learning. I thought it is better to differ terms of ‘noise’ and ‘rhythmical pattern’, then, which one allowed in learning activity.

What can be obtained from my sample result, is the checklist is trying to measure the tendency of respondents toward how musical and rhythmical pattern affect and useful for them. Even though the item should be re-checked in terms of reliability, all of them are well correlated with total scale gained from the scores, means that the articles properly measure what it should measure.

4.2.1.3 Logical-Mathematical Intelligence

Differently with test that measure students’ ability by giving them a label which is known as “grade”, MI Inventory is a tool that provide the information about students’ proclivity in learning and achieving their grade. In school practice, Logical-Mathematical Intelligence can be found on science-related subject, that seems to teach students the mathematical operation rather than how that could be worthwhile for their life.

Generally, the items checked about tendency of being organized in life, thinking logically, and being interested to numbers. Three of ten items on this kind of intelligence show significant correlation toward the other items, namely item about the interest of working on logic puzzle, on my sample, only showed invalid correlation with item about putting things in categories, hierarchies, or other logical patterns. This is how human brain work in mysterious way, when logical thinking in putting things like in the puzzle that, may be speculated as the one which has correlation with putting things in order, being considered in
different ways by my sample. On one hand, people may have the interest to assemble the disordered-shape things to become in an order, but not on ordered-shape things like books, furniture or shoes to be put in biggest-to-smallest order, or categorized based on colors. On another hand, the “interest” could be only in that common form, and cannot be done continuously to form the habit of human in their daily life. The similar phenomenon also happened on the other items.

These are the indication for the educators not teach students only in subject-based framework, because what students have on their mind are rich and still could be enriched by instructional process. When educators know what students need to learn, the so-called proclivities can be developed and valued in their daily life context. Logical-Mathematical Intelligence is not only related to the ability of perceiving and using number in equation such as in science related subject, but also about how the numbers can help student to build up their logical thinking that can be useful for their life. What is happening in our school practice nowadays? Have educators anticipated those terms mentioned above?

4.2.1.4 Interpersonal Intelligence

Based on my finding, Interpersonal Intelligence presented the highest value on the average of respondents’ tendency. The finding indicates that one who enjoy team games did not have correlation with being easy to learn in group, becoming a good listener, gives advice to friends who have problems, tell how someone feels just by looking at them, socializing with peers, and being a natural leader. “Games” could only be a game for its player with no guarantee for them being friend or socialize after the game. It is caused by disability of listening to other in
recognizing others’ emotion, which Goleman (1995) placed on fourth phase of Emotional Intelligence Theory before the phase of making relationship with other.

Meanwhile, item about “seems to be natural leader” is interesting to re-check because of its invalid correlation with “gives advice to friends who have problems; enjoys team games; seems to know her/his environment well; enjoys socializing with peers; and likes being involved in community”, which, basically connected to the prerequisite of being the leader.

The similar case also occur on item about socializing with new friend with being involved in community, which should be in correlation. However, what should be re-checked is the internal consistency, how consistent the articles will be if the questionnaire is administered in different time, place and subject. Internal consistency analysis will consider the placement of the item on questionnaire and the condition if the item will be deleted.

By having this in mind, item about ‘seems to be a natural leader’ should be considered for omission. What can be interpreted from the item is that, “being the natural leader” as placed on the item, was thing that should be observed by others to get an evaluation; while every items on my survey are inventing the characteristic by asking respondents’ perception toward themselves. The item should be re-formulated so that the respondent will not answer the question which, basically should be answered by other people to get a point of view toward the provided-item. The content of being a leader among other students actually can be observed within their daily interaction at school.
4.2.1.5 Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence

My sample showed significant differences on average value between male and female respondents on this kind of intelligence, where males are 3.81 points better than females in using their body to express their idea, and handling object skillfully. The items can be found on following checklist:

Think, for instance, respondents X-1-010 as one of 18 respondents who answered 5 for item No.47 about “mimics other people’s gestures and mannerism (including teacher)”, that perhaps could be considered as bad student who showed impolite mannerism in classroom practice, rather than as the one who tried using their body to remember information given by the teacher. Bodily-Kinesthetic is not only related to the ability of being expert in sport or dancing that, certainly, need bodily-kinesthetic expertise.

What Gardner proposed in MI Theory was beyond those traditional views toward students’ intelligence. Because each kind of intelligence can work together in human brain, bodily-kinesthetic can also be useful for other aspect of learning activities. It could be in reading activities as stated by Armstrong (2009) in item about using finger to point out words, sentences, or lines in books, or simple matter such as using hands in illustrating the idea as what Italian does. The items above, generally, are related to terms of using body to remember information, act, and create a product in real-life practice. Remember, it could be as real as using foot to kick the ball skillfully, or in more abstract way such as prefer paying attention toward the acting of actors when watching movie.
When my sample showed the interest in *taking things apart* and put them back together again, they revealed that they also *move, twitch, tap, and fidget while seated for a long time in one spot*. Such symptoms should be appreciated in learning activity, that, this could be the early warning phenomenon for educator not to judge what looks bad on student as badly as it looks like. For instance, the fidget described on the item above, perhaps caused this kind of student could be annoying for others when learning activity is running. However, it is also the sign for the educator that such student need to do something else in learning activity that provide the chance to create something by using body; to do such more real things to touch, real actions to finish, than the material provided on books and/or whiteboard. The question now, is, have educator differentiated their instructional design to appreciate this kind of intelligence?

4.2.1.6 *Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence*

President Soekarno, Soetardji C. Bachri, Steve Jobs or Oprah Whinfrey, are the ones who have reached the end-state on Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence. What they have, is the ability of using and manipulating the language to communicate, give information, or inspire others either in written or spoken way. On student, it can also be the interest on reading book, writing a simple report or enjoying the crosswords. One can be skillfully on certain aspect such as writing a story, but can be weak on another aspect like telling the story at front of the classroom.

My sample shows that enjoyment in reading books shows invalid correlation with possession of good memory for names, places, or trivia; easiness in learning language or social subject than science subject; interest in
communicating to others in a highly verbal way; skillful ability in discussion, speech, or debate. The proclivity in reading book is not only specified on language subject which also indicated that one who likes reading has no guarantee to have a good capacity in another language aspect such as speaking and communicating in a good verbal ways. This also occurs between item related to interest in verbal aspect with their tendency to assess own ability in reading and writing skills. This is a big challenge for educator in understanding student’s intelligence profile. There are many aspects of characteristic that are not involved in this survey checklist, which should be concerned by educator in order to invent students’ potential to be enhanced.

The item, that is about “communicating with others in highly verbal way” which originally placed as:

Teman-teman menyebut saya sebagai orang yang paling mampu membujuk/mengajak mereka untuk melakukan sesuatu (Misalnya: mengajak teman-teman untuk selalu membersihkan ruang kelas atau bahkan mempengaruhi mereka untuk membohongi guru)

can be important to be considered for ommision. The example that is given may be helpful for my respondents, but it makes them take more time to read the article. The analysis above indicate that it is better for the item to be ommited or re-phrased in order to make it easy to understand and provide more time for respondents to respond other items on questionnaire.

Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence, specifically, can be found on language subject in school practice. However, language is needed in all subject matters in transferring information from educator to student or vice versa; which means that language can affect the prospect of information-transfer in learning activity. The
items above can only be the outline for educator to invent students’ strength and weakness in order to construct the most effective instructional design to be applied at particular condition in educational unit; which, means that different subject, condition and time will be influential in this term.

4.2.1.7 Intrapersonal Intelligence

This intelligence, that is simplified by Armstrong as self smart related to the ability of recognizing one’s own emotion, strength and weakness; a similar thing that Goleman formulate on Emotional Intelligence as self recognition, self-regulation and self-motivation.

Item about proclivity of playing game alone that only correlated with a better performance on working alone than working with others; indicated a domain of individual performance. Similar case happened on item about keeping personal diary which only has a correlation with the ability of learning from one’s own failure and success. On my sample, individual performance showed invalid-correlation with self-independence and emotional-control items.

These results will only be comprehensively-analyzed by educator on daily learning activity with more variation of intrapersonal domain observed. Think of, for instance, my sample response toward individual performance which represented more agreement of working alone than of playing game alone. Game, perhaps can be more attractive to play in team, but what my sample showed about their tendency of individual performance in working, showed the possibility of thoughts-clash in team-work which affect the performance and learning result. In the other hand, what Gardner (1983) and Armstrong (2009) build in intrapersonal
conception is the capacity in self-emotion recognition and regulation; in order to appreciate other’s, which finally can be a good starting point of manifestation of the harmonious interpersonal relationship. These also are what Goleman (1995) claimed as the most important intelligence to have, which represented eighty percent of influence toward people success in life, than other common-intelligence being well-known nowadays.

In addition, the item measuring the tendency of intrapersonal intelligence in terms of the decision to the way of playing game was poor in the construction indeed. The item may be poor in construction because of containing two sentences with same meaning: “Saya tidak suka permainan yang melibatkan orang lain. Saya nyaman bermain sendiri”.

High performance on intrapersonal intelligence can be needful for adolescence-student to build self-confidence in school practice, however being alone in school environment is also an indicator for school counselor to detect causal factor, in order to deal intrapersonal student with conformation to the interpersonal environment.

4.2.1.8 Visual-Spatial Intelligence

I have Sri Susanti Bantu on my survey as one of eighty respondents who represented the habit of doodling on their notebook as a spare time activity. This characteristic that is possessed by forty five percents of my survey respondents may be missed by the educator to be involved as kind of ability that is useful and need to be concerned and enhanced at school practice. Especially for high school students, it is difficult to find picture as the main concern in school subjects
besides in art and culture subject. With a narrow space for them to express their idea through picture, student found their note book as a medium that provide a wide space of paper to be filled with expression of feeling, thought, or only to spend their spare time at the classroom.

What implied on my findings have been formulated by psychologist such as Thurstone in Primary Mental Ability theory and Gardner in Multiple Intelligence theory as an ability that is important for student and teacher to be concerned at school practice. It is about the ability of using picture and picturing, either in mind or in real action.

The interpretation that can be formulated based on correlation value, is that the habit of *daydreaming a lot* as one of visual characteristic, only correlated with the tendency of *watching picture on TV, slideshow, or photo*; and *having a good memory to remember faces*. Meanwhile, item about *doodling* is related to terms about *watching picture on TV, slideshow, or photo*; and *learning through picture*.

There might be a misinterpretation of “daydreams”, when it is behaved by student; that is the act of thinking nothing. The correlation showed different interpretation that daydreams, the visual imagination, is related to the act of picturing in mind, the interest of visual object such as prefer enjoying picture to the dialogue on TV program. The kind of people, who are known as visual learner on learning style theory, specifically, can find pictures on science-related subject such as on graphic, table, or illustration.

In addition to visual ability, the characteristic related to spatial ability is also important to be appreciated in school practice. Such characteristic that is
represented by *skill in navigation* on my survey, correlated to terms of *memory for faces; understanding of graph, table or map; and interest to pictures and picturing in mind*. Integration of pictures on learning activity was supported by 60% of survey sample that can be useful information for educator in differentiating the instruction with no regard to the other 40% who have another proclivity.

These should be appreciated in school because of its importance in real-life practice, on simple terms like: having good memory for places and things, until the complex visual-spatial terms on air navigational system.

4.2.2 *MI Tendency of First Grade Students of SMA N 1 Paguyaman*

This part is about to discuss the item analysis on the survey, that will be focused on how my respondents, namely 155 first grade students of SMA N 1 Paguyaman show their proclivity on every single item provided on the survey. The brief presentation of item analysis is attached on Addendum 4, that describe the percentage on five degree of responses provided on the survey.

In this part, I have shorten the degree of agreement that are *Strongly Disagree* (answers “1”), *Disagree* (answers “2”), *Slightly Agree* (answers “3”), *Agree* (answers “4”), and *Strongly Agree* (answers “5”); into three categories only, by merging answers “1” and “2” into *Disagree*; answers “3” into *So-So*; and answers “4” and “5” into *Agree*. This is taken for making the responses of the survey easier to discuss per item per aspect of intelligences. Below I provide the simplified item analysis in table of percentage of agreement on the eight intelligences.
4.2.2.1 Low Sensitivity toward Natural Changes and Ecological Preservation

The interpretation of “nature” depends on how it is interpreted on respondent’s environment. It could be living things for the one who lived in village, or nonliving things like fashion style or technology on urban environment.

The items on MI Inventory are checked in order to explore students’ tendency toward three main domains, such as (1) interest to nature, which started from interest of having field trip and preferred spot in nature until observing natural changes; (2) living things preservation, which elaborated into the interest in observing, caring for and speaking out for the right of living things; and (3) ecological awareness. This ability has been used by human in earlier time to survive by recognizing the pattern of natural phenomenon, observing star constellation to navigate, deciding what food to eat, and where to live. Nowadays, these items can be found simply on theory that is taught in school subject, scouting, school field-trip, or in complex form such as in climatology station, weather forecast, tsunami early-warning system or food-commodity diversification.

More than fifty percents of my sample showed interest to nature for enjoyment. They agree to watch plant and animal TV program, speak out in class for the right of animals, enjoy working outdoors and field trips in nature, and get excited when studying about ecology, nature, plants or animal.

In terms of animal and ecological preservation, my samples only show tendency in perception, not the action. They tend to enjoy learning about living
things and speaking out the right of animal in school subject, that provide descriptions of theory, pictures, videos and materials to be discussed about. It seems to be artificial-nature that is helpful for teaching learning activity, unfortunately learning about nature without being in contact with nature cannot build students’ awareness to the so-called natural and environmental preservation.

Tendency of watching plant and animal TV program indicates two possibilities, namely (1) sixty percent of my sample interested to living things; or (2) they are interested if it is showed on the TV program. If the tendency is resided in first possibility, living things can be teaching aids, which are presented as a choice for nature smart student to learn. For the second possibility, the tool can be replaced with nature-related audio-visual media as a micro-cosmos of the real nature.

Sensitivity toward natural changes and ecological preservation appear to be low responded as presented by more percentage on disagreement toward items No.15, 19, and 23. These will be emphasized because of the indication from the result, that 41% of my sample has low tendency on sensitivity toward climate and nature changes which represent how they perceive nature and make a prediction toward natural/environmental phenomena. This item is originally formulated as “Dibanding orang lain, saya merasa lebih peka terhadap perubahan cuaca di sekitar rumah saya (Misalnya: ketika saya kepanasan sampai sakit kepala, saya tahu bahwa hujan sebentar lagi akan segera turun)”, checking about students’ perception toward their mental ability in observing, perceiving, and predicting their environmental condition around them. Generally, this item did not only
measure about how my sample predict the weather changes, it is beyond it, where the item provide a chance for educator/teacher to know how students apply the material gained from school into real life practice. And, forty one percent of disagreement and 27% of “so-so” are the warning bells for instructional institution, in this term school, about building instructional design that motivate student to implement school subject material to be meaningful for real life practice.

Tendency toward caring for and interacting with animal also can be criticized by its forty six percent of disagreement. This is how my sample interested to terms related to animal or other living things only on school subject conception, which provide them the chance to discuss the material inside of the classroom. In a word, the tendency showed by my survey result implies that student has opportunity to learn-about animal, not learn-how the animal live, survive and interact with others. This made them difficult to directly observe, interact and understand what they have in learning table in real-nature. Even though for student, it sounds unimportant to have, but this sensitivity and ability can give long-term impact in life.

In addition, item about the awareness of ecological preservation that is low-responded by almost half of my sample should be considered in school. Student as a part of their environment, basically, should be capable of applying science-principle they get from school subject in real life practice, in order to achieve meaningful instructional practice. The awareness of trash-reduction by recycling can be a good effort of the so-called ecological preservation. What stated in
Permendiknas No.23/2006 about standar kompetensi lulusan can explain how instruction, in this case, science-related subject, should be meaningful not only covering material in school subject, but also building the powerful character that is valued in socio-cultural life outside of school, by directly observing nature, its importance for human life and its preservation (see DEPDIKNAS, 2006, p. 83-84).

4.2.2.2 Low Tendency on Playing Musical Instrument and Learning with Music Background.

Other theorists argue that what Gardner claimed as “intelligence” (see Armstrong, 2009) is more appropriate to call as “talent” because it is under the effect of the so-called g factor. Gardner than disagrees with this point of view in considering the existence of intelligence in human being. Notwithstanding the support of psychometric-psychologist like Sternberg, Gardner reveals that there is a semantically-error on how people consider one as “talented” and “intelligent”. People basically prefer call mathematician as intelligent to musician, even though they all smart in each domain. What I want to discuss in this part, is how music-smart exist in my sample including its usefulness in school practice.

My sample shows response variation on the ten items provided, that indicated differences of tendency. The characteristic of my sample that is illuminated by the result is that my samples are students who perceive music for enjoyment, which is showed by high percentage on the last-four-items on questionnaire. As most adolescent, my sample enjoyed their time by memorizing
their favorite song lyrics and give reaction toward it, only approximately 9% of respondents answer “disagree” for those items.

These characteristics may be enjoyable for student, but thing to be questioned is that whether or not it can be helpful for school practice, in which basically student only find song and music appreciated on art class or extracurricular activity. In fact, music is exist everywhere in human life, which even emerged in earlier time as human use language (Gardner, 1983) that can be helpful for learning activity not only in terms of knowing-how music is, but also knowing-that music can be integrated with school subject to help learning activity itself. Having regard to other 9% of students who do not have this tendency, learning method that provide a chance for students to perceive music within the subject, is needed in order to differentiate classroom activity and help students remember the information that teacher bring on the learning table.

In one hand, most activities which are held inside of the classroom, evoking the noises coming from outside of classroom or another classroom cannot be avoided. My samples reveal the fact that they are sensitive to environmental noises that make them have a hard time concentrating in learning activity. Don Campbell (2002:220) in his book “Mozart Effect” proposes music as the background to be used in classroom activity to decrease these environmental noises and at the same time, increase students’ concentration to learn.

In the other hand, student who predisposed not to enjoy music-integrated learning activity, should be considered and appreciated. Respondent X-1-006 who has low tendency on most items except item No.16, is representation of highly
sensitive student who perceives sounds as a noise that cause a hard time concentration on learning activity. Such sensitivity should be appreciated, because every single student in school has their own preference of enjoying music, using music background when learning, or using music to learn. However, incapacitation on musical performance should be enriched so that such student will not be isolated on school subject that require music to be played.

As presented on the table, my samples have low responses toward item No.4 revealing that twenty two percents of my sample can play at least one musical instrument. This seems to be trivial, but when it happened at high school, it means that there is new thing to be questioned. What have school taught to student about music, when they have it even when they still in elementary school? Twenty two percent is not a good percentage as attainment on music class which explains several possibilities, namely (1) playing musical instrument is not important or interesting for student, (2) it is not well-delivered to student by teacher; (3) there is no chance to learn playing musical instrument; or (4) no music teacher/tutor at school. In addition to that, playing musical instrument not only building the expertise on music itself, but also increasing students’ creativity in other aspects of learning which affected their test scores, as concluded by Edward J. Kvet in 1996 that student who can play musical instrument got 51 points higher on verbal-test scores, and 39 points higher on Mathematical-test scores (Campbell, 2002, p. 218). From my calculation, the one who shows low tendency on playing musical instrument, cannot learn best with music background, perform a good singing voice and melodies memory, use song or music to remember information, and
enjoy listening to and identifying rhyming pattern in poetry. Whatever it takes place in learning activity, musical-rhythmic should be appreciated in school practice as long as it can differentiate the instruction so that exhaustion could be decreased.

4.2.2.3 Low Tendency on Procedural Proposition

Standardized test is purely measure students’ ability in logical and mathematical ability, where require expertise in operating mathematical equation, or solving logical question. However, Ministry of Education have formulated the requirement for student not only to be expert in logical-mathematical on school subject, but also understand the essentials that are useful for solving life problem which, at the same time require them to be expert in thinking logically, analytically, systematically, critically, creatively and cooperatively (see Permendiknas No.23/2006).

Items that are checked on my survey covering the tendency of being organized in life that represented the characteristic of being neat, putting things in order, and being frustrated by disorganized people and place; Thinking logically, checked about habit such as asking logical matter, playing logic puzzle and strategic games, being interested to procedural proposition, and understanding causal case; and being Interested to numbers in arithmetic or science-related subject.

The items are about habit, interest, and logical ability based on how students assess their perception toward what they have. Self-assessment of the tendency as presented on the table indicates that more than half of my samples are positively
responded items about being organized in life. These can be helpful for teaching-learning process not only in science-related subject, but also on whole school practice and subject. Putting things in order, enjoying strategic games and puzzle can be helpful for teacher in defining learning strategy that support this tendency in order to build interesting learning activity.

Students get learning services in school subject material consist of numerical operation and other logical-mathematical material by 10 hours of time-allotment in science-related subject per week per semester at the first grade. These twenty six percent of total learning-hours in school are enough for giving student the knowledgement regarding the material. However, being expert in implementing the material to be meaningful in life, which is known as long-life learning, needed a little bit more time for student. Fifty five percent of my sample, who cannot perceive logical-mathematical term in more abstract ways such as procedural proposition, is an example of how logical-mathematical intelligence cannot only be measured on school subject. Trigonometry, algebra, or chemical reaction are well-delivered in school subject, however to implement the theory in life should be emphasized in school practice. Procedural proposition is about curious to explore how things work, by putting it apart and rebuild the procedure to put it together again. On the MI Inventory, the item is originally formulated as “Saya merasa tertantang membongkar atau memperbaiki barang-barang (eletronik/mesin) yang rusak di rumah saya” Sternberg formulated this ability as creative thinking, as the phase of creating one’s own product to solve a problem.
It requires logical thinking ability at one hand as the way of analyzing the procedure, and practical-thinking to execute the procedure on the others.

By having this result, it is better for subsequent administration of survey, if possible, to construct more complex instrument than I have in order to check more terms including its causes on the low tendency cases. In my case, of low tendency on procedural proposition can be a good description for cross-sectional observation on everyday activity that can only be held by teacher on school practice.

4.2.2.4 People-Smart Learner

...the ability to notice and make distinctions among other individuals and, in particular, among their moods, temperaments, motivations, and intentions...the capacity of the young child to discriminate among the individuals around him and to detect their various moods. In an advanced form, interpersonal knowledge permits a skilled adult to read the intentions and desires—even when these have been hidden...(Gardner, 2011, p. 253)

That is how Gardner defined Interpersonal intelligence (people-smart), which, then, inspired Goleman in writing his “Emotional and Social Intelligence”. However, the essential of their definitions toward it have been redefined by many educators, say, Armstrong, McKenzie, or Falk, to be reformed and used in instructional practices. Based on the item analysis of my survey, high agreement is showed by respondents on almost all items in this kind of intelligence, especially on items about socializing with friends both inside and outside of school.

Ninety two percent of my respondents find their self as the one who know and able to communicate with people on their environment. This can be useful for school practice, where students, think that they are skillful in socializing among
friends as Laurie Falk of New City School claimed as the most important skill to have. What can be interpreted in this term is that people-smart learner can be actively participated in learning activity at school setting, especially those who involved in group activities and games or other cooperative learning features.

From the result I have got from my sample, terms about interacting, socializing, and involving in community or other social groups, should be considered and get more attention in order of controlling the social behavior showed by student. The brief description can only be gained by having in-depth observation toward how student behave throughout life, by the involvement of parents and educator to control what Falk called as “acceptable behavior”. The description on my survey has no guarantee of presenting number of tendency on positive ways, which means that high-percentage on item about performances in socializing and recognizing own environment, is not only specified in positive behavior. The result cannot predict what and how environment are interpreted by the respondents, it can be a good friendship for an unacceptable or annoying behavior. So that is why the so-called “acceptable” behavior should be concerned in socio-cultural value where students’ live. The practical explanation of how interpersonal intelligence be enhanced can be found on “Engage Every Students” of Kirby and McDonald or “Social Intelligence” of Goleman.

4.2.2.5 Various Tendencies on Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence

I have Irfan Tato who loves bodily-kinesthetic experimentation by taking things apart and put it together; Destika Harun who is easy in remembering dance step; Adriyanto Lahay who likes sport; Nurain Ahmad who tends to use her hand
to illustrate points; Sri Wahyuni Hiola who cleverly mimics others gestures; Oktaviani Mansa who difficult to sit still for long period of time; Abidin Tina who can move rhythmically; Arman Bakari who prefers watch action movie; Nirwan Pakaya who is able to make a handicraft; and Ririn Bau who uses finger when reading or writing. They use different part of body in different action to help the activity in life. These are how body can be the instrument interpreting what brain produce in form of idea.

The first characteristic on the checklist is about using body in exploring things which always showed by hands-on student who learn comfortably by touching the objects being learned about. "They prefer to demonstrate to someone else how to do something rather than tell them how to do it" explained Nuernberg (2010) of the New City School about such kind of body-smart student.

Distribution of scores on the second characteristic that is about using body in remembering dance step is balance between one who agreed, so-so, and disagreed. Art-related subject provide the chance for student in practicing this kind of activity. Disagreement toward this item can be purely the tendency of student not to choose dance as part of using their body, or it could be the indication of less enrichment or practice in school activity that is related to dance itself.

Other characteristics such as using hand to illustrate points; mimicking other people’s gestures and mannerisms; cannot sit still in one spot for a long time; paying attention toward the acting of actors when watching movie; and using finger to point out words, sentences, or lines when reading or writing; are the
behavior of body-smart student that always appear in classroom. Those should be appreciated and guided so that students who have such characteristics will get the opportunity to practice the active learning.

Item about the expertise on one or more sport was showing much of disagreement of the respondents. Being expert in sport needs long-term training, which means that the result showing disagreement did not represent dislikes of student toward sport, it is only the description of their self-view toward their ability in doing sport.

In a word, there are many ways of using body to show the involvement in active learning process for the one who tend to have this kind of intelligence. However, the characteristics could be misinterpreted as the act of hyperactive or naughty person, if it is not well appreciated.

Think, for instance, students who always get the classmates annoyed by their fidgetiness on the seat, or the one who mimic teachers’ way of speaking in order to remember information. This kind of student, perhaps, will get a warning from teachers, when classroom activity was set to be in passive situation such as having writing task or listening to teachers explanation.

However, those students can be good in role-play or active games. Again, to detect, appreciate and improve this kind of intelligence cannot only be done by only observing statistical analysis result as presented on my survey, the involvement of education stake-holders and parents are needed to achieve such terms.
4.2.2.6 Tendency on Verbal Performance

The ten checklists of students’ characteristics on verbal-linguistic intelligence illuminated the tendency on how verbal and linguistic terms having been perceived by student on school setting and daily activity. The characteristic like “good memory for name, place, and trivia” is the description of how students use their memory for “words” to be processed into remembering information the words are about, such as person’s name that they have ever talked to or the name of places stated on the map they got from the book. It will be helpful for learning activity where information/knowledgement mostly transferred by using language as a medium.

The other checklists are about how students viewed their tendency toward language whether in receptive or productive way as can be found on item about making notes when reading books, telling story, or having involved in discussion or debate.

On percentage of agreement, there are variations can be found on my sample’s memory for names, places or trivia. Thirty percent cannot decide whether or not they have such characteristic as happened on other items related to their perception toward easiness in learning language, word games, writing, and with the kind of discussion, speech or debate.

Results that can be good input for educator of SMA N 1 Paguyaman are that in comparison with other items having been checked, almost a half of my sample disagree on item about communicating in verbal way and being good in discussion, speech and debates. First item mentioned was originally phrased as
“Teman-teman menyebut saya sebagai orang yang paling mampu membujuk/mengajak mereka untuk melakukan sesuatu (Misalnya: mengajak teman-teman untuk selalu membersihkan ruang kelas atau bahkan mempengaruhi mereka untuk membohongi guru)” which require respondents to check their habit in persuading people in verbal ways. Only few of my samples agree on the item, while in other eight items about receptive aspect in language, it showed more or less 48% - 75% of agreement. The similar case occurs on their tendency on learning language or social subject, where most of them cannot decide whether or not they have such kind of characteristic, thirty percents agree and the same amount disagree toward the item. And, on item that checked about tendency on being involved in and interest to verbal communication in discussion, speech, or debate, high disagreement also showed by my sample.

Those phenomena can be the warning bell for educator especially for language teacher and school counselor. When my sample show high tendency on interpersonal intelligence, it means that they are well-developed in interacting among them which require verbal ability in building a communication. In contrast to that, almost half of my sample are not showing good tendency in verbal performance in school setting as they have on their every day interaction. Highly formal way of speaking that is used in school, classroom-based activity; learning media, teacher’s teaching style, strategy and attitude; and involvement of parents should be the factors to be concerned in the anticipation of this kind of tendency.
4.2.2.7 *Characteristic of Self-Smart Student*

Information that can be gained from the table below are; Items about working alone, making regular activity schedule, expressing feeling, keeping personal diary and displaying sense of independence were showing various percentages on the agreement.

Meanwhile, items about playing game alone, solving one’s own problem, being able to learn for failures and successes in life, and giving strong reaction towards sensitive topic are showing big differences between percentage of agreement, so-so and disagreement.

The tendency such as prefer working alone can be important not only because of its percentage that represented by a half of respondents on the survey, but also its existence in school practice. It can be the description of self confidence in solving problem in a “right-time”, when individual performances are highly needed, such as in school task or examination. In comparison to that, much agreements showed by my sample toward item about being *easy to learn in group* will be helpful to describe how student manage and choose the activity they have at school; whether being involved in group to discuss and solve the problem or do it alone. Similar case also occurs on the tendency toward having game in school activity. Seventy nine percent of my samples agree to have group game, while only twenty one percents of them who choose to have “one-man game”. Choices on the activity can be a good option for teacher to appreciate this kind of tendency on student.
Other items related to self-awareness also show variation, some respondents are highly agreed by my sample and others are showing high percentage on disagreement. Those items are the most important one to describe self-smart student, to explore how good students aware of their strengths and weaknesses and understanding each other. The appreciation of teachers toward the tendency of twenty three percents of my samples who do not make regular activity schedule or thirty nine percent of them, who cannot accurately express their feeling, can help students to enhance their self awareness and confidence to succeed not only in school subject but also in real life practice. It is important for teacher and school counselor to help students recognizing their strengths and weaknesses appreciate the strengths and try to minimize the weaknesses throughout school activity. Helpful writing of Thomas Hoerr (2010) in Celebrating Every Learner illuminated how students’ successes in life are affected by their ability of making the strengths rise up and recognizing and accommodating the weaknesses.

4.2.2.8 Creative-Visual Performances

At a glance, Visual-Spatial Intelligence is related to visual sense. However, what Gardner formulated in Multiple Intelligence theory was that, this kind of intelligence is more than the process or ability of seeing; where even blind person possesses this kind of intelligence. On my survey, the intelligence is checked on the items about the ability of navigating, interest to visual-spatial pattern and object, and creative visual performance.

Item about “navigate well” is varied on percentage which presented approximately same amount of respondents, who agree, so-so, and disagree.
Thirty percent of my samples who are doubt to decide whether or not they have such kind of skill, or a third of them who answered “disagree” seems to have no problem with school subject. However, navigating as the early time people have, is important skill that is useful in life. It is the skill that fisherman has, to decide which part of sea to go, and which way to get back home or it can be as complex as air navigational system that is used nowadays. These means that the skill can be enhanced through learning activity or it can be used to empower learning material in school setting.

   High percentage on the agreement is showed on three items about the interest toward visual-spatial object, such as watching TV or slideshow, learning through picture, and see picture in head. The other two items namely item No.70 and 75 showed more or less thirty eight percents on the agreement. On one hand, in item No.75 about understanding graphic, table or map a third of my sample answered “so-so” which represented their doubt to choose whether or not they can read information through those visual means. On the other hand, on item No.73 there are a half of respondents who show agreement on making graph, or mind mapping to help learning process. This can be good input for teacher of SMA N 1 Paguyaman to do more observation toward this ability, which basically is needed further for academic practice of the students.

   Another characteristic which is interesting to be observed is ability of making picture, sketch or painting that was only represented by nineteen percent of my sample. This creative visual performance should be appreciated or even
enhanced at school practice in order to help students in perceiving information they got on school subject.

Related to those cases, Smith (2010, p.201) writes about some steps teachers can do for helping student who have visual-spatial intelligence, namely (1) set up spatial center in the classroom that provide tools to use and activity to do such as painting, having visual games (i.e. chess) or activity like creating spatial project such as making the detailed map of school; (2) invite local artists and spatially talented guests to share their expertise and experiences so that student can get the example of visual-spatial works in real life practice; (3) let students write a review or critic toward visual-spatial works like paintings or architecture design; (4) provide the opportunities for students to use visual-recorder or presentation tools such as digital camera, video camera or PowerPoint in learning activities; and (5) let student observe and navigate through environment and speak about it at school setting.

In conclusion to the discussion above, there are some characteristics need to be deeply observed in school practice at SMA N 1 Paguyaman. They are (1) Sensitivity toward nature changes; (2) Ecological awareness; (3) Interest of playing musical instrument; (4) Curiosity on how things work; (5) Sense of leadership; (6) Expertise in one or more sports; (7) communication in verbal way; (8) Interest toward being involved in discussion debate or speech; (9) Sense of independence; and (10) Creative-visual performances. These terms can only be well-recorded by teachers who faced students in everyday activities at school.
4.2.3 Gender Differences on the MI Tendency

On Addendum 6 the information about how male and female responded the items on the survey, is provided. In fact, percentage of the agreement toward the items described differences between male and female respondents. However, there are eleven cases showing the result that, in percentage male and female had contrast way of responding the items. The facts can be elaborated as follows:

1. Males show more percentage in agreement than female on items about having ecological awareness, enjoying strategy games and navigating well (30% of differences). The three items that are technically resided in different kind of intelligence are showing how male and female are different in perceiving their environment and solving problem within it. Ecological awareness needs sensitivity and frequency of being in touch with nature. In this case, my sample showed that male has more opportunities of being in nature to build their awareness toward it. Meanwhile, high agreement on strategy games and navigation indicated that male has more tendency toward things related to procedural proposition and active performance.

2. Females show 33% difference of agreement with male on item about giving advice to friends who have problems; 13% on item about expressing own feeling accurately; and 50% on item about keeping personal diary. The facts indicate that female respondents on my sample are good in their personal intelligence which related to social interaction and self esteem. It can be observed on Interpersonal Intelligence result that, females show higher percentage than males on seven items related to interpersonal relationship
except items about being involved in community and being a natural leader.

On Intrapersonal Intelligence, females show more agreement on items related to self-regulation.

3. Males show more percentage in disagreement than female on items about Using song or music to remember information. This information can be helpful for teacher in choosing strategy where song or music is used in learning activity.

4. Females show high percentage of disagreement toward the items about playing musical instrument, about asking question about how things work, about expertise in sport and about paying attention toward action-scene in movie. Disagreement toward the items was showed by more than 50% of female respondents. The first two items are showing more or less 30% of differences, while the other two items show contrastive result on percentage. Instead of using music to remember information, males prefer learning and playing musical instrument for enjoyment. And, as happened on fact No.1, active performance tends to be observed by males through action-scene in movie.

Females tend to have good self-regulation including the ability of finding their own way to help learning activity. Meanwhile, males show more tendencies on understanding procedure and showing active performance. These differences should be considered by teacher to provide activity based on students’ characteristic.

Terms that can be underlined according to the discussion above are, on one hand, the weaknesses happened on validity and reliability values of my self-
developed MI Inventory indicating the important of test-retest method in the construction of the instrument. On the other hand, the tendency showed by my sample exist in concept of learning setting means that the access, environmental expectation, or instructional design should appreciate the differences of the characteristic of the students. The gender differences also showed significant result on particular aspects such as physical performances and self-regulations which can be useful information for SMA N 1 Paguyaman in building a differentiated learning atmosphere. Those terms are extracted shortly on the last chapter, involving the conclusions of my study and the suggestions to the subsequent researchers whose concern take place on exploring multiple intelligences theory or building their own self-developed MI Inventory.